

1 **Research Article**

2 **Public awareness and support for use of wastewater for SARS-CoV-2 monitoring: A**
3 **community survey in Louisville, Kentucky**

4
5 Rochelle H. Holm^a, J. Michael Brick^b, Alok R. Amraotkar^a, Joy L. Hart^{a,c}, Anish Mukherjee^d, Jacob
6 Zeigler^a, Adrienne M. Bushau-Sprinkle^e, Lauren B. Anderson^{a,f}, Kandi L. Walker^{a,c}, Daymond
7 Talley^g, Rachel J. Keith^a, Shesh N. Rai^{a,d,h,i}, Kenneth E. Palmer^{e,j}, Aruni Bhatnagar^a, and Ted
8 Smith^{a*}

9
10 ^aChristina Lee Brown Envirome Institute, School of Medicine, University of Louisville, 302 E.
11 Muhammad Ali Blvd., Louisville, KY 40202, United States

12 ^bWestat, Inc., 1600 Research Blvd., Rockville, MD 20850, United States

13 ^cDepartment of Communication, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Louisville, 2010 S.
14 Avery Court Walk, Louisville, KY 40208, United States

15 ^dDepartment of Bioinformatics and Biostatistics, School of Public Health and Information
16 Science, University of Louisville, 505 S. Hancock St., Louisville, KY 40202, United States

17 ^eCenter for Predictive Medicine for Biodefense and Emerging Infectious Diseases, University of
18 Louisville, 505 S. Hancock St., Louisville, KY 40202, United States

19 ^fCenter for Healthy Air Water and Soil, University of Louisville, 302 E. Muhammad Ali Blvd.,
20 Louisville, KY 40202, United States

21 ^gLouisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District, Morris Forman Water Quality
22 Treatment Center, 4522 Algonquin Parkway, Louisville, KY 40211, United States

23 ^hBrown Cancer Center, School of Medicine, University of Louisville, 505 S. Hancock St.,
24 Louisville, KY 40202, United States

25 ⁱCenter for Integrative Environmental Health Sciences, 500 S. Preston St., Louisville, KY 40202,
26 United States

27 ^jDepartment of Pharmacology and Toxicology, School of Medicine, University of Louisville, 323
28 E. Chestnut St., Louisville, KY 40202, United States

29

30

31

32 *Corresponding author: Ted Smith (ted.smith@louisville.edu)

33

34

35

36

37


38 **Abstract**

39 The majority of sewer systems in the United States and other countries, are operated by public
40 utilities. In the absence of any regulation, public perception of monitoring wastewater for
41 population health biomarkers is an important consideration for a public utility commission
42 when allocating resources for this purpose. In August 2021, we conducted a survey as part of an
43 ongoing COVID-19 community prevalence study in Louisville/Jefferson County, KY. The survey
44 comprised of seven questions about awareness of and privacy concerns and was sent to 32,000
45 households randomly distributed within the county. A total of 1,220 sampled adults
46 participated in the probability sample, and 981 were used in analysis. A total of 2,444 adults
47 additionally responded in the convenience sample, and 1,751 were used in analysis. The
48 samples were weighted to produce estimates representative of all adults in the county. Public
49 awareness of tracking COVID-19 virus in the sewers was low. Opinions about how data from
50 this activity are shared strongly supported public disclosure of monitoring results. Responses
51 showed more support for measuring the largest areas (>30,000 to 50,000 households) typically
52 representing population levels found in a community or regional wastewater treatment plant.
53 Those who had a history of COVID-19 infection were more likely to support highly localized
54 monitoring. Understanding wastewater surveillance strategies and thresholds of privacy
55 concerns requires in-depth, comprehensive analysis of public opinion for continued success and
56 efficacy of public health monitoring.

57

58 **Keywords:** COVID-19; community health; sewer; public opinion; wastewater based
59 epidemiology

60 **Graphic for Table of Contents (TOC)/Abstract Art**



Public opinion:

- Low awareness
- Strong support for public disclosure of results
- More support for catchments measuring >30,000-50,000 households

61

62

63

64

65

66

67 **1. Introduction**

68 The Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has brought to fore monitoring an
69 individual's health status related to severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-
70 CoV-2) infection or vaccination. Rapid testing for the presence of the virus in the
71 nasopharyngeal cavity and the presence of viral antigens and ant-viral antibodies in the blood
72 have been repeatedly and widely employed. Such testing has been variably effective in
73 preventing infections, which are primarily spread through aerosols and contaminated fluids.
74 Additionally, individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 also shed the virus in their stool. Therefore,
75 rates of infection could also be estimated in the wastewater by anonymously quantifying SARS-
76 CoV-2 genetic material in fecal matter from infected individuals who reside within an area with
77 a piped sewer network. Abundance of the virus in wastewater has been shown to trend with
78 infection levels measured clinically (Wu et al., 2020; Hoffmann and Alsing, 2021; Pecson et al.,
79 2021). Globally, over 200 universities, at 2,000 sites, within 50 countries are monitoring
80 wastewater for SARS-CoV-2 RNA (COVIDPoops19, 2021). Wastewater monitoring in the United
81 States is being conducted by private and government laboratories, as well as academic
82 partners; the work initiated by the United States Department of Health and Human Services
83 alone covered wastewater SARS-CoV-2 monitoring of one-third of the US population across 42
84 states (Smith et al., 2021). In the United States, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
85 operates a national wastewater surveillance system with SARS-CoV-2 results from which are
86 available only to state public health officials (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2021).
87 Commercial laboratories such as Biobot Analytics have also published a national dashboard of
88 results covering data from participating communities (<https://biobot.io/data/>; Biobot Analytics,

89 Inc., 2021). Although there are ongoing legal and ethical discussions around wastewater
90 monitoring (Gable et al., 2020; Coffman et al., 2021; Hrudehy et al., 2021), the perceptions and
91 understandings of community members whose wastewater is being monitored for SARS-CoV-2
92 are unknown. This information is important for future and continued application of wastewater
93 monitoring because a majority of the sewer systems in the United States, and many other
94 countries, are operated by public utilities. Without clearly formulated regulation, it is difficult to
95 convince these utilities to participate in this type of sampling. In this context, public perception
96 is an important factor that a public utility commission may need to consider when allocating
97 resources for this purpose.

