

1 **Potential environmental transmission routes of SARS-CoV-2 inside a large meat processing plant**
2 **experiencing COVID-19 clusters**

3 **Authors**

4 Myrna M.T. de Rooij*¹, Reina S. Sikkema², Martijn Bouwknecht³, Yvette de Geus¹, Kamelia R.
5 Stanoeva^{4,5}, Sigrid Nieuwenweg¹, A.S.G. (Sandra) van Dam⁶, Ceder Raben¹, Wietske Dohmen¹, Dick
6 Heederik¹, Chantal Reusken⁴, Adam Meijer⁴, Marion P.G. Koopmans², Eelco Franz⁴, Lidwien A.M.
7 Smit¹

8 *corresponding author, m.m.t.derooij@uu.nl (*Institute for Risk Assessment Sciences, Utrecht*
9 *University, Yalelaan 2, 3584CM Utrecht, the Netherlands; ORCID: 0000-0002-6560-4839*)

10 **Affiliations**

11 ¹Institute for Risk Assessment Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

12 ²Department of Viroscience, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

13 ³Vion Food Group, Boxtel, the Netherlands

14 ⁴Center for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment
15 (RIVM), Bilthoven, the Netherlands

16 ⁵European Public Health Microbiology Training Programme (EUPHEM), European Centre for Disease
17 Prevention and Control (ECDC), Stockholm, Sweden

18 ⁶Municipal health Services GGD Hart voor Brabant, 's-Hertogenbosch, the Netherlands

19

20 **Supplemental Information available online**

21 Supplemental Methods

22 **Abstract (<250 words)**

23 Worldwide exceptionally many COVID-19 clusters were observed in meat processing plants. Many
24 contributing factors, promoting transmission, were suggested, including climate conditions in cooled
25 production rooms favorable for environmental transmission but actual sampling studies are lacking.
26 We aimed to assess SARS-CoV-2 contamination of air and surfaces to gain insight in potential
27 environmental transmission in a large Dutch meat processing plant experiencing COVID-19 clusters.

28 We performed SARS-CoV-2 screening of workers operating in cooled production rooms and intensive
29 environmental sampling during a two-week study period in June 2020. Sampling of air (both
30 stationary and personal), settling dust, ventilation systems, and sewage was performed. Swabs were
31 collected from high-touch surfaces and workers' hands. Screening of workers was done using oro-
32 nasopharyngeal swabs. Samples were tested for presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by RT-qPCR.

33 Of the 76 (predominantly asymptomatic) workers tested, 27 (35.5%) were SARS-CoV-2 RNA positive
34 with modest to low viral loads ($Ct \geq 29.7$). In total, 6 out of 203 surface swabs were positive ($Ct \geq 38$),
35 being swabs taken from communal touchscreens/handles. One of the 12 personal air samples and
36 one of the 4 sewage samples were positive, RNA levels were low ($Ct \geq 38$). All other environmental
37 samples tested negative.

38 Although one-third of workers tested SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR positive, environmental contamination
39 was limited. Hence widespread transmission of SARS-CoV-2 via air and surfaces was considered
40 unlikely within this plant at the time of investigation in the context of strict COVID-19 control
41 measures in place.

42 **Keywords**

43 SARS-CoV-2; Occupational health; Meat processing plant; Environmental transmission; Air; Surfaces.

44

45 Introduction

46 Clusters of human SARS-CoV-2 infections (COVID-19) have been observed worldwide in a variety of
47 private, public and occupational settings. Not only workers in healthcare but also workers in other
48 essential services/industries like the food producing industry face an increased risk¹. Exceptionally
49 many SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks were reported in meat processing plants across Europe, Australia and
50 the Americas¹⁻⁵. In some cases, facilities were closed due to the high number of infected workers
51 which was regarded as a last resort by local authorities given the necessity of food production.

52 A combination of several factors may explain why meat processing plants were found to be SARS-
53 CoV-2 infection hotspots, including operational practices (e.g. high density of workers, enhanced
54 breathing and yelling due to the physically intense work and noisy environment), societal and/or
55 economic factors (e.g. migrant workers sharing housing and transportation), and the climate
56 conditions inside the production rooms^{1-3,6}. The low temperature, which is in place to ensure food
57 safety, combined with presence of air recirculation systems to reduce energy use, are suggested to
58 be advantageous for persistence and circulation of SARS-CoV-2 in air. The probable relevance of
59 climate conditions was highlighted in experimental studies on factors affecting viability of
60 aerosolized SARS-CoV-2⁷⁻¹² and was suggested to play a role in an outbreak at a meat processing
61 plant in Germany¹³ where no environmental sampling was conducted. Besides low temperatures
62 being potentially advantageous for airborne transmission, it might also facilitate fomite transmission
63 (touching a contaminated surface and then transferring virus to facial mucosa) as experiments
64 showed prolonged viability of SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces with cooler temperatures¹⁴. However, studies
65 including environmental sampling in meat processing plants to assess potential transmission via air
66 and surfaces have thus far not been performed.

67 In the Netherlands, an increased incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections was notified amongst workers
68 in cooled production rooms of a high-throughput pig meat processing plant by the end of May 2020.
69 Immediately, the COVID-19 policy of the slaughterhouse already in place was sharpened with stricter
70 measures and supervision on compliance was intensified. In June 2020, we conducted a study to
71 assess the role of environmental transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in this plant. The objectives were to
72 assess potential transmission via air and surfaces. Therefore, extensive environmental sampling was
73 performed simultaneously with voluntary screening for SARS-CoV-2 RNA in oro-nasopharyngeal
74 swabs collected from employees.

75 Methods

76 Details and pictures of study setting, sampling methods, and laboratory procedures are provided in
77 the Supplemental Material.

