1	Covid-19 Exposure Assessment Tool (CEAT): Easy-to-use tool to quantify exposure				
2	based on airflow, group behavior, and infection prevalence in the community				
3					
4	Brian J. Schimmoller ^{1,2,12*} , Nídia S. Trovão ^{2,3} , Molly Isbell ¹ , Chirag Goel ^{2,4} , Benjamin F.				
5	Heck ⁵ , Tenley C. Archer ^{2,6} , Klint D. Cardinal ⁷ , Neil B. Naik ⁷ , Som Dutta ^{2,8} , Ahleah Rohr				
6	Daniel ⁹ , Afshin Beheshti ^{2,10,11,12*}				
7					
8	¹ Signature Science LLC, Austin, TX, 78759, USA				
9	² COVID-19 International Research Team				
10	³ Fogarty International Center, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA				
11	⁴ Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, 60611, USA				
12	⁵ Bastion Technologies, NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA, 94035, USA				
13	⁶ Biomea Fusion, Inc. Redwood City, CA, 94063, USA				
14	⁷ Leidos, Inc., NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA, 94035, USA				
15	⁸ Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84332, USA				
16	⁹ Space Biosciences Division, NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA, 94035, USA				
17	¹⁰ KBR, Space Biosciences Division, NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA, 94035,				
18	USA				
19	¹¹ Stanley Center for Psychiatric Research, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge,				
20	MA, 02142, USA				
21	¹² Lead Contacts				
22	*Correspondence: <u>bschimmoller@signaturescience.com</u> and <u>afshin.beheshti@nasa.gov</u>				
23					
24					
25	Summary				
26	The COVID-19 Exposure Assessment Tool (CEAT) allows users to compare respiratory				
27	relative risk to SARS-CoV-2 for various scenarios, providing understanding of how				
28	combinations of protective measures affect exposure, dose, and risk. CEAT incorporates				
29	mechanistic, stochastic and epidemiological factors including the: 1) emission rate of virus, 2)				

- 30 viral aerosol degradation and removal, 3) duration of activity/exposure, 4) inhalation rates, 5)
- 31 ventilation rates (indoors/outdoors), 6) volume of indoor space, 7) filtration, 8) mask use and
- 32 effectiveness, 9) distance between people, 10) group size, 11) current infection rates by variant,
- 12) prevalence of infection and immunity in the community, 13) vaccination rates of the
 NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
 community, and 14) implementation of COVID-19 testing procedures. Demonstration of

35	CEAT, from published studies of COVID-19 transmission events, shows the model accurately				
36	predicts transmission. We also show how health and safety professionals at NASA Ames				
37	Research Center used CEAT to manage potential risks posed by SARS-CoV-2 exposures.				
38					
39					
40	Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, aerosol model, COVID-19 Exposure Assessment,				
41	CEAT, Wells-Riley				

42

43 Introduction

The novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) that causes the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has quickly spread around the world and was formally recognized as a pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO) on March 11, 2020 (WHO, 2021 March 11). COVID-19 poses a great public health, clinical, economical, and societal burden worldwide. SARS-CoV-2 transmission occurs mainly through close contact (WHO, 2021 March 11), by direct and indirect contact (via fomites), and through the air via respiratory droplets and/or airborne particles (i.e. aerosols) (Jayaweera et al. 2020).

51 The global and local transmission dynamics drove an urgent need for assessing potential 52 risk of transmission while performing different activities in various facilities. Public health 53 officials have had to reevaluate how the public should interact to reduce and contain viral 54 spread (Bargain and Aminjonov 2020; Keskinocak et al. 2020; Deckert et al. 2021; Heydari et al. 2021), leading to assessment of worker and group risks associated with viral exposure in 55 various settings (Din et al. 2020; Mutambudzi et al. 2020; Sun et al. 2020; Wells et al. 2021). 56 Risk assessment and planning regularly consider the contribution of an array of factors, using 57 largely qualitative guidance from public health and media sources (Feyman et al. 2020; 58 59 Keskinocak et al. 2020; Wells et al. 2021), such as the viral exposure pathways, risk of infection 60 (e.g. number of cases per population), efficacy of interventions and personal protective equipment (PPE; e.g. masks, gloves), human behavior (e.g. adhering to public health 61 62 guidelines, hand washing, social distancing), and environmental factors (e.g. ventilation). 63 Given the numerous factors that affect exposure to the virus, qualitative assessments are insufficient when trying to compare various courses of action or potential mitigation options. 64

The WHO and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have released guidance for risk assessment and management of exposure in the context of COVID-19 at work (CDC, 2021 August 24), towards health-care personnel (CDC, 2021 September 10),

community-related (CDC, 2021 March 1 2022), and associated with domestic and international
travel (CDC, 2021 July 2). However, the qualitative nature of these guidelines makes it difficult
to quantify the exposure risk in varied settings.

71 Researchers have developed tools that predict the risk of transmission from exposure 72 through inhalation of emitted SARS-CoV-2-containing aerosols. Risk assessment tools provide 73 an important means of gaining understanding of dynamics of transmission and evaluating and 74 comparing risks associated with local environmental conditions, community epidemiological factors, and mitigation options. Typically, the infectious disease risk assessment tools utilize 75 76 either a deterministic dose-response approach or, alternatively, a Wells-Riley approach (Sze To and Chao 2010). A detailed comparison of dose-response models and Wells-Riley models 77 78 applied to infectious disease risk assessment is provided in Sze and Chao, 2010, addressing both models' advantages and limitations. Specific to SARS-CoV-2, Miller et al. (2021) (Miller 79 80 et al. 2021) offers a Wells-Riley-based method to model transmission and has developed a 81 companion COVID-19 Aerosol Transmission Estimator spreadsheet-based tool (CIRES 2020). 82 The Wells-Riley-based method addresses physical factors that contribute to indoor 83 transmission, applying a uniform well-mixed box (WMB) assumption and transmission 84 estimates using the Wells-Riley equation. Bazant and Bush, 2021 (Bazant and Bush 2021) 85 provide a comprehensive physical model of the factors that affect indoor transmission and 86 released a spreadsheet-based tool and online app (Khan et al. 2021) that calculates safety guidelines to limit the viral transmission based upon Wells-Riley and WMB assumptions. This 87 tool recommends the total number of hours of exposure that are permissible given the number 88 89 of people, their behavior, characteristics of the room and its ventilation, and the prevalence of COVID-19 and variants in the community. Parhizkar, et al., 2021 (Parhizkar et al. 2021) 90 91 developed a dose-response approach and model that uses a WMB assumption and a novel treatment of the inhaled and deposited doses. They demonstrate the model's capability against 92 93 well-documented COVID-19 outbreaks and offer a demo version of an online tool (Safe Air 94 Spaces 2022). Wagner, et al., 2021 (Wagner et al. 2021) offer a comprehensive modeling study 95 that examines both indoor and outdoor exposures from two-person interactions, examining near 96 field and far field effects, and modeling the behavior of particulates of various sizes. Other 97 modeling efforts have focused on predicting transmission risks using epidemiological and behavioral factors and population statistics (Chande, Lee, et al. 2020; Chande, Gussler, et al. 98 2020; Harvard IQSS 2020), without addressing facility- and event-specific physical 99 mechanisms that would affect transmission risk. 100