98

99 The aim of this study is to report findings on public awareness and support of SARS-CoV-2
100 monitoring in community wastewater from a statistically representative sample of residents in
101 Louisville/Jefferson County, Kentucky, United States. As this line of community monitoring
102 continues to develop, the results may inform a wider understanding of how community
103 members monitored through an existing sewer infrastructure view public health monitoring,
104 which may influence future approaches for disclosure and consent for wastewater surveillance
105 and epidemiological modeling.

106

107

108 **2. Methods**

109 This study was part of a larger research project: the *Co-Immunity Project Phase II-Stratified*
110 *Randomized Testing for COVID-19 Infection and Immunity in Jefferson County, KY, USA*. Study
111 participants were 18 years and above and residents of Louisville/Jefferson County, Kentucky,
112 United States. One group of participants was invited to enroll in the study by a postal mailing
113 and was given an online code to consent and complete a battery of online surveys and then a
114 few days later participated in clinical testing. This group is referred to as the probability sample.
115 As a public service, the study was also open to all residents 18 years and older of
116 Louisville/Jefferson County. This second group of participants, which enrolled without being
117 invited via mail, is referred to as the convenience sample. Inclusion of the convenience sample
118 offered a different type of population for study, and also provided an additional testing capacity
119 for the county. The consenting and data collection procedures were identical for both
120 probability and convenience sampling. All study participants were directed to an IRB-approved
121 Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) compliant secure website,
122 where they were able to provide online signed consent, complete questionnaires, and schedule
123 their testing appointment. Each participant provided responses to a total of 104 questions,
124 including demographic questions, occupational information, contact and risk assessment,
125 health history, lifestyle, COVID-19 vaccination questions, and the wastewater monitoring
126 community survey. For this work, only demographic, COVID-19 antibody status and wastewater
127 monitoring community survey results are reported for a single wave of this serial testing.

128

129

130 2.1. Data collection instrument

131 The wastewater monitoring community survey is presented in Supplement A. The survey was
132 designed to assess the level of awareness of wastewater surveillance as a part of the COVID-19
133 pandemic public health response within Louisville/Jefferson County and to learn public
134 preferences regarding how wastewater based epidemiology should be conducted. Of particular
135 focus was the size of sewage catchment area that residents believed was appropriate for this
136 type of health surveillance. The sewer catchment sizes, expressed as the number of households
137 pooled in a sample, in the survey responses represented the full range of catchment areas that
138 have been implemented in Louisville/Jefferson County (Yeager et al., 2021).

139

140 2.2. Serological assessment


141 Full methodological details for serological assessment of SARS-CoV-2 infection from this study
142 have been recently published by Hamorsky et al. (2021). We used the antibody results from
143 serological positivity for nucleocapsid immunoglobulin G (N-IgG) to identify participants with
144 previous SARS-CoV-2 infection. Vaccinated respondents should not be positive for N-IgG
145 because current COVID-19 vaccines used in the studied areas rely only on the SARS-CoV-2 viral
146 spike protein as the immunogen.

147

148

149 2.3. Probability sampling

150 For the probability sample, households were contacted such that one adult within the
151 household was randomly selected to participate. All households in Louisville/Jefferson County
152 were stratified into 8 sectors roughly proportional to the sector size (population) based on the
153 census block group of the address, where the area corresponded to sewer catchment areas
154 (community sites and treatment plants). A sample of between 2,000 and 3,000 households was
155 selected in each sector, about 32,000 total households were invited to participate in August
156 2021 using an address list derived from United States Postal Service delivery. In addition to the
157 sampling strata, 4 areas (Figure 1) that were based on the demographic characteristics of the
158 community were defined and those areas were used in the analysis (Table 1). Each selected
159 household was mailed an invitation to participate in the study in which the sampled adult (18
160 years or older) was asked to complete an online informed consent, screening and survey
161 questions and schedule an appointment for clinical testing. With the mailed invitations, each
162 household of the probability sample population was provided with a unique personal
163 identification registration code to be entered at the time of online registration, thereby
164 allowing the investigators to differentiate between probability and convenience sampling
165 populations. Each household was contacted multiple times to encourage participation. Public
166 service announcements from the Louisville Mayor, Director of the Department of Public Health
167 and Wellness, and mainstream media also publicized the research project.



168

169 Figure 1. Studied area, Louisville/Jefferson County, Kentucky, United States.

170 Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the population surveyed.

Area	Population	Sex	Race	Age category
1	98,164 (16.49%)	Male	White	18-34
				35-59
				60+
2	98,920 (16.63%)	Male	White	18-34
				35-59
				60+
3	206,589 (34.73%)	Male	White	18-34
				35-59
				60+
4	191,270 (32.15%)	Male	White	18-34
				35-59
				60+

171

172 2.4. Convenience sampling

173 The convenience sample was recruited using a variety of methods including social media,
174 community outreach with organizations and influential citizens such as clergy, and public
175 service announcements via media organizations. For example, public officials gave press
176 conferences to publicize the efforts and local organizations made appeals to their communities.
177 Pre-registration as well as on-site walk-up registration were both allowed.

178

179 2.5. Weighting the sample

180 The respondents were first weighted by the inverse of the probability of selection of the
181 household and the inverse of the number of adults in the household. The final step was raking
182 the respondents to the number of adults in the county by: sex by age, race, and geography. To
183 produce standard errors of the estimates, 50 jackknife replicate weights were created. These
184 replicate weights are used to estimate the standard errors of the estimates and 95 percent
185 confidence intervals for the estimates.