78 **Investigated slaughterhouse**

79 Investigations were performed at a high-throughput pig slaughterhouse in the Netherlands. The
80 production process can be divided into two parts: i) process from live animals until halved carcasses,
81 and ii) process where carcasses are further sectioned, processed and packed. The latter is performed
82 in two large cooled production rooms (temperature: 5-9°C): a cutting room of 9,000 m³ and
83 deboning room with a packaging area of 10,800 m³. The number of persons working in the abattoir
84 during each shift is around 850, of whom 600 are working in cooled production rooms (215 in cutting
85 room, 385 in deboning room/packaging area). Cooled production rooms are ventilated by a system
86 comprising of two-stage filtering and air is largely recirculated. Each day after production, a rigorous
87 multi-stage cleaning procedure is followed involving wetting from bottom-to-top with a mix of
88 cleaning/disinfecting agents including chlorine-based agents.

89 Screening for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR status amongst a random selection of voluntarily participating
90 abattoir workers on May 29th, showed a prevalence that was especially high among workers
91 operating in cooled production rooms: 41% in the cutting room (9/22), 32% in the deboning room
92 (6/19) and 16% in the packaging area (3/19) versus 0% (0/45) in other sections. From March 2020,
93 initial COVID-19 measures were implemented involving prevention of close contact between
94 workers (separation of work shifts and breaks in time, work place modifications) and increased focus
95 on hand hygiene at entry of the premises and in non-production locations. From the start of June,
96 additional measures were implemented involving intensified cleaning and disinfection procedures
97 (incl. air treatment by fogging every Sunday with hydrogen peroxide and lactic acids), a triage based
98 on symptoms (questionnaire and interview) of all individuals entering and contact reductions while
99 commuting.

100 **Sampling strategy**

101 Environmental sampling was performed at three time-points in June 2020 (T1: June 8, T2: June 15,
102 T3: June 19). SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR screening of a random selection of workers by oro-nasopharyngeal
103 sampling was performed at T2, and screening based on sewage sampling at T1 and T2. To assess
104 potential transmission via air, we performed sampling of air, settling dust and filters of the
105 ventilation system. To assess potential transmission via surfaces, swabs were collected from surfaces
106 that were expected to be touched frequently as well as the hands/gloves of workers. At T1 the

107 purpose of environmental sampling was to gain broad insight into potential environmental SARS-
108 CoV-2 RNA presence in the various areas either in air or on surfaces. Stationary air sampling was
109 performed at potential hotspots based on workers' density and ventilation characteristics in both
110 production rooms. Environmental swabs were used to sample a selection of various high-touch
111 surfaces present throughout the facility. At T2, focus was on personal air sampling during the shift of
112 workers participating in SARS-CoV-2 oro-nasopharyngeal screening combined with swabbing of their
113 hands/gloves enabling. Environmental swabs were taken from high-touch surfaces not yet sampled.
114 At T3, environmental swabs were collected from same and similar high-touch surfaces identified to
115 be relevant at T2. Throughout the study, strict safety and hygienic procedures were followed to
116 prevent infection and contamination. Field blanks of all sample types were collected as a control.

117 **Screening and scoring**

118 Sewage samples (2 tubes of 50ml 24-hour flow dependent composite sample) were collected as
119 described previously¹⁵ at both T1 and T2 in collaboration with the external water treatment plant
120 located at the facility. At T2, in collaboration with the municipal health services (GGD), oro-
121 nasopharyngeal swabs were collected from persons working at the cooled production rooms before
122 and after the shift (minimum working time: 6.5 hours). Questionnaires were collected including
123 items on health status, contacts and working and living conditions. Workers participated on a
124 voluntary basis, informed consents were obtained. Each worker received 40 euros for participation.

125 Workers were scored on SARS-CoV-2 transmission relevant behaviour and personal protective
126 measures (PPM) by means of scoring cards by fieldworkers. To gain an overall impression of wearing
127 surgical masks (categorized: covering nose and mouth, covering mouth, or not-wearing), a minimum
128 of 45 persons in both production rooms were scored. In addition, 5-minute observations of workers
129 performing their job-tasks were performed to note wearing of PPM and physical distancing (both for
130 longer durations, e.g. conversations, and solely passing).

131 **Sampling air and surfaces**

132 Air sampling methodology was similar as described previously by De Rooij et al¹⁶. In short, a filter-
133 based technique was used to sample inhalable dust—airborne particles small enough to enter the
134 respiratory tract. For stationary air sampling, sampling heads were attached onto a pole at 1.50m
135 height (average breathing height of humans). Personal air sampling was performed by attaching the
136 sampling head within the breathing zone of the worker. Stationary 6-hour sampling was performed
137 in both production rooms. At T1, sampling was performed at 5 sites per room. At T2, stationary
138 sampling was performed at 2 sites per room; the remainder of sampling equipment was used for

139 personal sampling. Of the workers participating in oro-nasopharyngeal screening, 12 workers (6 per
140 room) were selected to participate in personal air sampling. Personal air sampling was performed
141 from the beginning until the end of the worker's shift, resulting in 6 to 8 hour measurements.

142 Sampling of settling dust in production rooms and the canteen was performed by using Electrostatic
143 Dust fall Collectors (EDCs), which contain electrostatic cloths placed in a disposable holder, as
144 described previously¹⁷.

145 Sampling of the ventilation system was performed at T2 for both production rooms. Per room, one
146 filter of each type (Coarse 50% and ePM10 80%/ePM2.5 70%) was collected from their respective
147 grid. These filters had been placed in August 2019.

148 Swabs of high-touch surfaces were collected in the production rooms and in all other areas workers
149 have access to (e.g. canteen area, locker room, toilets). Per time-point, at least 60 surface swabs
150 were taken throughout these areas. Swabs of hands, or gloves if worn, of the 12 workers
151 participating in the personal air sampling were collected during their mid-shift break.