101 Rigorous study of the physics of aerosol behavior in indoor spaces have also been accomplished using both experiments and computational fluid dynamic (CFD) numerical 102 103 simulations. These studies analyzed key aspects of the hydrodynamics produced by expiratory 104 events, including sneezing, coughing, talking, singing and breathing, and the dispersion 105 processes of the resulting aerosol cloud (Fabregat, Gisbert, Vernet, Dutta, et al. 2021; Fabregat, 106 Gisbert, Vernet, Ferré, et al. 2021; Li et al. 2022). While these experiments and modeling 107 studies produce important understanding of the aerosol behavior in the environment and the 108 respiratory system, their results are specific to the defined scenarios that were modeled and are 109 too computationally intensive to be used directly and routinely by non-experts.

110 Our goal was to develop a simple-to-use, quantitative exposure and risk assessment tool 111 that addresses the factors summarized Fig. 1 and was based on principles of epidemiological, physics and engineering to provide benefit to risk assessors and decision makers in a variety 112 of settings. Additionally, we wanted to incorporate recent findings regarding disease 113 114 characteristics and virus dynamics Our focus was to create a tool that could be easily used by 115 people who are tasked with making recommendations or decisions for their organizations or 116 groups (e.g., businesses, schools, and civic groups) on approaches to reduce viral exposure. 117 The end result of our project has been the development of the COVID-19 Exposure Assessment 118 Tool (CEAT). The CEAT model is embedded in an Adobe® PDF (Portable Document Format) file and was coded in JavaScript using Adobe Acrobat's ® "Prepare a Form" function. The 119 120 model's user interface is shown in Fig. 2A and is available for download at https://www.cov-121 irt.org/exposure-assessment-tool/ as a PDF. The PDF platform was chosen instead of a web 122 app, since the PDF allows organizations to use the tool within the privacy and security of their 123 own networks and devices, eliminating any concern that an organization's private worker 124 safety information was being shared externally. Additionally, the PDF offers the ability to save 125 and disseminate the results for specific events and scenarios as individual PDF files. The 126 underlying algorithm used in CEAT leverages aspects of both Wells-Riley models and dose-127 response models. An important difference between the CEAT model and the other models 128 discussed above is that CEAT assesses the additional higher concentration of virus containing 129 aerosols that may occur when people are in close proximity and applies this approach to groups 130 between 2 and 250 people, both indoor and outdoors. The model relies on information that the 131 users would have available or could reasonably estimate, addresses the mechanisms that are 132 within the organization's control (i.e, distancing, duration, ventilation rates, filtration, mask wearing, vaccination requirements, and option for indoor/outdoor activities), and 133 134 communicates a clear and easily interpretable result. The model attempts to address the full

range of exposure risks within a community, from highest exposure risk to people known to be
infected, typical of a clinical environment, to lowest-risk exposure to people who rigorously
follow public health guidance.

138 **Results**

139 Model Overview

140 CEAT allows users to estimate group-wide and individual relative dose, an individual 141 dose, and transmission risk from potential SARS-CoV-2 exposure in various scenarios, based 142 on the key mechanistic, viral, and epidemiological factors summarized in Fig. S1A and Table 143 **1**. Here we present 1) a brief overview of the CEAT model; 2) the demonstration of the model 144 applied to real-world, well-documented transmission scenarios; 3) describe how CEAT was applied operationally by NASA Ames Research Center's Health and Safety office to manage 145 146 exposure risk of its staff. Full details of the mathematical model used for CEAT can be found 147 in the STARS Methods section.

148 Exposure is defined as the contact of an agent with an external boundary of a receptor 149 (exposure surface) for a specific duration (US EPA 2019). Dose is the amount of material that 150 passes through the boundary based upon the intake rate, concentration and exposure time. In 151 this case, the boundary is the entrance to the respiratory system (i.e., through the nose, mouth, 152 and other mucosa) (US EPA 2019) and the intake rate is the inhalation rate. Importantly, rather 153 than a mass of material, we are only concerned with the quantity of material that contributes to 154 transmission of disease. For viral dose-response models, the disease causing quantity is often 155 expressed in plaque forming units (PFU). A Wells-Riley based model expresses dose as an 156 amount of quanta and when applied in a Poisson probability distribution, the complement of 157 the Poisson distribution's probability mass function (with the assumption number of 158 occurrences is zero) can be used to predict an infection rate (Riley et al. 1978, (Sze To and Chao 2010), (Rudnick and Milton 2003). Engaging in activities with high inhalation and 159 160 exhalation rates, such as group exercise, strenuous work tasks or singing (Hamner 2020), is 161 thought to correlate with higher doses and transmission risks (Jang et al. 2020). Dose is the 162 appropriate endpoint for a risk model, since it captures the contributions of concentration, 163 exposure time, and inhalation rate. Since the model is meant to evaluate risks for events that 164 includes groups of people and the number of people in group is a variable that can be adjusted when planning events, we use a total group dose $(D_{Group \ Dose})$ as the basis for our model: 165

 $D_{Group \ Dose} = \underline{C} \times \underline{Q}_{Inhalation} \times \Delta t \times Pe_{Total} \ (Eq 1)$

167 where $\underline{Q}_{Inhalation}$ is the average inhalation rate for the group, \underline{C} is the average concentration 168 of the agent (in this case, aerosols containing SARS-CoV-2), Δt is the duration of group 169 exposure, and Pe_{Total} is the number of people exposed in the group, which we will assume are 170 all of the people in the group. The $D_{Group \ Dose}$ represents the total quantity of infectious 171 material that enters the respiratory tracts of all of the group by inhalation over the duration of 172 the potential event.