186

187 2.6. Study participants

188 A total of 1,220 sampled adults participated in the probability sample, and 981 of those
189 responded to all six multiple choice wastewater survey questions and resided in
190 Louisville/Jefferson County and are included in this report. A total of 2,444 adults responded in
191 the convenience sample, and 1,751 of those responded to all six multiple choice wastewater

192 survey questions and resided in Louisville/Jefferson County are included in this report (Figure
193 2).

194



195

196 Figure 2. Studied population.

197

198 2.7. Data collection

199 Data were collected from August 25 to September 1, 2021.

200

201 2.8. Ethics

202 The University of Louisville Institutional Review Board approved this project as Human Subjects
203 Research (IRB number: 20.0393 and 15.1260).

204

205

206 3. Results and discussion

207 3.1. Random probability versus convenience sample

208 The weighted responses from the probability and convenience samples provided estimates of
209 the percentage of the population represented for each question. The estimates from the two
210 samples differed substantially in several aspects (Supplement Tables B1 to B7; probability [N =
211 981] and convenience [N = 1,751]). Even more importantly for this analysis, the responses from
212 the probability and convenience sample groups to the questions about wastewater monitoring
213 varied substantially. The probability respondents were 14 to 20 percentage points less likely to
214 indicate awareness of wastewater monitoring when compared with the convenience
215 respondents (Supplement Table B1 to B3). Due to these differences, only the weighted random
216 probability sample data are reported in the following quantitative analysis.

217

218 3.2. Wastewater monitoring awareness

219 When asked ‘Can the coronavirus that causes COVID-19 be detected in the city sewer system?’,
220 43% of respondents selected “yes”, and 49% indicated they didn’t know. More males (48%)
221 selected “yes” than females (38%) ($p = 0.04$), and generally, an even distribution of white
222 participants (45%) and minority participants (38%) selected “yes” ($p = 0.18$). When asked ‘Did
223 you know that the amounts of the COVID virus in sewers reflect the general level of infection in
224 the community?’, approximately one-third (34%) responded affirmatively. There was no
225 difference in males (39%) that selected “yes” and females (30%) ($p = 0.06$), or for white
226 participants (36%) and minority participants (31%) that selected “yes” ($p = 0.21$). Regarding
227 familiarity with their wastewater utility as part of this monitoring (‘Did you know that UofL is

228 working with Louisville Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD) to test whether measurements of
229 coronavirus in wastewater could be used to determine the risk of COVID-19 across Louisville?’),
230 28% indicated that they knew MSD and UofL were conducting this monitoring.

231
232 Since the start of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater monitoring, there have been nine local news updates
233 featuring wastewater monitoring by different media outlets in Louisville/Jefferson County
234 (Supplement C); thus, information about the activity was shared with the public. The sewer
235 systems in the studied area are also frequently in the news as MSD is under a Consent Decree
236 regarding a series of sewer overflow reduction projects (MSD, 2021). Additionally, a public
237 dashboard was initiated on May 24, 2021 to share weekly data
238 (<https://louisville.edu/envirome/thecoimmunityproject/dashboard>; University of Louisville,
239 2021), though public engagement has been limited. And, although the national level
240 COVIDPoops19 (2021) dashboard is available to the public, its primary audience is networking
241 wastewater monitoring researchers.


242

243

244 3.3. Wastewater monitoring support and data sharing


245 The majority of respondents (85%) were supportive of wastewater sampling for public health
246 monitoring. There was no difference in male (87%) and female (84%) participants that
247 responded affirmatively ($p = 0.26$), while minority participants (91%) were more likely to be
248 supportive than white participants (84%) ($p = 0.03$) (Figure 3). These results also underscore the
249 disproportionate impact COVID-19 has had on minorities (Shiels et al., 2021) which may be
250 driving these differences in support for public health monitoring. Importantly, in our study
251 while some minority participants were neutral (9%), few were opposed (0.6%). Opinions about
252 how data should be shared strongly supported (97%) public disclosure of the monitoring
253 results. The views of male (98%) and female (97%) participants were similar ($p = 0.46$), and,
254 although the sample size was smaller and the result was not significantly different, minority
255 participants were unified in terms of publicly sharing such data (99%) and had ratings higher
256 than white participants (97%) ($p = 0.06$).

257




258

A



259

B



260

C

261


262 Figure 3. Weighted level of support for monitoring sewage to better understand COVID
263 community infection levels instead of only testing people for probability samples (N = 981),
264 Louisville/Jefferson County. Total survey response (A), by race (B) and by sex (C). Bars are 95%
265 confidence intervals.

266

267

268 3.4. Size of catchment area residents believed was appropriate

269 The responses to the question about the smallest number of households respondents support
270 being measured (ranging from >50,000 households to opposing any sized area) indicated
271 considerable support (78%) for very large pooled sampling typically found in a community
272 wastewater treatment plant (more than >50,000 households). The next largest group (11%)
273 indicated support for >30,000 households. The response rate of preference for wastewater
274 monitoring at population levels >50,000 households was not different among the four areas
275 (Rao-Scott Chi-Square Test $p = 0.077$), while the response rate of preference for community
276 wastewater monitoring at the smallest number of households (>5,000 households) was
277 generally lower and different (between the areas Rao-Scott Chi-Square Test $p = 0.0008$) (Figure
278 4). Area 1 encompasses western Louisville/Jefferson County and had the highest percentage of
279 respondents that endorsed >50,000 households sized sampling areas. Conversely, area 4 had
280 more variance across response options indicating a wider range of views. Area 3 has the largest
281 portion of minority respondents in the overall study and a trend towards support for smaller,
282 more targeted, sampling areas was observed. Opinion varies by location in the study area
283 suggesting that there is no generic opinion for the city.




284

285 Figure 4. Weighted support of catchment size monitoring by geographic area for probability
286 samples (N = 981), Louisville/Jefferson County.