152 **Sample processing and laboratory procedures**

153 Samples were stored after collection at 4°C until further processing within 24-hours at BSL-2
154 conditions. Total nucleic acid was extracted from oro-nasopharyngeal samples using a MagNA Pure
155 96 with total nucleic acid small volume kit (Roche). Thereafter, samples were tested for the presence
156 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA using RT-qPCR, targeting the E-gene and the RdRP-gene with detection limits at
157 3.2 and 3.7 RNA copies/reaction respectively¹⁷. A worker was defined positive if at least one of the
158 two genome targets tested positive in one or both swabs.

159 On the other samples, RNA extraction was performed using an in-house method using Ampure
160 beads¹⁸. These samples were tested for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA using RT-qPCR, targeting
161 the E-gene (detection limit 3.3 RNA copies/reaction)^{19,20}.

162 **Results**

163

164 **Screening**

165 Of the 81 workers invited, 76 (94%) participated in the oro-nasopharyngeal SARS-CoV-2 screening
166 performed at T2. One worker solely participated in the pre-shift sampling round (sample tested
167 negative). In total, 27 workers (35.5%) tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA (Table 1). Of the cutting
168 room workers, 21% tested positive versus 50% of the deboning area workers. Most workers were

169 Polish or Romanian, in both groups 40% tested positive. For 6 persons (22% of the test-positive
170 cases) SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in both pre- and post-shift swabs. Seventeen workers tested
171 positive pre-shift and negative post-shift, while only 4 workers tested negative pre-shift and positive
172 post-shift. Ct-values ranged between 29.7 and 38.3 for E-gene and between 31.2 and 39.6 for RdRp-
173 gene (Figure 1), corresponding to modest to low viral loads. Of the 76 workers, 74 (97%) filled in the
174 questionnaire. The two workers that did not return the questionnaire tested SARS-CoV-2 negative.
175 None of the surveyed employees classified themselves as symptomatic at entrance triage. However,
176 three testing-negative and two testing-positive workers did report mild symptoms in our
177 questionnaire (Table 1). At T2, one sewage sample tested positive (Ct-value 39 corresponding to
178 approx. 5.5 copies/ml sewage).

179 **Air and surfaces**

180 In total 271 samples were collected (Table 2). At T2, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in 9.8% of the
181 surface swabs (6/61, Ct-values 38 to 39 corresponding to approx. 8×10^1 to 1.6×10^2 copies per
182 swabbed surface). Of the 22 surface swabs collected at the cutting room at T2, three (14%) swabs
183 tested positive, taken from a machine handle (with ridges), grip side of a stepladder, and the handle
184 of a pressure pump used for disinfection. Of the 18 surface swabs collected at non-production areas
185 at T2, three (17%) tested positive: swabs taken from a touch screen on the coffee machine, main
186 touch screen for lockers in a changing room, and handle of a dispenser used for hand disinfecting. All
187 6 positive surfaces can be classified as high-touch. All 21 surface swabs collected in the deboning
188 room at T2 were negative. All 142 surface swabs collected at T1 and T3 in production rooms as well
189 as non-production areas were negative.

190 SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in one of the 12 personal air samples (Ct-value 38 corresponding to
191 approx. 5×10^2 copies/m³). The worker with the SARS-CoV-2 positive air sample, tested oro-
192 nasopharyngeal positive at the start of the shift (Ct-value 33.2 E-gene, 33.8 RdRp-gene), but tested
193 negative post-shift. Of the other 11 workers participating in the personal air sampling, one worker
194 had a positive pre-shift and post-shift test (Ct-value E-gene 34.9, 32.8, respectively; RdRp-gene 33.7,
195 33.6); five workers only had a positive pre-shift swab (range in Ct-values E-gene 33.5-35.6; RdRp-
196 gene 31.7-33.6 and two >40). SARS-CoV-2 RNA was not detected in any of the stationary inhalable
197 dust samples (T1, n=10; T2, n=4). All other sample types (settling dust, filters ventilation system,
198 swabs of workers' hands) also tested negative.

199 **Observations**

200 The majority of the 100 scored workers wore a surgical mask covering solely the mouth (66%, 29/40
201 cutting workers; 75%, 30/40 deboning workers; 55%, 11/20 packaging workers), others wore the
202 mask covering mouth and nose. One person (deboning area) did not wear a mask. All of the 12
203 personal air sampling participants wore a mask, 11 (92%) wore the mask covering solely the mouth.
204 Of the 11 personal air sampling participants with a negative air sample, 9 had a stationary job task
205 and few persons passed by their fixed positions along the line (most kept 1.5m distance). Seven of
206 them worked at a position with 8 or more persons working in 10m vicinity, the other two workers
207 were surrounded by respectively 2 and 4 persons. The 2 workers with non-stationary tasks, showed
208 frequent passing-by or being passed-by within 1.5m distance (several times per minute). The only
209 worker with a positive personal air sample had a stationary job task in the deboning room and was
210 surrounded by 10 persons in 10m vicinity with a distance of >1.5m from the nearest worker.
211 Observations of personal air sampling participants were similar to 10 randomly selected workers per
212 production room with respect to surrounding workers and 1.5m distancing.

213 Discussion

214 Our findings provide compelling leads to the relevance of environmental transmission of SARS-CoV-2
215 in a large meat processing plant. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in one personal air sample, and on
216 six frequently touched surfaces. Screening of workers' SARS-CoV-2 status by oro-nasopharyngeal
217 swabbing showed a considerable percentage of workers to be SARS-CoV-2 RNA positive, with a
218 relatively low viral load and generally without symptoms. Results of environmental sampling showed
219 a low number of SARS-CoV-2 RNA positive samples overall which suggests a limited role of
220 transmission via air and surfaces inside the cooled production rooms during the two-week study
221 period. Results should be interpreted in the context of strict prevention and mitigation measures in
222 place at the time the study was performed.