173 Rather than using an explicit calculation of group dose, the CEAT model takes the form of
174 a relative dose model, comparing a specific evaluated scenario to a defined high risk baseline
175 by a ratio:

176
$$Ratio of Doses = \frac{D_{Evaluated Group Dose}}{D_{Baseline Group Dose}} (Eq 2)$$

When the specific scenario results in a value that is equal to the baseline scenario, the ratio is 177 178 1. The ratio may be orders of magnitude greater or less than 1 depending on the specific 179 evaluated scenario. By benchmarking the dose calculations to a baseline scenario that is 180 considered high risk by Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), the model's 181 results can be aligned with the OSHA classifications of exposure risks (US OSHA 2020) (see 182 **Table S1**). The OSHA risk classifications depend on the industry type, the need for close 183 contact (i.e. within 6 feet or approximately 2 meters) with people known to be or suspected of being infected with SARS-CoV-2, or requirement for repeated or extended contact with 184 185 persons known to be or suspected of being infected with SARS-CoV-2 (US OSHA 2020). We 186 define the baseline scenario to represent a person (perhaps a healthcare worker) who is exposed 187 to a COVID-19 infected person for 15 minutes in an indoor setting with typical ventilation. We 188 apply a range of assumptions to this scenario, addressing each of the factors in Table S2 to 189 arrive at a baseline scenario. This scenario was estimated to be consistent with between 4 and 190 9 percent likelihood of infection, based upon the range of infection rates reported in various 191 studies due to close contacts, presumably involving wild type SARS-CoV-2 transmission based upon the dates of the cases included in the studies in early 2020 (Ng et al. 2021; Qian et al. 192 193 2021). The inhalation dose values for other scenarios are compared to the baseline value 194 through the simple ratio.

A critical variable that must be estimated by the model is the concentration of viruscontaining aerosols that occurs as a result of the exhalation from people in the group at the event. The underlying concentration model used in CEAT assesses both the contributions of concentration due to the proximity of people (i.e., people in the "near field" whether indoors

199 or outdoors) and the build up of concentration in a room over time (i.e., "far field") after Nicas, 200 2009 (Nicas 2009a). As presented in the STARS Methods, to determine the near field 201 concentration, we employ a method that captures the effect of turbulent mixing that occurs due 202 to higher air changes through ventilation or increased mixing of the air (e.g., through the HVAC 203 system recirculating the air). Specifically, we employ equations that use the air change rate and 204 total volume for an indoor space to calculate an eddy diffusivity based on relationships 205 previously proposed (Cheng et al. 2011; Foat et al. 2020; Venkatram and Weil 2021). We apply 206 the calculated eddy diffusivity in a novel way that still allows us the advantage of using the 207 computationally-simple near- and far-field approach. Outdoors, only the near field 208 concentration contributions are used, since the far field is considered to be negligible (Nicas 209 2014). Furthermore, also presented in detail in the STARS Methods, the CEAT concentration 210 algorithm uses an approach for extending the near- and far-field approach to groups of people 211 at set distancing intervals through the application of the superposition principle (Illingworth 212 1991). The superposition principle has been applied in the modeling of outdoor air pollutants 213 from multiple sources (Stockie 2011) and to indoor air quality modeling of gaseous pollutants 214 (Cheng et al. 2011).

215 An important driver of the dose calculation is a stochastic approach that estimates the 216 expected value of the number of infections in the group, since this is correlated to the quantity of virus-containing aerosols emitted in the modeled scenarios. In the baseline scenario, we 217 218 assumed there to be one infected person. For the evaluated scenario, the number of infections 219 in the group is dependent on the user's estimate of the group's behavior characteristics and an 220 estimate of the number of active cases in the community population, calculated using the 221 prevalence of diagnosed COVID-19 in the community, an estimate of the duration of 222 infectiousness, and an estimate of the fraction of cases thought to be undiagnosed. The resulting 223 number of active infections may be less than or greater than 1.

224 We adjust the calculated dose ratio result by additional factors: 1) concentration of virus-225 containing aerosols that occurs as a result of the exhalation from people in close proximity, 2) 226 number of infections in the group, 3) current community prevalence of variants, 4) relative 227 infectiousness of the prevalent variants; 5) current prevalence of immunity in the community 228 of group gained by recovery or vaccination, 6) efficacy of immunity in preventing transmission, 229 and 7) efficacy of surveillance testing of the group. The full CEAT dose ratio equation (Eq. 3) 230 is shown in Fig. 1B, along with a mapping of where each of the CEAT step's inputs are applied 231 in the equation. The expanded version of the CEAT dose ratio equation, showing the NF and 232 FF terms is found in Equation S46.

233 Users can use the tool to assess two side-by-side scenarios, and results are shown for the worst case individual dose ratio, total group dose ratio, and near- and far-field contributions to 234 235 the total group dose ratio. In the CEAT tool user interface, we refer to this dose as an 236 "exposure" rather than a "dose," since exposure is a more recognized term and will not be 237 misconstrued by a user to have any association with a vaccine dose or medication dose. The 238 group dose ratios for both scenarios are then categorized into four exposure risk bins, ranging 239 from "Lower Exposure" through "Very High Exposure" and presented graphically (Fig. 1A). 240 The model's results include:

241 242 243

244

245

• **Group-wide Exposure (Dose) Ratio (Fig. 1B, Eq. 3):** Ratio of the group-wide dose to the baseline group-wide dose. This result is also shown in the bar graph. This result takes into account the dose that group members are exposed to, as well as the size of the group. Accordingly, this group-wise result provides an evaluation of the overall risk of the event.