287

288 An interesting finding is that support for how localized the monitoring should be varied by
289 history of COVID-19 infection (N-IgG). Of those who had a previous infection, 42% supported
290 the lowest threshold of 5,000 households, whereas only 22% of those who did not have a
291 previous infection supported the smallest threshold (Figure 5). The geographic estimates of
292 prior COVID infection were also consistent with this finding (Table 1). For example, areas 1 and
293 2 have previous infection rate estimates almost half of those in areas 3 and 4 (10% versus

294 almost 20%). In the low infection areas 1 and 2, support for the highest threshold (>50,000
295 households) is 49%, whereas in areas 3 and 4, support for the highest threshold is 40% - almost
296 9 percentage points lower. How our findings relate to public awareness and support for use of
297 wastewater monitoring outside of pandemic emergency response but related an individual's
298 health status for pharmaceuticals, personal care products, illicit drugs, and enteroviruses needs
299 further study. Public opinion to surveil at the population level, and thus avoid privacy concerns,
300 may be the most important factor to maintain the collaborative support of public utilities for
301 such unregulated activities.
302



303
304 Figure 5. Weighted support of thresholds appropriate for wastewater monitoring by previous
305 COVID-19 infection status (N-IgG) for probability samples (N = 981), Louisville/Jefferson County.
306 Bars are 95% confidence intervals.

307 3.5. *Qualitative feedback*

308 We also asked for general feedback in an open-ended survey question. Of the random
309 probability respondents ranked as being more aware and supportive of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater
310 monitoring, some added the following comments:

311 *Any way to study community spread is important, especially if people aren't getting*
312 *tested. It is a less personally invasive way of gathering that data*

313 *-female*

314

315 *If you're monitoring for COVID, then other diseases should be monitored also...*

316 *-female*

317

318 *The more measuring sites the better. I have no qualm with people gaining more*
319 *knowledge about the health of the city. I view it no different then {than} monitoring air*
320 *quality or school test scores. Feel free to do it although it sounds like gross work. Oh and*
321 *thank you.*

322 *-male*

323

324 A random probability respondent ranked as being less aware and less supportive of SARS-CoV-2
325 wastewater monitoring, added the following comment:

326 *If such monitoring of sewers was really effective, then why have I never heard of such a*
327 *thing before? There is way too much 'false science' combined with 'false logic' going*
328 *around worldwide in these so called modern times. As an open minded student of*

329 *science, I believe that a logic based skepticism is essential to avoid wasted time on*
330 *useless pursuits.*

331 *-male*

332

333 Only convenience sample respondent commented about sample size stating:

334 *Concerned that measuring and reporting smaller areas could lead to biases based on*
335 *racial, SES {socioeconomic status} or other factors. On the other hand, it could also help*
336 *to get services to address health care disparities in particular areas. I'd want to really*
337 *think this through if I were making a decision on this.*

338 *-female*

339

340 *As long as MSD is notifying the community that they are testing and can't pin point a*
341 *specific house I have no problem with such testing*

342 *-male*

343

344 *Workers who come into Jefferson County can bring covid and it show up in our sewers.*
345 *Therefore, that area might show higher covid rates but it may not be from the people*
346 *who live in that area. Being a very mobile society can skew an area or neighborhood's*
347 *results.*

348 *-female*

349

350 *I caution sponsors to avoid any focus on presumed areas of economic or social status. All*
351 *results must be presented as referenced to the full community, unless specifically*
352 *excluded in the project plan design.*

353 *-female*

354

355 **4. Limitations**

356 Although our findings shed light on an understudied topic, the results have limitations. The
357 large research cohort population (N = 3,664) was almost 90% vaccinated for COVID-19 in
358 August, much higher than the, than the nearly 75 % adult residents who have received at
359 minimum the first dose until October. Further, although a random probability and convenience
360 sample were both used, a participant self-selection bias towards interest in research and public
361 health is always possible.

362

363 **5. Conclusion**

364 Wastewater monitoring has largely been accepted as part of COVID-19 pandemic emergency
365 response and determined to be a public health surveillance method in accordance with US
366 Department of Health and Human Services, Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations 46, Protection
367 of Human Subjects (US Department of Health and Human Services, 2009). Despite the
368 likelihood our participants tended to be pro-public health, awareness overall regarding
369 wastewater surveillance was low. Our results also underscore that, in Louisville/Jefferson
370 County, KY, the public supports wastewater monitoring and expects to see the results of such
371 research. We found differences in race and place across the study community which has

372 implications for how communications about these initiatives could be improved and merits
373 further study in other communities. Our study results suggest that to maintain public support
374 for this type of sampling public utilities and public health professionals should consider a
375 threshold of privacy concerns set around >30,000-50,000 households. That respondents who
376 had a history of COVID-19 infection supported more localized monitoring suggests a possible
377 psychographic factor which should be further explored that may account for difference in
378 acceptance of public health activities. Despite sewers having been extensively used for public
379 health monitoring through public utility commission participation during the COVID-19
380 pandemic, the use of wastewater monitoring for SARS-CoV-2 and current views of individual
381 versus community rights, as well as privacy and informed consent, in a pandemic guarantee the
382 issue of public awareness and support of wastewater monitoring will see increasing interest.
383

384 Abbreviations

385 severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)

386 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)