223 **SARS-CoV-2 status of workers**

224 Our investigation showed that one third of the tested workers were positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
225 at least one of the two oro-nasopharyngeal swabs collected pre- and post-shift. Viral loads detected
226 in the swabs were low and workers were predominantly asymptomatic. There are several
227 hypotheses to explain these findings: i) worker(s) may have experienced a (mild) infection in the past
228 without noticing/recalling symptoms (post-infection scenario), ii) worker(s) could be in pre-
229 symptomatic state at the time of sampling (pre-symptomatic scenario), iii) worker(s) could
230 experience an asymptomatic infection (asymptomatic scenario). Published meta-analyses reported
231 percentages of SARS-CoV-2 infected persons remaining asymptomatic throughout infection of
232 around 15-20%²¹⁻²³, although percentages can be higher in single-family clusters (95% CI: 26%–

233 44%)²². SARS-CoV-2 RNA can remain detectable in swabs from the upper respiratory tract several
234 weeks to months after onset of infection^{24,25}. As workers that tested positive were followed-up and
235 no clear symptoms suggestive of COVID-19 had developed, the pre-symptomatic scenario seems
236 unlikely leaving both scenarios of post-infection and asymptomatic as realistic. If we consider low
237 RNA loads in participating workers a proxy of viral excretion²⁵⁻²⁷, high shedding rates of infectious
238 SARS-CoV-2 are not to be expected. The majority of workers tested positive only pre-shift, which
239 may be explained by physiological accumulation of respiratory tract secretions at the start of the
240 day²⁸, swabbing differences between testers²⁹, and/or influence of stochastic processes especially at
241 low viral loads (higher chance of false-negatives). SARS-CoV-2 RNA level in the positive sewage
242 sample was comparable to levels detected at urban sewage sites in the Netherlands in the early
243 stage of the epidemic (March 2020)³⁰. Because of site-to-site dissimilarities and methodological
244 differences^{30,31}, exact prevalence cannot be estimated but points to a limited number of acute
245 infections.

246 **Exposure assessment and risk estimation**

247 Findings indicated absence of considerable SARS-CoV-2 levels in air throughout the cooled
248 production areas. None of the stationary air samples were positive, despite the selection of likely
249 hotspots. Central ventilation system filters were also all negative while it has been suggested that
250 SARS-CoV-2 RNA may accumulate in filters³². One of 12 personal air samples was positive, with a
251 100-fold lower level than personal exposure levels measured in SARS-CoV-2 infected mink farms¹⁶.
252 As the Ct-value of this air sample was too high for whole genome sequencing, and this worker's oro-
253 nasopharyngeal swab tested positive, it could not be determined whether SARS-CoV-2 RNA detected
254 in this personal air sample originated from this individual, and/or from other workers. Low or non-
255 detectable exposure as found in personal air samples can be explained by COVID-19 measures in
256 place³³ (e.g. physical distancing, masks) and limited viral shedding by workers in line with low viral
257 loads in oro-nasopharyngeal screening and negative personal air samples for 6 positive-tested
258 workers. Inhalation exposure during a workday to such low/non detectable levels of SARS-CoV-2
259 RNA (and even lower levels of viable virus), is not expected to pose a high risk of infection³⁴.
260 Deposition of inhaled SARS-CoV-2 contaminated particles anywhere along the respiratory tract, from
261 nasal epithelial cells to deep in the airways, has the potential to initiate infection³⁵ so air sampling
262 covered the relevant particle size fraction. As no viability testing was performed, no inferences on
263 potential levels of viable virus could be made.

264 The many surfaces sampled showed limited SARS-CoV-2 surface contamination, with low viral RNA
265 loads in a few positive samples. As the hygiene standards in the food processing industry are

266 high^{36,37}, regulations are already in place to ensure frequent and proper hand washing and
267 disinfecting. This was substantiated by swabs from workers' hands/gloves being all negative for
268 SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Considering limited SARS-CoV-2 RNA surface contamination observed (thus even
269 lower considering viable virus), and focus on hand hygiene is in place, we consider this not a main
270 route of transmission in this meat processing plant during the study period. Given the sampling
271 design (focus on major high-touch surfaces, sampling later during the day so both shifts have
272 passed), it is unlikely that the level of surface contamination at the time of investigation was
273 underestimated. Pork carcasses or meat products as a possible source can be excluded, as animal
274 studies showed that pigs are unlikely to get infected with SARS-CoV-2^{38,39}.

275 **Comparisons to other research in meat processing plants**

276 The importance of the airborne route has been suggested in particular by an outbreak investigation
277 performed in a large meat processing plant in Germany, which did not look at the potential role of
278 surface contamination¹³. Based on spatio-temporal aspects of the outbreak, it was suggested that
279 SARS-CoV-2 had efficiently spread inside the production room via distances of more than 8 meters
280 but no environmental sampling was performed. Airborne transmission was not supported by our air
281 sampling, but differences between facilities (e.g. lay-out, ventilation system and air flow), COVID-19
282 incidence, and control measures in place at the time of investigation preclude firm conclusions on
283 the airborne route. Research performed in the United States on evaluation of effectiveness of
284 COVID-19 measures in meat processing plants suggested mitigation of transmission after initiating
285 universal mask policy and installing physical barriers but the exact effect could not be determined as
286 not all, potentially confounding, factors (e.g. other measures implemented, transmission beyond the
287 workplace) could be assessed⁴⁰.