- Far-Field Group-wide Exposure (Dose) Ratio: Portion of the group-wide dose that
 is due to the well-mixed concentration in the room.
- Near-Field Group-wide Exposure (Dose) Ratio: Portion of the group-wide dose that
 is due to the localized concentration in the room due to the proximity of people.
- Individual Exposure (Dose) Ratio (Fig. 1B, Eq. 4): This is the ratio of the individual dose to the baseline individual dose.
- Individual Dose (Fig. 1B, Eq. 5): An estimate of the highest-exposed person's dose in
 units of quanta.
- Infection Rate (%): To determine the infection rate, the Individual Dose is applied to a Poisson distribution to calculate the probability that the exposed group will become infected. The estimated rate of infection within the group can be inferred from this probability. The relationship between the dose and the infection rate can be adjusted through using a variable in the model called the "Poisson Distribution Adjustment Factor" in Step 10, which provides a linear adjustment factor to that relationship. The dose is multiplied by 1 over the adjustment factor.
- # of Index Infectors: Provides the assumed number of the infected individuals that
 were present based upon the selections and inputs in Step 1, Step 2, and Step 10 in the
 model. The model used this value to estimate the initial source(s) of infection in the
 room or at the event. This value can be a less than one person or fraction of a person,
 since it represents a probabilistically-determined number of people
- 266

267 Demonstration of the Model Applied to Documented Transmission Events

We have demonstrated the effectiveness of CEAT results to predict infection rates for 268 known transmission events by assembling data from eleven transmission events that were 269 270 documented in the literature (listed in **Table 2**). All of the events except for one, occurred 271 before the vaccines were available and before the emergence of SAR-CoV-2 variants. To 272 evaluate each of these scenarios in CEAT, we collected the data needed for each step and set 273 the average daily cases per 100,000, such that the "Number of people initially infected" in the 274 results would be equal to one, assuming there was one index case in each scenario. There are 275 two ways of conceptualizing how the CEAT model is addressing this scenario of a known 276 infected person (or index case), which are both mathematically equivalent:

- 1. A receptor at the center and all others are potential sources. The emissions may occur 277 278 from any one of the sources. We calculate an expected value of the dose for the person 279 at the center, assuming that all of the people are equally likely to be the emitter, with a 280 probability of φ , where $\varphi = 1/($ Number of People-1)) and the one emitter has a quanta based emission rate of \dot{M} . CEAT sums the results from all people (both FF and NF), s 281 282 and multiplies by φ . This is the expected value of dose that the person located at the center of the group would receive if there was one emitter in the room, given that the 283 284 emitter could have been anywhere in the room.
- 285 2. The source is at the center and all of the people are receptors. We calculate the expected 286 value of the dose for each receptor (i.e., each susceptible person) given an emitter at the 287 center, emitting at \dot{M} . CEAT sums the results from all people (both FF and NF) and 288 then divides by the number of receptors (i.e., number of people - 1) to arrive at an 289 average. The result is the expected value of the mean dose that all people would receive 290 in the room from the one emitter.

When examining CEAT performance for transmission events, we use the event's number of infections, and the infection rate, *P*, which is the number of secondary cases (total infected)

293 divided by the total susceptible people, yielding, P

$$= \frac{Total \, Infected}{Total \, Susceptible}$$
 . The total

number of total susceptible is equal to the total people minus the index cases (typically equal to one). Using the information describing the event's duration, room size, ventilation rate, activity type and any information on the location or the spacing of the people (**Table 2**), the CEAT individual dose is calculated. The infection rate can be predicted using the same statistical approaches that are used in the Wells-Riley model (Riley et al. 1978), in which the

probability of at least one infection is computed using an assumed Poisson distribution, with shape parameter equal to $D_{CEAT \ i}$, as shown in Eq. 7:

301

$$P_{CEAT Prediction} = 1 - exp(-D_{CEAT i})$$
 (Eq 7)

The CEAT predicted infection rate is plotted against the observed cases among the 302 303 susceptible people (Fig. 2A). Information on vaccination, variant, and mask usage (which was 304 none) was gathered from the reported events (Table 2). The CEAT results show a high correlation with the observed with an almost 1-to-1 (i.e. $R^2 = 0.94$) relationship to the observed 305 infection rates (Fig. 2A). In addition, CEAT correctly binned the events as high risk and there 306 307 is a significant positive correlation between the number of observed infections and CEAT group-wise dose ratio (Fig. 2E). As discussed in the previous section, to assess infection rate, 308 309 the initial relationship between the dose and the infection rate is unadjusted and then through the "Poisson Distribution Adjustment Factor" in step 10 we achieve the corrected adjustment. 310 311 With CEAT, even before this adjustment takes place, we still observe a strong correlation to 312 the observed infection rates (Fig. 2B).

313 As a comparison to the CEAT results, the traditional Wells-Riley result that assumes a well-314 mixed dose, \underline{D}_{WMB} , is calculated using:

315
$$P_{Wells Riley Prediction} = 1 - exp(-D_{WMB}) \quad (Eq 8)$$

Using the same assumptions applied to the CEAT model for each of the events, including the same quanta based emission rate, the Wells-Riley predicted infection rates for both the adjusted (**Fig. 2C**) and unadjusted (**Fig. 2D**), clearly show poor predictions when compared to the observed infection rates. The CEAT approach clearly outperforms the Wells-Riley in predicting infection rate in these cases (**Fig. 2E**). Interestingly, we also observe that the CEAT outperforms the Wells-Riley model with several other important parameters which include: distancing, density, breathing rate, and volume of the room (**Fig. 2E**).

323 CEAT use to determine risk assessment for social gatherings

To demonstrate how CEAT can estimate potential exposure risk to COVID-19 for gatherings and events, we used CEAT to assess a set of hypothetical gathering scenarios that could have occured in three locations in the United States (**Fig. 3**) using published CDC countylevel COVID-19 7-day average new case data for the locations on 31 January 2022 (CDC 2020a). We chose three representative locations: 1) a county with a low vaccination rate and 329 high 7-day average new case rate (Knox County, TN), 2) a county with a moderate vaccination 330 rate and a 7-day average case equivalent to the national average (Suffolk County, MA), 3) a 331 county with the high vaccination rate and a low daily cases (Montgomery Country, MD). At 332 the time of analysis for all counties the Omicron variant accounted for >99% of COVID-19 333 cases (CDC 2022). We assumed the gatherings lasted 5 hours and would be held both indoors 334 or outdoors. We also included a range of scenarios for distancing, type of masks being used, 335 composition for the group of people, and location (i.e. indoors or outdoors). Lastly, we included 336 analysis for 3 different group characteristic scenarios for the gatherings: 1) the general public 337 (i.e. "equal to the community average"); 2) groups of people that are 100% vaccinated and 338 follow all public guidelines; and 3) groups of people that are 100% vaccinated, follow all public 339 guidelines, and testing was required before the gathering.