387

388 Funding

389 This study was supported, in part, by a contract with the Centers for Disease Control and

390 Prevention (GB210585). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis,

391 decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

392

393 Disclosure

394 The authors declare no competing financial interest.

395

396

397 **References**

- 398 Biobot Analytics, Inc., 2021. Nationwide wastewater monitoring network.
399 <https://biobot.io/data/> (accessed 18 October 2021)
- 400 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2021. National wastewater surveillance system
401 (NWSS). [https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/surveillance/wastewater-](https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/surveillance/wastewater-surveillance/wastewater-surveillance.html)
402 [surveillance/wastewater-surveillance.html](https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/surveillance/wastewater-surveillance.html) (accessed 18 October 2021)
- 403 Coffman, M.M., Guest, J.S., Wolfe, M.K., Naughton, C.C., Boehm, A.B., Vela, J.D. and Carrera,
404 J.S., 2021. Preventing scientific and ethical misuse of wastewater surveillance data.
405 *Environmental science & technology*, 55(17), 11473–11475.
- 406 COVIDPoops19, 2021. Summary of global SARS-CoV-2 wastewater monitoring efforts by UC
407 Merced researchers. <https://arcg.is/1aummW> (accessed 18 October 2021)
- 408 Gable, L., Ram, N. and Ram, J.L., 2020. Legal and ethical implications of wastewater monitoring
409 of SARS-CoV-2 for COVID-19 surveillance. *Journal of law and the biosciences*, 7(1),
410 p.lsa039.
- 411 Hamorsky, K.T., Bushau-Sprinkle, A.M., Kitterman, K., et al., 2021. Serological assessment of
412 SARS-CoV-2 infection during the first wave of the pandemic in Louisville Kentucky.
413 *Scientific reports*, 11(1), 1–12.
- 414 Hoffmann, T. and Alsing, J., 2021. Faecal shedding models for SARS-CoV-2 RNA amongst
415 hospitalised patients and implications for wastewater-based epidemiology. medRxiv.
416 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.16.21253603v1> (accessed 18
417 October 2021)

418 Hrudey, S.E., Silva, D.S., Shelley, J., Pons, W., Isaac-Renton, J., Chik, A.H.S. and Conant, B., 2021.
419 Ethics guidance for environmental scientists engaged in surveillance of wastewater for
420 SARS-CoV-2. *Environmental science & technology*, 55(13), 8484–8491.

421 Louisville Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD). Project WIN. <https://www.msprojectwin.org/>
422 (accessed 18 October 2021)

423 Pecson, B.M., Darby, E., Haas, C.N., Amha, Y.M., Bartolo, M., Danielson, R., Dearborn, Y., Di
424 Giovanni, G., Ferguson, C., Fevig, S. and Gaddis, E., 2021. Reproducibility and sensitivity
425 of 36 methods to quantify the SARS-CoV-2 genetic signal in raw wastewater: findings
426 from an interlaboratory methods evaluation in the U.S. *Environmental science: Water
427 research & technology*, 7(3), 504–520.

428 Shiels, M.S., Haque, A.T., Haozous, E.A., Albert, P.S., Almeida, J.S., García-Closas, M., Nápoles,
429 A.M., Pérez-Stable, E.J., Freedman, N.D. and de González, A.B., 2021. Racial and ethnic
430 disparities in excess deaths during the COVID-19 pandemic, March to December 2020.
431 *Annals of internal medicine*.

432 Smith, T., Cassell, G. and Bhatnagar, A., 2021, January. Wastewater surveillance can have a
433 second act in COVID-19 vaccine distribution. *JAMA Health Forum*, 2(1), e201616-
434 e201616.

435 United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2009. Protection of Human Subjects,
436 Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations Part 46. United States of America.

437 University of Louisville, 2021. Wastewater monitoring results for the current week in Louisville-
438 Jefferson County. <https://louisville.edu/envirome/thecoimmunityproject/dashboard>
439 (accessed 18 October 2021)

440 Wu, F., Zhang, J., Xiao, A., Gu, X., Lee, W.L., Armas, F., Kauffman, K., Hanage, W., Matus, M.,
441 Ghaeli, N. and Endo, N., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater are higher than expected
442 from clinically confirmed cases. *Msystems*, 5(4).

443 Yeager, R., Holm, R.H., Saurabh, K., Fuqua, J.L., Talley, D., Bhatnagar, A. and Smith, T., 2021.
444 Wastewater sample site selection to estimate geographically-resolved community
445 prevalence of COVID-19: A sampling protocol perspective. *GeoHealth*,
446 p.e2021GH000420.

447

448 **Supplement A**

449 **Instrument: Wastewater Monitoring Community Survey**

450

451 wmc1: Can the COVID virus be detected in the city sewer system?

452 1 Yes

453 0 No

454 2 I Don't Know

455 wmc2: Did you know that the amounts of the COVID virus in sewers reflect the general level of
456 community infection?

457 1 Yes

458 0 No

459 wmc3: Did you know that UofL works with Louisville Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD) to
460 study whether this kind of measurement can determine health risk across Louisville?

461 1 Yes

462 0 No

463 wmc4: On a scale of 1 to 7, how much do you support monitoring sewage to better
464 understand COVID infection levels in our community instead of only testing people?

465 1 Very Supportive

466 2 Moderately Supportive

467 3 Supportive

468 4 Indifferent

469 5 Opposed

470 6 Moderately Opposed

471 7 Very Opposed

472 wmcs5: On a scale of 1 to 7, how important is it to share what's discovered with the public?

473 1 Very Important

474 2 Moderately Important

475 3 Supportive

476 4 Indifferent

477 5 Unimportant

478 6 Moderately Unimportant

479 7 Very Unimportant

480 wmcs6: Measuring at different sewer locations can help identify patterns of infection for

481 different sized areas. Please tell us which statement best describes the smallest number of

482 households you support being measured:

483 1 Support Measuring Largest Areas

484 (>50,000 households)

485 2 Support Measuring Smaller Sections

486 (>30,000 households)

487 3 Support Measuring Neighborhoods

488 (>5,000 households)

489 4 Neither Support nor Oppose

490 5 Oppose Measuring Any Size

491 wmc57: Please share any other information you'd like about your views on monitoring sewers

492 for signs of COVID.