288 **Considerations on COVID-19 policy**

289 At the time the study was performed, strict preventive and mitigation measures were already in
290 place, so effectiveness of individual interventions can only be speculated upon. Even more intense
291 cleaning could be recommended for exceptionally high-touch surfaces in the non-production rooms
292 (touchscreens and handle) and non-smooth surfaces in the production rooms (handles/grip side).
293 Based on our findings, the meat processing plant decided to further intensify cleaning and
294 disinfection of these surfaces during the day. Entrance triage appeared not completely effective in
295 preventing persons with potential COVID-19 related symptoms going to work emphasizing, on top of
296 the risk of asymptomatic infections, the importance of mitigation measures. Physical distancing
297 measures, which were mostly adhered to according to observations of workers' behaviour, may
298 have limited inhalation exposure. The effectiveness of surgical masks to prevent shedding by positive

299 persons and protect susceptible persons cannot be properly estimated as many influential factors
300 are suggested including mask-related (e.g. type and fit) and human-related factors (e.g. way of
301 wearing, use in general including donning, doffing, renewal)^{33,41,42}. In cooled production rooms,
302 standard surgical masks can cause discomfort/annoyance as glasses fog easily and masks typically
303 become moist quickly, which also may deteriorate effectiveness⁴³. Studies on PPE including mask
304 wearing are highly warranted in occupational settings like these, to evaluate effectiveness and user-
305 friendliness in practice and to provide concrete evidence-based advise on policy. Proper ventilation
306 and cleaning of the ventilation system could have contributed to low virus levels in the air⁴⁴, but
307 effectiveness of ventilation in reducing SARS-CoV-2 transmission remains to be quantified.

308 To conclude, given the overall low number of environmental samples positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA,
309 widespread transmission of SARS-CoV-2 via air and surfaces within this meat processing plant was
310 not considered likely at the time of investigation, and could be a consequence of the many COVID-19
311 control measures in place. Studies evaluating interventions in real-life settings are highly warranted
312 to better understand the role of environmental transmission of SARS-CoV-2, and to guide proper
313 control measures to take in occupational settings.

314

315

316

317 **Acknowledgements**

318 We gratefully acknowledge all persons contributing to sample collection and/or in the lab: Thijs
319 Groeneveld, Isabella van Schothorst, Jack Spithoven, Aniek Lotterman, Inge Wouters, Pascalle
320 Roulaux, Calvin Ge, Olivier Horstink, Derk Oorburg, Bart de Ruiter, Irina Chestakova, Anne van der
321 Linden, Gabriel Goderski, Lisa Wijsman, Sharon van den Brink and Harry Vennema. We gratefully
322 thank the participating slaughterhouse employees for their cooperation.

323 **Ethics Approval statement**

324 The Medical Research Ethics Committee (MREC) Utrecht confirmed that the Medical Research
325 Involving Human Subjects Act (WMO) did not apply to this study, and that therefore an official
326 approval of this study by the MREC Utrecht was not required under the WMO (Protocol 20-385/C,
327 reference number WAG/mb/20/021975).

328 **Competing interests**

329 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

330 **Funding**

331 Environmental sampling and laboratory analysis of environmental samples was funded by Vion Food
332 Group. This funder was not involved in analyses, data interpretation, nor the decision to publish.
333 Oro-nasopharyngeal sampling of workers and laboratory analysis of human samples was funded by
334 the Municipal health Services (GGD) and National Institute for Public Health (RIVM). KRS received
335 fellowship funding by the European Public Health Microbiology Training Programme (EUPHEM),
336 European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC).

337 **Data availability**

338 The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available from the
339 corresponding author on reasonable request.

340

Tables

Table 1. Characteristics of 76 meat processing workers participating in naso-oropharyngeal SARS-CoV-2 RNA screening performed on June 15th 2020

	N	SARS-CoV-2 negative	SARS-CoV-2 positive
		N=49 (64.5%)	N=27 (35.5%)
Cooled production room			
Cutting	38	30 (79%)	8 (21%)
Deboning	38	19 (50%)	19 (50%)
Nationality			
Hungarian	5	5 (100%)	0 (0%)
Lithuanian	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Polish	15	9 (60%)	6 (40%)
Portuguese	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Romanian	53	32 (60%)	21 (40%)
Slovak	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Current residential situation			
Alone	13	8 (62%)	5 (38%)
Shared with up to 4 housemates	41	26 (63%)	15 (37%)
Shared with 5 or more housemates	19	13 (68%)	6 (32%)
Mode of transportation to work			
Alone (car/bike)	29	20 (69%)	9 (31%)
By public transport	3	2 (67%)	1 (33%)
By car/mini-van with other people	42	25 (60%)	17 (40%)
Current province of residence			
Noord-Brabant (NL)	68	44 (65%)	24 (35%)
Nordrhein-Westfalen (DE)	8	5 (63%)	3 (37%)
COVID-19 related symptoms^a (n=74)			
Without symptoms (self-reported)	69	44 (64%)	25 (36%)
With symptoms (self-reported)	5	3 (60%)	2 (40%)
Chronic disease status^b (n=74)			
Without chronic condition (self-reported)	71	45 (63%)	26 (37%)
With chronic condition (self-reported)	3	2 (66%)	1 (33%)

Note. Per characteristic, the number of participants is noted for which this data was available.

^a Self-reported potential COVID-19 related symptoms included runny nose and loss of smell and/or taste (1 worker test-positive and 1 worker test-negative), fever or feeling warm and loss of smell and/or taste (1 worker test-negative), headache (1 worker test-negative), having a cough maybe/don't know (1 worker test-positive).


^b Chronic disease status defined as positive answer to question 'Do you have a chronic disease'. The person with chronic disease testing SARS-CoV-2 RNA positive reported hypertension controlled by beta blockers.