340 The exposure assessment from this analysis can help guide individuals to safely plan 341 gatherings and events. As expected in all scenarios, if the gathering is composed of 100% 342 vaccinated individuals that were tested and follow all public guidelines, the exposure risk is 343 very low both indoors and outdoors with the best masks and with an increasing number of 344 people it increases to medium risk (Fig. 3). When considering the gathering in a general public 345 scenario (e.g. eating at a restaurant), for all indoor scenarios in all counties without a mask with >10 people in the room, the group is at high risk of exposure to SARS-CoV-2 even when spaced 346 3 meters (approximately 10 feet) apart. Overall we demonstrate with CEAT the more 347 348 precautions followed, the greater the reduction of exposure and this scenario can be used as a 349 guide for the public on how to use CEAT to properly determine the safest way to assemble 350 while keeping the risk of exposure to COVID-19 low.

351

352 NASA Ames Research Center used CEAT to determine the safest method for 353 allowing workers to return to work

354 CEAT has been used by the NASA Ames Research Center (ARC) safety office to assist 355 them in planning for workers to return to their campus. Starting on December 11, 2020, NASA ARC began to use the first beta version of CEAT to assess whether the tool could assist in 356 357 gaining understanding on how to keep essential workers safe when having to work in person 358 on the NASA ARC campus. To demonstrate how NASA ARC safety office has utilized this 359 tool, we provide their assessment of exposure potential in 73 different scenarios throughout the 360 campus (Fig. 4 and Table S3). Since NASA ARC has been using this tool throughout the 361 pandemic, every assessment used the latest COVID-19 case numbers from the State of

362 California (US State of California 2022a). As is shown in Fig 4, the case numbers will vary
363 due to the changing number of cases for that particular date of assessment, so it is essential to
364 analyze the risk continuously with the most up-to-date COVID-19 case rates.

365 For each scenario, CEAT was used to determine the maximum number of personnel that 366 could be allowed to be in each location such that the exposure risk was the lowest, while still 367 allowing the work to be performed (Fig. 4 and Table S3), which during pre-pandemic would 368 have been occupied by more personnel. These maximum occupancy were included in the 369 project's Return To Onsite Work (RTOW) plan that was reviewed by the safety office. In 370 general, most operations could occur with one to two people thus reducing the potential 371 exposure and resulting in a lower exposure risk. However, some operations required up to 10 372 personnel to be fully functional. As expected, these conditions increased the COVID-19 exposure risk to medium level. NASA ARC considered the group of people at work to be 373 374 composed of people following all public health guidance which had the effect of reducing the 375 assumed probability of COVID-19 prevalence in the group below the average for the 376 community, with exception of a few locations where employees from organizations outside 377 NASA ARC would participate. Social distancing was assumed to be the maximum possible for 378 that work to be performed. For some locations such as "Critical activities when spacecraft 379 arrives and extra hands needed - Location C" social distancing could not be achieved while 380 performing the work, so other factors were considered, such as limiting the project duration, to 381 find the lowest risk exposure estimate possible for that location and operation.

382 The breathing rate and vocalization for each location were also part of the decision in 383 determining the maximum number of people in each location. Of all the locations and 384 operations analyzed, only one location/operation resulted in the worst case scenario which 385 produced the highest risk exposure assessment (i.e. "High-Medium Risk Exposure"). The operation "Material testing such as compression testing and fatigue testing" typically involved 386 387 high exertion physical activities as well as heavy exertion for the breathing rate and speaking 388 over a long duration. The majority of the other locations and operations only require passive 389 breathing rate and standing/speaking. The various operations that required elevated breathing 390 rate and vocalization to light exertion typically had shorter project durations in order to reduce 391 the COVID-19 exposure risk.

To provide inputs for the Air Changes per Hour (ACH), the ventilation rates for each location were either provided by the building managers, were directly measured, or were assumed using the guidelines in Step 8 in the CEAT. The most accurate ventilation rates available to the safety office were used in the model for each scenario. With the available data and estimated parameters in some cases, CEAT allowed NASA ARC to determine the
operation-specific mitigation approaches, allowing its essential workers to return to work inperson with the low exposure risk to COVID-19.

399 CEAT has also been effective in allocating project resources and PPE where they would be 400 most beneficial. When reviewing RTOW plans, NASA ARC safety office used the CEAT as a 401 resource to recommend whether limited KN95/N95 masks would be effective at reducing 402 potential exposure risk. Similarly, projects used CEAT when purchasing portable air cleaners 403 (PACs), calculating the number of ACH needed to reduce risk to acceptable levels, typically 404 "Lower Exposure". Multiple projects found the number of PACs needed to reduce risk to 405 acceptable levels were not financially feasible, and other controls such as increasing mask 406 effectiveness and/or working in a different location were more cost effective for the same risk 407 reduction. This allowed projects to spend their budgets more efficiently.

When the workplace face mask policy became optional for vaccinated personnel, CEAT was used to identify potential locations and operations where face masks would be required regardless of vaccination status. Locations and/or operations where the relative exposure risk was in the "Medium" or "High" category were required to wear face coverings regardless of vaccination status. CEAT was especially effective in this regard as it allowed the safety office to provide this guidance using a consistent and unbiased method.

414 When tracking the CEAT model results over time, one can examine how the model 415 responds to changes in community conditions and changes in organizational policies. NASA 416 ARC tracked their worksite-specific relative group-wide exposure ratios with the California 417 seven-day case rate (Fig. 5). There was a strong correlation (correlation coefficient=0.9759) 418 between the two results, as would be expected, since the seven-day case rate is an input into 419 the CEAT model in Step 10 (Fig. 1B, Eq. 3). Specifically, NASA ARC used the location- and 420 operation-specific exposure risk ratios that were assessed on a biweekly basis to calculate a 421 "Centerwide Accepted Median Exposure Risk Ratio". The fact that the CEAT results moved 422 up and down with the community conditions allowed the NASA ARC safety office to adjust 423 its guidance and mitigation strategies accordingly.

Beginning May 14, 2021, NASA ARC implemented the updated CEAT that included variant prevalence. It was noted that the correlation between the "Centerwide Accepted Median Exposure Risk Ratio" and the California case rate immediately decreased. However, at the same time this updated CEAT iteration was implemented, the NASA ARC face mask policy became optional for vaccinated personnel. Once NASA ARC reinstated their face mask policy for all individuals regardless of vaccination status, the correlation between "Centerwide

Accepted Median Exposure Risk Ratio" and the California case rate appeared to return tosimilar values before May 14, 2021.