493 (open)

494

495 **Supplement B**
496 **Data Analysis**

497
498 Table SB 1. Percent responding to whether the coronavirus that causes COVID-19 can be
499 detected in the city sewer system, by sample type

500

WMCS1	Probability	Convenience
No	8.6	6.4
Yes	42.6	56.8
Don't know	48.8	36.7
Total	100.0	100.0

501
502 Table SB 2. Percent responding to knowing that the amounts of the COVID virus in sewers
503 reflect the general level of infection in the community, by sample type

504

WMCS2	Probability	Convenience
No	65.9	49.5
Yes	34.1	50.5
Total	100.0	100.0

505
506 Table SB 3. Percent responding to knowing that UofL is working with Louisville Metropolitan
507 Sewer District (MSD) to test whether measurements of coronavirus in wastewater can be used
508 to determine the risk of COVID-19 across Louisville, by sample type

509

WMCS3	Probability	Convenience
No	72.4	52.8
Yes	27.6	47.2
Total	100.0	100.0

510
511 Table SB 4. Percent responding to how much do you support monitoring sewage to better
512 understand COVID infection levels in our community instead of only testing people, by sample
513 type

514

WMCS4	Probability	Convenience
1	52.2	61.4
2	11.7	8.1
3	21.5	14.4
4	13.4	15.0
5	0.5	0.5
6	0.1	0.1
7	0.6	0.4
Total	100.0	100.0

515

30

516 Table SB 5. Percent responding to how important is it to share the results of wastewater testing
517 with the public, by sample type
518

WMCS5	Probability	Convenience
1	77.8	81.3
2	11.2	6.8
3	8.4	6.6
4	0.9	4.4
5	0.8	0.1
6	0.0	0.0
7	0.9	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0

519
520 Table SB 6. Percent responding to the smallest number of households support being measured,
521 by sample type
522

WMCS6	Probability	Convenience
1	43.3	39.9
2	10.2	10.9
3	25.0	27.9
4	19.8	20.1
5	1.7	1.2
Total	100.0	100.0

523
524 Table SB 7. Percent positive for natural infection antibodies (August 2021), by sample type
525

Area	Probability	Convenience
1	6.8	11.8
2	10.2	14.6
3	21.9	13.0
4	18.2	10.3

526

527 Table SB 8. Comparison of probability (N = 981) survey results by sex
528

Male				Female							
WMCS1	n	Percent	SE	n	Percent	SE	diff	se(diff)	Z	p-value	
No	28	6.6	1.5	56	10.6	2.9	-4.0	3.22	-1.23	0.110	
Yes	212	48.3	4.5	274	38.1	3.7	10.2	5.87	1.74	0.041	
DK	160	45.1	4.0	251	51.4	3.6	-6.3	5.43	-1.15	0.125	
Total	400	100.0		581	100.0						
WMCS2	n	Percent	SE	n	Percent	SE					
No	217	60.8	4.7	345	70.0	3.2	-9.2	5.75	-1.60	0.055	
Yes	183	39.2	4.7	236	30.0	3.2	9.2	5.75	1.60	0.055	
Total	400	100.0		581	100.0						
WMCS3	n	Percent	SE	n	Percent	SE					
No	268	76.1	3.5	395	69.2	4.7	6.9	5.83	1.17	0.120	
Yes	132	23.9	3.5	186	30.8	4.7	-6.9	5.83	-1.17	0.120	
Total	400	100.0		581	100.0						
WMCS4	n	Percent	SE	n	Percent	SE					
1 to 3	331	86.7	2.8	486	84.3	2.4	2.4	3.65	0.65	0.258	
4	64	12.5	2.6	87	14.2	2.5	-1.7	3.57	-0.48	0.315	
5 to 7	5	0.8	0.3	8	1.5	0.3	-0.7	0.48	-1.37	0.085	
Total	400	100.0		581	100.0						
WMCS5	n	Percent	SE	n	Percent	SE					
1 to 3	385	97.5	0.8	568	97.4	1.3	0.1	1.48	0.09	0.463	
4	9	1.1	0.5	7	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.70	0.56	0.289	
5 to 7	6	1.4	0.7	6	1.9	1.1					
Total	400	100.0		581	100.0						
WMCS6	n	Percent	SE	n	Percent	SE					
1	143	35.5	3.7	252	50.3	3.2	-14.8	4.89	-3.02	0.001	
2	42	12.2	2.5	55	8.4	2.3	3.7	3.43	1.09	0.138	
3	117	33.7	3.9	124	17.3	2.4	16.5	4.57	3.61	0.000	
4	91	16.8	2.7	145	22.5	2.6	-5.7	3.77	-1.50	0.067	
5	7	1.8	1.0	5	1.6	0.9	0.2	1.31	0.17	0.431	
Total	400	100.0		581	100.0						

529

530 Table SB 9. Comparison of probability (N = 981) survey results by race

531

White				Minority				diff	se(diff)	Z	p-value
WMCS1	n	Percent	SE	n	Percent	SE					
No	68	6.9	1.3	15	14.2	5.1	-7.3	5.27	-1.39	0.083	
Yes	436	44.6	2.7	48	37.6	7.0	6.9	7.49	0.93	0.177	
DK	353	48.6	2.4	58	48.2	7.1	0.4	7.47	0.05	0.480	
Total	857	100.0		121	100.0						
WMCS2				WMCS2							
No	480	64.5	2.9	81	69.5	5.6	-5.0	6.34	-0.79	0.213	
Yes	377	35.5	2.9	40	30.5	5.6	5.0	6.34	0.79	0.213	
Total	857	100.0		121	100.0						
WMCS3				WMCS3							
No	574	72.7	3.2	87	71.7	5.8	0.9	6.67	0.14	0.444	
Yes	283	27.3	3.2	34	28.3	5.8	-0.9	6.67	-0.14	0.444	
Total	857	100.0		121	100.0						
WMCS4				WMCS4							
1 to 3	711	83.8	2.3	104	90.7	2.7	-6.9	3.59	-1.93	0.027	
4	135	14.9	2.3	15	8.7	2.6	6.1	3.51	1.75	0.040	
5 to 7	11	1.4	0.3	2	0.6	0.4	0.8	0.51	1.53	0.063	
Total	857	100.0		121	100.0						
WMCS4				WMCS4							
1 to 3	831	97.0	1.0	119	98.9	0.8	-2.0	1.26	-1.58	0.057	
4	16	1.2	0.5	0	.	.					
5 to 7	10	1.8	0.9	2	1.1	0.8	0.8	1.17	0.68	0.247	
Total	857	100.0		121	100.0						
WMCS6				WMCS6							
1	341	43.0	2.5	54	44.3	6.8	-1.3	7.26	-0.19	0.427	
2	80	6.9	1.2	17	20.4	6.7	-13.5	6.84	-1.98	0.024	
3	214	25.5	2.5	25	23.4	7.9	2.1	8.30	0.25	0.401	
4	212	22.5	2.3	23	11.2	3.0	11.3	3.79	2.99	0.001	
5	10	2.0	0.9	2	0.6	0.4	1.4	0.96	1.50	0.067	
Total	857	100.0		121	100.0						