Table 2. SARS-CoV-2 PCR test results of in total 275 samples taken of air, surfaces, workers' hands and sewage in a meat processing plant

Sampling time-point	Sample type	% positive samples (n positives/N)
T1	Inhalable dust - stationary	0% (0/10)
T1	EDC	0% (0/16)
T1	Surface swab	0% (0/68)
T1	Sewage water	0% (0/2)
T2	Inhalable dust - stationary	0% (0/4)
T2	Inhalable dust - personal	8.3% (1/12)
T2	EDC	0% (0/6)
T2	Surface swab	9.8% (6/61)
T2	Sewage water	50% (1/2)
T2	Ventilation system filter	0% (0/8)
T2	Swab of hand worker	0% (0/12)
T3	Surface swab	0% (0/74)

Figures

Figure 1. Distribution of Ct-values by gene target and moment of sampling (pre-shift, post-shift) detected in oro-nasopharyngeal swabs from 27 meat processing workers tested SARS-CoV-2 RNA positive



Note. Red dots indicate six employees that were positive at both sampling moments (pre-shift and post-shift) for one or two target genes; blue dots indicate eleven employees who were positive for one target gene and one sampling moment; grey dots indicate ten employees who were positive for both target genes pre-shift only. The horizontal bar indicates the mean Ct-value.

References

1. Carlsten C, Gulati M, Hines S, et al. COVID-19 as an occupational disease. *Am J Ind Med.* 2021;(September 2020):1-11. doi:10.1002/ajim.23222
2. Middleton J, Reintjes R, Lopes H. Meat plants—a new front line in the covid-19 pandemic. *BMJ.* 2020;370:m2716. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m2716>
3. Dyal JW, Grant MP, Broadwater K, et al. COVID-19 Among Workers in Meat and Poultry Processing Facilities — 19 States, April 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(18):557-561. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6918e3
4. Steinberg J, Kennedy E, Basler C, et al. COVID-19 Outbreak Among Employees at a Meat Processing Facility - South Dakota. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(31):1015-1019.
5. Waltenburg M, Victoroff T, Rose C, Butterfield M, Jervis R, Fedak M. COVID-19 Among Workers in Meat and Poultry Processing Facilities - United States. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(27):887-892.
6. Taylor CA, Boulos C, Almond D. Livestock plants and COVID-19 transmission. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2020;117(50):202010115. doi:10.1073/pnas.2010115117
7. Aboubakr HA, Sharafeldin TA, Goyal SM. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 and other coronaviruses in the environment and on common touch surfaces and the influence of climatic conditions: A review. *Transbound Emerg Dis.* Published online 2020. doi:10.1111/tbed.13707
8. Chin AWH, Chu JTS, Perera MRA, et al. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions. *The Lancet Microbe.* 2020;1(1):e10. doi:10.1016/s2666-5247(20)30003-3
9. Van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, et al. Aerosol and surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 as compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(16):1564-1567. doi:10.1056/NEJMc2004973
10. Matson MJ, Yinda CK, Seifert SN, et al. Effect of environmental conditions on sars-cov-2 stability in human nasal mucus and sputum. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;26(9):2276-2278. doi:10.3201/eid2609.202267
11. Dabisch P, Schuit M, Herzog A, et al. The influence of temperature, humidity, and simulated sunlight on the infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 in aerosols. *Aerosol Sci Technol.* 2021;55(2):142-153. doi:10.1080/02786826.2020.1829536
12. Morris DH, Yinda KC, Gamble A, et al. The effect of temperature and humidity on the stability of SARS-CoV-2 and other enveloped viruses. *bioRxiv Prepr Serv Biol.* Published online October 16, 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.10.16.341883
13. Guenther T, Czech-Sioli M, Indenbirken D, et al. Investigation of a superspreading event preceding the largest meat processing plant-related SARS-Coronavirus 2 outbreak in Germany. *SSRN Electron J.* Published online 2020. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3654517
14. Marquès M, Domingo JL. Contamination of inert surfaces by SARS-CoV-2: Persistence, stability and infectivity. A review. *Environ Res.* 2021;193(November 2020). doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.110559
15. Izquierdo-Lara R, Elsinga G, Heijnen L, et al. Monitoring SARS-CoV-2 Circulation and Diversity through Community Wastewater Sequencing, the Netherlands and Belgium. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2021;27(5):1405-1415. doi:10.3201/eid2705.204410
16. de Rooij MMT, Hakze-Van der Honing RW, Hulst MM, et al. Occupational and environmental exposure to SARS-CoV-2 in and around infected mink farms. *medRxiv.* Published online January 14, 2021:2021.01.06.20248760. doi:10.1101/2021.01.06.20248760
17. Noss I, Wouters IM, Visser M, et al. Evaluation of a low-cost electrostatic dust fall collector for indoor air endotoxin exposure assessment. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2008;74(18):5621-5627.