432 **Discussion**

By establishing a set of equations that included mechanistic factors affecting nearfield and 433 434 far field concentration, filtration, group behavior, and SARS-CoV-2 infection and immunity 435 prevalence in the community, we developed a flexible, simple-to-use COVID-19 Exposure 436 Assessment Tool. The tool achieved our goal of allowing businesses, schools, government 437 agencies, and individuals to assess COVID-19 exposure to the risk for groups and 438 organizations. The tool is easy to use, computationally fast, and built on a well-developed and documented mathematical model that includes aerosol behavior, knowledge of SARS-CoV-2 439 440 transmission dynamics, as well as the effect of proximity. Here, though our comparison of 441 CEAT results against observed transmissions for documented events, we demonstrate that 442 CEAT can provide the accurate predictions compared to known cases with observed infection 443 rates (Fig. 2), an example of how CEAT can be used for gatherings (Fig. 3), and real-time 444 usage of this tool demonstrating how NASA ARC safety office has been over the past year 445 (since the tool's original release in December 2020) evaluating how to allow essential employees to work in person with the lowest possible risk to COVID-19 exposure (Fig. 4). 446

447 As the CDC notes, the inhalation of fine respiratory droplets and aerosol particles is the principal means of SARS-CoV-2 transmission (CDC 2020b). This is in line with recent 448 449 publications that have shown that SARS-CoV-2 is spread by airborne transmission through the 450 aerosols produced from breathing, talking, and singing (Chen et al. 2021; Miller et al. 2021; 451 Adenaive et al.: Coleman et al.). Given this, the CEAT's mathematical model addresses the 452 aerosol dynamics and transport, treating the suspended aerosols as if they are dispersed as 453 gasses would be using a eddy diffusivity approach, but also addressing deposition as a sink, 454 using the same approach for aerosol deposition that was presented in the COVID-19 Aerosol 455 Transmission Estimator spreadsheet-based tool (CIRES 2020), where an aerosol deposition factor of 0.24 hr⁻¹ was used. 456

To demonstrate the model, we examined eleven literature-documented events with one of the events occurring in 11/2021 with known the Omicron variant and vaccine data (NIPH 2021) (**Fig. 2** and **Table 2**). When comparing CEAT results to the Wells-Riley model, CEAT better predicted the infection rate compared to the observed infection rates reported (**Fig. 2**). In addition, the exposure scores for all events predicted a high risk of exposures, which correlates to what was reported for each of these cases. 463 Schools and universities that have opened to in-person classes have been able to maintain low to no COVID-19 cases by applying many of the mitigation methods that are included in 464 465 the CEAT, albeit independent of CEAT. The scenarios included in our assessment of gatherings 466 (Fig. 3) can be applied to such environments and seems to match the observations that are being 467 reported by schools and universities. Known outbreaks or superspreader events related to 468 school openings have been chiefly reported occurring outside the classroom environment, 469 including events during spring breaks (Doyle et al. 2021) or athletic-related events (Teran et 470 al. 2020), where enforcement of specific guidelines to reduce spread were not implemented. 471 Other COVID-19 models for school re-openings have also shown similar recommendations as 472 CEAT (Brooks-Pollock et al. 2021; Hernández-Hernández and Huerta-Quintanilla 2021; 473 Phillips et al. 2021). Brooks-Pollock et al. (Brooks-Pollock et al. 2021) provided a stochastic 474 transmission model based on social contact data and patterns of student mixing to determine 475 the impact and risk of COVID-19 transmission for universities in the United Kingdom. Since 476 their model only targets social patterns and behavior of students contributing to COVID-19 477 infections, the focus for their mitigation strategies was with reducing the number of students in 478 in-person classroom settings (i.e. increase social distancing), reducing living circles for 479 students, and included regular testing. Although their model only takes into account one 480 parameter from our model, the social distancing measures are in agreement with the exposure 481 risk assessment results from our CEAT analysis. There also have been two independent agent-482 based models developed to assess SARS-CoV-2 transmission (Phillips et al. 2021) and 483 COVID-19 cases (Hernández-Hernández and Huerta-Quintanilla 2021). Similar to the model 484 described above, Phillips et al. (Phillips et al. 2021) agent-based model focuses on SARS-CoV-485 2 transmission based on children's household sizes in the Ontario child care centers and school 486 buildings. They have also included parameters to take into account classroom sizes, sibling 487 influence, symptomatic and asymptomatic rates, and physical distancing. Hernández-488 Hernández et al. (Hernández-Hernández and Huerta-Quintanilla 2021) presented an agent-489 based model that utilizes the students' community network to predict spread of COVID-19 490 within a school setting. They also considered the following parameters: 1) status of COVID-491 19; 2) physical distancing; 3) viral load; 4) hygiene standards; 5) confined spaces; and 6) social 492 interactions. As expected, both models demonstrated the importance of social distancing and 493 following the proper guidelines to prevent spread of COVID-19 which is in agreement with 494 our model.

The recently published model by Miller et al. (Miller et al. 2022) utilizes CDC's
COVIDTracer Advanced tool to provide a transmission model for SARS-CoV-2 in schools.

497 They took into account scenarios for infection in the community and public compliance to CDC guidelines to mitigate COVID-19 spread. Similar to other models, they found that social 498 499 distancing is key to reduce spread and that the COVD-19 community case rate is crucial when 500 assessing exposure risk. Other models of COVID-19 spread in small colleges only consider 501 similar parameters as the models described above (Bahl et al. 2021). Although all these models 502 provide a good basis for predicting the optimal conditions for having in-person classes, they 503 miss key parameters incorporated in CEAT that are important to determine the most effective 504 and accurate assessment of exposure risk to COVID-19. The lessons learned from classroom 505 scenarios can also be applied to other gatherings, such as family gatherings. We demonstrated 506 that depending on the location and people's behavior, there are scenarios which have low risk 507 for viral exposure (Fig. 3). Currently, there are no models specifically focused on family gatherings, but the literature available confirms the risk assessment analysis that CEAT 508 509 generates. Whaley et al. (Whaley et al. 2021) reported an assessment of COVID-19 risk 510 associated with social gatherings, specifically during birthdays. They utilized data from 2.9 511 million households from a large insurance database that included COVID-19 prevalence from 512 January 1 to November 8, 2020, and household birthdays across geographical regions in the 513 US. They estimated that increased cases of COVID-19 correlated with social gatherings (i.e. 514 birthdays), with increased cases for households in counties with higher COVID-19 prevalence. 515 This study can serve as a population confirmation for the assessment we provided for 516 gatherings with CEAT (Fig. 3).