532

533

534 Table SB 10. Comparison of probability (N = 981) survey results by area

535

Area	WMCS1	n	Percent	SE		diff-yes	se(diff)	Z	p-value
1	No	6	10.4	6.4	1 vs 2	-8.3	12.78	-0.65	0.258
	Yes	25	47.9	10.3	1 vs 3	10.1	11.09	0.91	0.181
	DK	28	41.7	8.4	1 vs 4	9.2	10.98	0.84	0.200
	Total	59	100.0		2 vs 3	18.4	8.68	2.12	0.017
2	No	16	6.8	3.8	2 vs 4	17.5	8.54	2.05	0.020
	Yes	162	56.2	7.6	3 vs 4	-0.9	5.70	-0.15	0.440
	DK	81	37.0	6.2					
	Total	259	100.0						
3	No	21	8.7	2.1					
	Yes	84	37.8	4.2					
	DK	100	53.5	3.6					
	Total	205	100.0						
4	No	41	8.8	2.2					
	Yes	215	38.7	3.9					
	DK	202	52.5	4.2					
	Total	458	100.0						

Area	WMCS2	n	Percent	SE		diff-yes	se(diff)	Z	p-value
1	No	39	70.1	7.8	1 vs 2	-17.0	11.02	-1.54	0.061
	Yes	20	29.9	7.8	1 vs 3	-1.0	8.86	-0.12	0.453
	Total	59	100.0		1 vs 4	-3.8	8.77	-0.44	0.331
2	No	115	53.1	7.8	2 vs 3	16.0	8.89	1.80	0.036
	Yes	144	46.9	7.8	2 vs 4	13.2	8.80	1.50	0.067
	Total	259	100.0		3 vs 4	-2.8	5.87	-0.47	0.318
3	No	137	69.1	4.2					
	Yes	68	30.9	4.2					
	Total	205	100.0						
4	No	271	66.3	4.1					
	Yes	187	33.7	4.1					
	Total	458	100.0						

536

Area	WMCS3	n	Percent	SE		diff-yes	se(diff)	Z	p-value
1	No	41	62.5	9.9	1 vs 2	4.3	12.22	0.35	0.364
	Yes	18	37.5	9.9	1 vs 3	13.5	10.83	1.25	0.106
	Total	59	100.0		1 vs 4	14.4	10.32	1.40	0.081
2	No	152	66.7	7.1	2 vs 3	9.2	8.35	1.11	0.135
	Yes	107	33.3	7.1	2 vs 4	10.2	7.68	1.32	0.093
	Total	259	100.0		3 vs 4	0.9	5.19	0.18	0.429
3	No	144	76.0	4.3					
	Yes	61	24.0	4.3					
	Total	205	100.0						
4	No	326	76.9	2.8					
	Yes	132	23.1	2.8					
	Total	458	100.0						

537

Area	WMCS4	n	Percent	SE		diff-1-3	se(diff)	Z	p-value
1	1 to 3	53	87.2	6.0	1 vs 2	1.3	6.92	0.19	0.425
	4	5	11.9	5.6	1 vs 3	3.5	6.83	0.52	0.302
	5 to 7	1	0.9	0.6	1 vs 4	1.1	6.45	0.17	0.432
	Total	59	100.0		2 vs 3	2.2	4.77	0.47	0.320
2	1 to 3	215	85.9	3.5	2 vs 4	-0.2	4.21	-0.05	0.481
	4	41	12.3	3.3	3 vs 4	-2.4	4.06	-0.60	0.274
	5 to 7	3	1.7	1.4					
	Total	259	100.0						
3	1 to 3	162	83.7	3.3					
	4	39	15.0	3.4					
	5 to 7	4	1.3	0.7					
	Total	205	100.0						
4	1 to 3	387	86.1	2.4					
	4	66	12.9	2.3					
	5 to 7	5	0.9	0.4					
	Total	458	100.0						

538

Area	WMCS5	n	Percent	SE		diff-1-3	se(diff)	Z	p-value
1	1 to 3	59	100.0	0.0	1 vs 2	3.2	1.67	1.93	0.027
	4	0	.	.	1 vs 3	4.7	1.98	2.38	0.009
	5 to 7	0	.	.	1 vs 4	1.1	0.52	2.20	0.014
	Total	59	100.0		2 vs 3	1.5	2.59	0.58	0.281
2	1 to 3	250	96.8	1.7	2 vs 4	-2.1	1.75	-1.19	0.117
	4	4	1.7	1.4	3 vs 4	-3.6	2.05	-1.75	0.040
	5 to 7	5	1.5	0.9					
	Total	259	100.0						
3	1 to 3	193	95.3	2.0					
	4	7	1.3	0.6					
	5 to 7	5	3.4	1.9					
	Total	205	100.0						
4	1 to 3	451	98.9	0.5					
	4	5	0.5	0.3					
	5 to 7	2	0.6	0.5					
	Total	458	100.0						