doi:10.1128/AEM.00619-08

18. Richard M, Kok A, de Meulder D, et al. SARS-CoV-2 is transmitted via contact and via the air between ferrets. *Nat Commun*. 2020;11(1). doi:10.1038/s41467-020-17367-2
19. Iglói Z, Ieven M, Abdel-Karem Abou-Nouar Z, et al. Comparison of commercial realtime reverse transcription PCR assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Virol*. 2020;129(June):4-6. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104510
20. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25(3):2000045. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045
21. He J, Guo Y, Mao R, Zhang J. Proportion of asymptomatic coronavirus disease 2019: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol*. 2021;93(2):820-830. doi:10.1002/jmv.26326
22. Buitrago-Garcia D, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, et al. Occurrence and transmission potential of asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: A living systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med*. 2020;17(9). doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003346
23. Byambasuren O, Cardona M, Bell K, Clark J, McLaws ML, Glasziou P. Estimating the extent of asymptomatic COVID-19 and its potential for community transmission: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Assoc Med Microbiol Infect Dis Canada*. 2020;5(4):223-234. doi:10.3138/jammi-2020-0030
24. Gombar S, Chang M, Hogan CA, et al. Persistent detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in patients and healthcare workers with COVID-19. *J Clin Virol*. 2020;129. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104477
25. van Kampen JJA, van de Vijver DAMC, Fraaij PLA, et al. Duration and key determinants of infectious virus shedding in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19). *Nat Commun*. 2021;12(1):267. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-20568-4
26. Walsh KA, Spillane S, Comber L, et al. The duration of infectiousness of individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2. *J Infect*. 2020;81(6):847-856. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.10.009
27. Stohr JJM, Zwart VF, Goderski G, et al. Self-testing for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection with rapid antigen tests. *medRxiv*. Published online February 23, 2021:2021.02.21.21252153. doi:10.1101/2021.02.21.21252153
28. Mcnaughton CD, Adams NM, Johnson CH, Ward MJ, Lasko TA. Diurnal variation in SARS-CoV-2 PCR test results: Test accuracy may vary by time of day. *medRxiv*. Published online March 13, 2021:2021.03.12.21253015. doi:10.1101/2021.03.12.21253015
29. Minich JJ, Ali F, Marotz C, et al. Feasibility of using alternative swabs and storage solutions for paired SARS-CoV-2 detection and microbiome analysis in the hospital environment. *Microbiome*. 2021;9(1):25. doi:10.1186/s40168-020-00960-4
30. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands. *Cite This Environ Sci Technol Lett*. 2020;7:511-516. doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357
31. Michael-Kordatou I, Karaolia P, Fatta-Kassinou D. Sewage analysis as a tool for the COVID-19 pandemic response and management: The urgent need for optimised protocols for SARS-CoV-2 detection and quantification. *J Environ Chem Eng*. 2020;8(5):104306. doi:10.1016/j.jece.2020.104306
32. Nissen K, Krambrich J, Akaberi D, et al. Long-distance airborne dispersal of SARS-CoV-2 in COVID-19 wards. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10(1):19589. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-76442-2
33. Zhang XS, Duchaine C. SARS-CoV-2 and Health Care Worker Protection in Low-Risk Settings: a Review of Modes of Transmission and a Novel Airborne Model Involving Inhalable Particles. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 2020;34(1). doi:10.1128/CMR.00184-20
34. Karimzadeh S, Bhopal R, Huy NT. Review of infective dose, routes of transmission, and outcome of COVID-

- 19 caused by the SARS-CoV-2: comparison with other respiratory viruses. *Epidemiol Infect.* 2021;149:1-22. doi:10.1017/s0950268821000790
35. Sungnak W, Huang N, Bécavin C, et al. SARS-CoV-2 entry factors are highly expressed in nasal epithelial cells together with innate immune genes. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(5):681-687. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0868-6
 36. Aday S, Aday MS. Impact of COVID-19 on the food supply chain. *Food Qual Saf.* 2020;4(4):167-180. doi:10.1093/fqsafe/fyaa024
 37. Zuber S, Brüssow H. COVID 19: challenges for virologists in the food industry. *Microb Biotechnol.* 2020;13(6):1689-1701. doi:10.1111/1751-7915.13638
 38. Shi J, Wen Z, Zhong G, et al. Susceptibility of ferrets, cats, dogs, and other domesticated animals to SARS-coronavirus 2. *Science (80-).* 2020;368(6494):1016-1020. doi:10.1126/science.abb7015
 39. Mahdy MAA, Younis W, Ewaida Z. An Overview of SARS-CoV-2 and Animal Infection. *Front Vet Sci.* 2020;7. doi:10.3389/fvets.2020.596391
 40. Herstein JJ, Degarege A, Stover D, et al. Characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission among Meat Processing Workers in Nebraska, USA, and Effectiveness of Risk Mitigation Measures. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2021;27(4). doi:10.3201/eid2704.204800
 41. Ueki H, Furusawa Y, Iwatsuki-Horimoto K, et al. Effectiveness of Face Masks in Preventing Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *mSphere.* 2020;5(5):2-6. doi:10.1128/msphere.00637-20
 42. Cheng Y, Ma N, Witt C, et al. Face masks effectively limit the probability of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Science.* Published online May 20, 2021. doi:10.1126/science.abg6296
 43. Lopes H, Middleton J, Martin-Moreno J, et al. *Strategic Use of Masks As an Element of a Nonpharmaceutical Measures Set for a Pandemic.*; 2020. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.25214.13125
 44. Morawska L, Tang JW, Bahnfleth W, et al. How can airborne transmission of COVID-19 indoors be minimised? *Environ Int.* 2020;142. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2020.105832

Supplemental Methods

Additional information on the investigated meat processing plant

The abattoir is in production six days a week (Monday-Saturday) and per day two consecutive shifts are scheduled (morning shift and afternoon/evening shift, with the exception of Saturday with solely a morning shift). In general, workers are scheduled to work one week in the morning shift and the next week in the afternoon shift in pools with stable composition. Workers typically have a fixed job task and operate at the same position along the processing line. There is a strict separation between the first (non-cooled) and second part (cooled) of the production process regarding personnel, areas accessible to personnel, materials and clothing.

Cooled production-associated areas are solely accessible for workers operating in the cooled production rooms. These include a canteen area with restaurant, various changing rooms with lockers and toilet facilities, passageways with staircases and one large hygiene lock. Areas are cleaned daily and toilet facilities cleaned twice a day with designated cleaning/disinfecting agents including chlorine-based agents.

Rooms are ventilated by a system comprising of two-stage filtering. The first stage includes a filter for larger particles (ISO 16890 Coarse 50%), the second stage includes a filter for smaller particles (ISO 16890 ePM₁₀ 80% and ISO 16890 ePM_{2.5} 70%). Air is largely being recirculated, with minimally passive air refreshment through *e.g.* open inner doorways and corridors. Rooms are being thoroughly cleaned each day after production. A rigorous multi-stage procedure is followed involving wetting from bottom until top with a mix of cleaning/disinfecting agents including chlorine-based agents. Since June 2020, fogging was also performed each Sunday with hydrogen peroxide and lactic acid as active substances.

Face shields were solely worn by workers with communication duties (*e.g.* foremen/intendents) in line with the slaughterhouse's policy.