517 Since the beta version release of CEAT in December 2020, we have made several additions 518 to the tool to improve it including: 1) an eddy diffusivity-based near-field concentration 519 algorithm; 2) added an infection rate calculation, 3) accounted for new SARS-CoV-2 variants, 520 3) address COVID-19 surveillance testing for groups, 4) addressed immunity within the 521 population gained from recovery or vaccination. These additional functionalities were added 522 to adapt to new information that was available since the initial release and reflect the team's 523 increased understanding of the risk dynamics related to SARS-CoV-2 transmission.

To determine the capability of CEAT being used by an organization to safely regulate employees working in-person, we have provided an example of it being applied by the NASA ARC safety office (**Fig. 4** and **Table S3**). NASA ARC adjusted parameters related to group size, duration of time, and ventilation for the project to bring the exposure level to the lowest possible risk. The analysis shows how NASA ARC continued to monitor the changing case numbers within the community and utilized CEAT to provide the safest possible scenario for essential employees to work in-person. The use of CEATby NASA ARC represents a blueprint for other organizations, businesses, and schools to use the tool to manage their organizations exposure and risks to allow the organization to optimize mitigation strategies for employees to work in-person with lower exposure risk to COVID-19. The case study at NASA ARC has shown that as the push for employer vaccine mandates increases (The White House 2021), employers can calculate the potential exposure risk reduction among their workforce compared to the community. This will be especially useful for workplaces in communities with low vaccination rates, where an employer vaccine mandate could have a large reduction in risk.

538 There are certain parameters in CEAT's model that will have a greater influence on the 539 assessment for exposure risk to COVID-19. As the examples we have provided show, the 540 location of the gathering makes a big impact on the outcome (i.e. indoors vs outdoors) (Figs. 3 541 and 4). This is due to the fact that the exchange of aerosols between people outdoors will obviously be greatly reduced due to open circulation of the air versus in a confined space. The 542 543 compliance to public health guidance policies is another parameter that will greatly change the 544 outcome of the exposure risk assessment (Figs. 3 and 4). Lastly, the type of mask will make a 545 considerable difference on the outcome of the model. From existing literature on effectiveness 546 of masks (Brooks and Butler 2021; Howard et al. 2021; Wang et al. 2021), our model takes 547 into account that the better the mask and the greater the adherence to mask wearing results in 548 a reduction of dose ratio. (Figs. 3 and 4).

We believe that this tool and model can be easily modified and applied for guidance in 549 550 current and future epidemics/pandemics from respiratory pathogens. In addition to SARS-551 CoV-2, a systematic review of the literature has shown that measles, TB, chickenpox, 552 influenza, smallpox and SARS have strong and sufficient evidence of an association between 553 their transmission and ventilation and air movement (Li et al. 2007). Accordingly, if pathogens 554 have similar transmission mechanisms through aerosols, CEAT model can be modified to include the aerosol and viral dynamics to accommodate their pathogen-specific exposure risk 555 556 assessment. We believe that by providing CEAT to the general public and building on its 557 capabilities, will have a long lasting beneficial impact for both our current pandemic and many 558 other scenarios.

559

560 Limitations of the Study

As with any mathematical model, there will be parameters that cannot be fully captured. Our model has a number of inherent limitations; nonetheless, it has been demonstrated to be used to accurately predict COVID-19 exposure risk for a limited number of eleven documented transmission event cases. In some of these cases key parameters were not available but were instead estimated. A full validation of the model where a separate complete training set and test data set were compiled and applied to the model validation.

567 Several simplifying assumptions were made in the development of CEAT that resulted in 568 more conservative results. One conservative assumption was using the highest exposed person 569 to represent all people in a group. In future versions of CEAT, we may calculate location 570 specific exposure values that account for the location of each person in the space, versus every 571 other person in the space. This approach would result in a lower group exposure estimate than 572 we currently calculate.

The CEAT concentration model assumes exhalations behave isotropically (i.e., they 573 574 disperse equally in all directions), are non-buoyant, and are continuous exhalations. In reality, exhalations are more complex and may range from violent expiratory events or more regular 575 576 puffs (Bazant and Bush 2021). Exhalation plumes are typically anisotropic jets and have a 577 buoyant nature due to their relative warmth and higher humidity. CFD modeling has captured 578 these dynamics (Fabregat, Gisbert, Vernet, Ferré, et al. 2021; Fabregat, Gisbert, Vernet, Ferré, 579 et al. 2021; Li et al. 2022). To compensate for the fact that CEAT assumes plumes are non-580 buoyant, which likely results in CEAT over-predicting concentrations at breathing heights, we 581 adjust the height of the near-field volume to be equal to the distance between the source and 582 the receptor, mixing the emission in all directions and in a larger near-field volume. The 583 anisotropy is more difficult to capture in a model, given that people in groups may be facing in 584 different directions at any point in time and in some events, such as a classroom, people may 585 have a more uniform directionality. Additionally, the direction of the airflow in an indoor space 586 is dependent on the flowrate characteristics of the ventilation system, geometry of the space, 587 geometry and type of air vents, doors, windows, differential heating and cooling, other fans in 588 the building, movement of people, and indoor/outdoor environment interactions. The simple 589 approach used by CEAT to arrive at a concentration, certainly could be improved upon for any specific situations using CFD modeling, however the computational complexity and run times 590 591 would greatly increase. Experiments that included high temporal and spatial measurement of 592 CO_2 from people in a variety of indoor conditions may be useful for testing and optimizing the 593 concentration modeling approach used in CEAT. Experimentation, similar to the studies 594 conducted by Vernez et al. 2021 (Vernez et al. 2021), but using exhaled CO₂ and inert aerosols 595 as tracers, could be accomplished to compare with results obtained using CEAT's algorithms 596 to validate its concentration models and possibly calculate adjustments for the eddy diffusivity.