539

540

Area	WMCS6	n	Percent	SE		diff-1	se(diff)	Z	p-value
1	1	28	50.8	9.8	1 vs 2	2.9	11.87	0.25	0.403
	2	5	8.9	6.3	1 vs 3	9.7	10.91	0.89	0.187
	3	18	32.3	9.5	1 vs 4	11.3	10.33	1.10	0.136
	4	7	7.1	3.7	2 vs 3	6.8	8.32	0.81	0.208
	5	1	0.9	0.6	2 vs 4	8.4	7.55	1.12	0.132
	Total	59	100.0		3 vs 4	1.7	5.92	0.28	0.390
2	1	105	47.8	6.8					
	2	23	7.7	2.9					
	3	69	24.2	4.6					
	4	61	19.9	4.6					
	5	1	0.3	0.3					
	Total	259	100.0						
3	1	88	41.1	4.9					
	2	14	4.3	1.3					
	3	38	25.2	5.3					
	4	60	26.2	4.5					
	5	5	3.3	1.8					
	Total	205	100.0						
4	1	174	39.4	3.4					
	2	55	18.8	3.7					
	3	116	21.5	3.4					
	4	108	19.3	2.5					
	5	5	1.0	0.6					
	Total	458	100.0						

541

542

543 Table SB 11. Weighted support of catchment size monitoring with history of SARS-CoV-2
 544 infection (N-IgG) by area for probability samples (N = 981), Louisville/Jefferson County.

Area	Support Measuring Largest Areas (>50,000 households)		Support Measuring Smaller Sections (>30,000 households)		Support Measuring Neighborhoods (>5,000 households)		Neither Support nor Oppose		Oppose Measuring Any Size	
	Positive % (N-IgG)	Negative % (N-IgG)	Positive % (N-IgG)	Negative % (N-IgG)	Positive % (N-IgG)	Negative % (N-IgG)	Positive % (N-IgG)	Negative % (N-IgG)	Positive % (N-IgG)	Negative % (N-IgG)
1	59.0	50.4	-	9.6	20.1	33.4	8.3	6.6	12.7	-
2	21.9	50.5	23.9	5.9	28.7	23.8	25.5	19.4	-	-
3	29.8	44.7	-	4.4	58.2	16.1	6.2	32.2	5.9	2.6
4	26.4	42.3	27.5	17.0	28.6	19.8	17.5	19.6	-	1.3

545

546

547 **Supplement C**

548 **Wastewater Monitoring in the News, Louisville, KY**

549

- 550 1. WBRD, Louisville health officials concerned about possible spread of COVID-19 Delta
551 variant - Jul 7, 2021 ([https://www.wdrb.com/news/louisville-health-officials-concerned-
552 about-possible-spread-of-covid-19-delta-variant/article_27a1149e-de6d-11eb-8362-
553 0b7fe26b39e6.html](https://www.wdrb.com/news/louisville-health-officials-concerned-about-possible-spread-of-covid-19-delta-variant/article_27a1149e-de6d-11eb-8362-0b7fe26b39e6.html))
- 554 2. WLKY, Louisville could become only city in U.S. to document herd immunity -- with help
555 of wastewater - Apr 15, 2021 ([https://www.wlky.com/article/louisville-could-become-
556 only-city-in-us-to-document-herd-immunity-with-help-of-wastewater/36135716#](https://www.wlky.com/article/louisville-could-become-only-city-in-us-to-document-herd-immunity-with-help-of-wastewater/36135716#))
- 557 3. Scripps Media - University of Louisville documenting herd immunity using wastewater -
558 May 21, 2021 ([https://www.thedenverchannel.com/news/national-politics/the-
559 race/university-of-louisville-documenting-herd-immunity-using-wastewater](https://www.thedenverchannel.com/news/national-politics/the-race/university-of-louisville-documenting-herd-immunity-using-wastewater))
- 560 4. WAVE3, Brazilian variant of COVID-19 found in Louisville's wastewater - May 13, 2021
561 ([https://www.wave3.com/2021/05/13/brazilian-variant-covid-found-louisville-
562 wastewater/](https://www.wave3.com/2021/05/13/brazilian-variant-covid-found-louisville-wastewater/))
- 563 5. UofL News, UofL receives \$8.6 million from the CDC for COVID-19 wastewater research -
564 April 14, 2021 ([https://www.uoflnews.com/section/science-and-tech/uofl-receives-8-6-
565 million-for-covid-19-wastewater-research/](https://www.uoflnews.com/section/science-and-tech/uofl-receives-8-6-million-for-covid-19-wastewater-research/))
- 566 6. WDRB, California COVID-19 variant detected in Louisville - Mar 2, 2021
567 (<https://www.wdrb.com/news/california-covid-19-variant-detected-in-louisville-as-city->

- 568 [preps-for-johnson-johnson-vaccines/article_a76e7b22-7b70-11eb-8992-](#)
569 [a310c3dfa719.html](#))
- 570 7. Kentucky Waterways Alliance, Wastewater and surface water webinar - Jan 19, 2021
571 ([https://zoom.us/rec/share/P84J7YFiHXfgVp6f_sDe-](https://zoom.us/rec/share/P84J7YFiHXfgVp6f_sDe-ainT_OmB7n2KAVc4dGip5xeDfQXVDS5pu5h70lMH4Rh.p7tOR7kjlrhWkxAM?fbclid=IwAR2QhC3V46RXEnhrPKd1mBUO4OgbIRXCJUKzjC0dJApxpg_4Ta2X_V_bRM)
572 [ainT_OmB7n2KAVc4dGip5xeDfQXVDS5pu5h70lMH4Rh.p7tOR7kjlrhWkxAM?fbclid=IwAR](#)
573 [2QhC3V46RXEnhrPKd1mBUO4OgbIRXCJUKzjC0dJApxpg_4Ta2X_V_bRM](#))
- 574 8. NY Times, Watching what we flush could help keep a pandemic under control - Nov 24,
575 2020 (<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/24/magazine/coronavirus-sewage.html>)
- 576 9. UofL News, MSD and UofL testing Louisville wastewater to track COVID-19 - June 18,
577 2020 ([https://www.uoflnews.com/section/science-and-tech/msd-and-uofl-testing-](https://www.uoflnews.com/section/science-and-tech/msd-and-uofl-testing-louisville-wastewater-to-track-covid-19/)
578 [louisville-wastewater-to-track-covid-19/](#))
- 579