Additional information on sampling

Oro-nasopharyngeal sampling

Oro-nasopharyngeal sampling was performed according to the June 2020 prevailing national monitoring protocol (<https://ici.rivm.nl/richtlijnen/covid-19>); the same swab was used to first swab the oropharynx followed by the nasopharynx. Thereafter, the swab was directly placed in 3 ml GLY virus transport medium.

Questionnaires

Self-reported data obtained from employees was collected using questionnaires focusing on the following topics: current and prior symptoms, overall health and chronic conditions, living situation, contact with workers in meat-processing facilities, contact with COVID-19 cases, recent travel history, work situation and workplace, contact with co-workers, and commuting. The questionnaires were available in five languages (Dutch, English, Polish, Hungarian and Romanian). Questionnaires were distributed upon the first sampling and collected upon the second sampling.

Personal and stationary air sampling

Teflon filters (Pall Corporation, Ann Arbor, USA) were used in GSP (Gesamtstaubprobenahme, total dust sampling; JS Holdings, Stevenage, UK) sampling heads connected to a Gilian GilAir 5 pump (Sensidyne, St. Petersburg, USA) calibrated at a flow of 3.5 l/min.

Picture showing stationary air sampling (orange circle around sampling head):



Pictures showing personal air sampling:




Note. Due to privacy reasons, a picture of a researcher was taken and not of a slaughterhouse worker

Electrostatic Dust fall Collectors (EDCs)

EDCs are sterilized electrostatic cloths (polyester electrostatic cloth; Albert Heijn, Zaandam, the Netherlands) placed in a disposable holder. At T1, 5 EDCs were placed per production room; these could only be exposed

during one day due to the cleaning regime involving bottom-to-top wetting. EDCs placed in the canteen area were exposed during 7 days. At T1, 6 EDCs were placed in the canteen area, which were collected at T2 and replaced with new EDCs which were collected at T3.

Picture showing EDC positioned on top of machine in cutting room:



Surface swabs

Swabbed items included knobs, grips, push buttons, touchscreens and all sorts of handles (e.g. machinery in production rooms, dispensers in toilets); but also table tops, chairs, stair railings and other surfaces frequently touched. Disposable plastic grids of 10 cm² were used for standardization of the sampled surface. If a surface was smaller than 10 cm² this was noted. Dry swabs with a rayon tip and plastic shaft (CLASSIQSwabs 167KS01; COPAN, Brescia, Italy) were used, which were placed in 2ml virus transport medium (VTM) directly after swabbing.

Swabs of workers' hands/gloves

Dry swabs with a rayon tip and plastic shaft (CLASSIQSwabs 167KS01; COPAN, Brescia, Italy) of hands, or gloves if worn, of the 12 workers participating in the personal air sampling were collected during their mid-shift break. The inner part of their index finger, middle finger and ring finger was swabbed until the half of their palm.

Specifications of fieldworkers and field blanks

Fieldworkers that visited the meat processing plant for sampling were routinely monitored for SARS-CoV-2 infection (remained negative throughout the study). Field blanks of all sample types were collected as a control, these blanks underwent all procedures (e.g. preparations, transportation, processing) as the actual samples except for sampling. All field blanks tested negative.

Details on laboratory analyses

Electrostatic Dust fall Collectors (EDCs)

One tablet of protease inhibitor was dissolved in 20mL D-PBS, without Calcium and Magnesium. Half of the EDC/mouth mask was put into a 50mL tube, containing 10 mL D-PBS+protease inhibitor and incubated for 1 hour at room temperature on a tube roller. 60uL sample was removed, and 90 ul MagNA Pure 96 External Lysis Buffer (Roche) was added. PDV (10 uL) was used as internal control, as described previously⁴⁰. RNA was eluted in 30 uL distilled water, 8 uL was used for the SARS-CoV-2 PCR, as described previously¹⁷.

Surface swabs and swabs of workers' hand/gloves

Swabs in 1 ml VTM were vortexed, and 60 uL VT was further processed as described above.

Air filters (Teflon and ventilation system)

Teflon filters were collected from the GSP sampling heads and transferred to a 15ml tube. Per ventilation system filter, 2 punches were taken (25mm diameter, approximately 6mm thick). Each punch was transferred to a 15ml tube. To each tube 1ml VTM and 1 ml lysisbuffer (MagNA Pure 96 External, Roche) was added and subsequently vortexed for 5 minutes. PDV (10uL) was added to 150 ul of sample. RNA extraction and SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR was performed as described above.

Sewage

Each tube containing 50 ml of sewage was spun down (3000g during 15 min) and 15 ml of the supernatant was transferred to an Amicon tube. The sample was subsequently spun down during 30 min at 4000g. The filter was rinsed with PBS and transferred into a new tube. RNA extraction and SAR-CoV-2 RT-PCR was performed as described above.

Schematic overview of PCR analysed proportion per sample type

Sample type	Original sample	Volume of medium added (ml)	Volume aliquot of sample for PCR (μ l)	Volume added to aliquot (μ l)	Volume eluens (μ l)	Volume in PCR (μ l)	Proportion volume PCR/volume eluens	Proportion volume aliquot/sample volume medium	Proportion subsample of original sample
Teflon filter T2 (filter used in active air sampling)	1 filter ~ cubic meter of air sampled dependent on flow rate and sampling duration	2 ml (1 ml VTM + 1 ml lysisbuffer)	150 \rightarrow 75 μ l sample	10 μ l PDV	30	8	0.267	0.075	0.00415
Swab T2	1 swab ~ swabbed surface of max 10 cm ²	1 ml VTM	60	100 μ l (90 μ l lysis buffer + 10 μ l PDV)	30	8	0.267	0.06	0.01602
Sewage sample T2	15 ml out of 50 ml tube concentrated to 200 μ l ~ 24 h flow-dependent composite sample	None	60	100 μ l (90 μ l lysis buffer + 10 μ l PDV)	30	8	0.267	0.3	0.0801