597 The aerosol deposition and virus decay behavior are simplistically handled in CEAT by adding additional terms to the air change rate resulting in a lower concentration since the 598 599 effective ACH is increased. CEAT uses the same values for aerosol deposition and virus decay of 0.24 hr⁻¹ and 0.63 hr⁻¹, respectively, for all conditions, using the same values recommended 600 601 in CIRES, 2020. The deposition and virus decay rates should vary based upon environmental 602 conditions and the nature of the exhalation conditions (breathing, coughing, sneezing, singing, 603 and speaking). In future versions of CEAT, exhalation-specific deposition rates and the 604 environmental-specific decay rates (i.e., varying by humidity, temperature, and ultraviolet 605 radiation) could be calculated (Biryukov et al. 2020; Ratnesar-Shumate et al. 2020; US DHS 606 2022).

607 The lack of incorporation of different efficiencies for the different vaccines available. In our model, we currently have "Protective Effectiveness of Immunity" being considered as one 608 609 universal number for the population being assessed. We believe that differences for efficacy 610 between the vaccines can be averaged for the overall community. Our model also lacks the 611 ability to incorporate the length of time that has passed since being vaccinated or previously 612 infected. This might change the risk assessments since we now know that for both cases the 613 levels of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 reduce over time (Khoury et al. 2021; Marot et al. 614 2021; Yamayoshi et al. 2021). However, more research is needed to determine how this impacts the protection against SARS-CoV-2, which is the reason we have not incorporated this 615 616 parameter into our model at the moment. Additionally, CEAT does not account for the buildup 617 of viral particles between groups utilizing the same space one after another. This limitation will 618 impact groups gathering in a room separately, but sequentially. One way to overcome this 619 limitation is for groups to allow a certain amount of time between occupancy. Calculating the 620 amount of time needed for a ventilation system to remove 99% of contaminants, like that 621 provided by the CDC for infection control in health-care facilities (CDC 2003), can allow 622 groups to calculate their exposure risk ratio during separate but successive events. Similarly, 623 groups can estimate their relative risk of back-to-back gatherings by adding the total duration 624 of all meetings throughout the day.

625

626 Acknowledgments: The opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not 627 reflect the view of Signature Science LLC, National Institutes of Health, the Department of 628 Health and Human Services, or the US government. The authors acknowledge and thank 629 Signature Science's Mr. Jim Gibson, of Charlottesville Virginia, for the development of certain 630 graphics for the manuscript and for the website development for the publishing of CEAT.

Additionally, the authors acknowledge and thank Mr. Ken Martinez of the Integrated
Bioscience and Built Environment Consortium (IBEC) for his review of the draft manuscript
and his enthusiasm for the CEAT.

634

635 Funding Acknowledgments: B.S. and M.I. developed the CEAT concept, method, model, 636 code and user interface, conducted literature reviews, and prepared this manuscript using solely 637 Signature Science, LLC provided Internal Research and Development (IR&D) funding. S.D. 638 was supported by the DOE Office of Science through the National Virtual Biotechnology 639 Laboratory (NVBL), a consortium of DOE national laboratories focused on response to COVID-19, with funding provided by the Coronavirus CARES Act. A.B. is supported by 640 641 supplemental funds for COVID-19 research from Translational Research Institute for Space Health through NASA Cooperative Agreement NNX16AO69A (T-0404) and further funding 642 643 was provided by KBR, Inc.

644

645 Author Contributions: Conceptualization: B.S.; Creation of Model and Tool: B.S. and M.I.; Methodology: B.S., M.I.; Formal Analysis: A.B., B.S., C.G., N.S.T.; Analysis with NASA 646 647 ARC usage: B.F.H., K.D.C., N.B.N, A.R.D., A.B.; Investigation: A.B., B.S., M.I.; Resources: A.B., B.S.; Writing Original Draft: B.S., M.I. A.B., N.S.T.; Writing original draft for NASA 648 649 ARC usage: B.F.H., A.R.D.; Review & Editing: A.B., B.S., M.I., C.G., S.D., A.R.D., N.S.T., 650 B.F.H., T.A.; Figures and Visualization: B.S., A.B., N.S.T., for graphical abstract: A.B.; 651 Funding Acquisition: A.B., B.S.; Supervision: A.B., B.S. 652 653 Declaration of Interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

654

655 **Figure and Table Captions**

656 Figure 1. COVID-19 Exposure Assessment Tool Interface (CEAT) and background on

the model utilized. A) User interface of the interactive PDF for CEAT. B) The equations thatthe CEAT model uses to calculate results.

659

Figure 2. Validation of the CEAT with Known COVID-19 Spreading Events. A) and B)
The adjusted and unadjusted scatter plot comparing the observed infection rates of known
events (found in Table 2) to CEAT predicted infection rates. C) and D) The adjusted and

663 unadjusted scatter plot comparing the observed infection rates of known events to Wells-Riley model predicted infection rates. For A) - D) linear fits were made to the data points and the 664 residuals of these fits are plotted underneath each plot. The R² values for the fits are shown in 665 666 the plots. E) Correlation plot of the observed infection rate to both the CEAT and Wells-Riley 667 adjusted predicted infection rates. Correlation with additional parameters from the event is 668 shown. The size of the nodes reflects the degree of correlation (i.e. larger the size the higher 669 the correlation). Positive correlation is related to the higher shades of red, while negative 670 correlation is related to higher shades of blue. Statistically significant correlations are denoted 671 by *** p-value < 0.001, ** p-value < 0.01, and * p-value < 0.05. F) Scatter plot of the exposure 672 risk for all eleven events determined by CEAT.

673

674 Figure 3. COVID-19 Exposure Assessment for Gathering Lasting 5 Hours. Data was 675 analyzed on January 31st, 2022 for three US counties from the lowest (Montgomery County, 676 MD) to highest (Knox County, TN) COVID-19 cases. The time was kept constant for all data 677 points which assumes an average gathering of around 5 hours. The vaccination rates and 678 population recovered rates are displayed on top of the plot for each county. Different scenarios 679 were represented for location (outdoors = triangle, indoors = circle), distancing (increasing) 680 point size relates with increasing distance), and mask usage (no masks = red, average masks = 681 blue, and N95/KN95 = yellow). The background shading of the plot indicates whether the data 682 points are considered low risk (light blue), medium risk (yellow), or high risk (red) for COVID-683 19 exposure.

684

Figure 4. COVID-19 Exposure Assessment for Determining Lowest Exposure Risk for In-Person Work by NASA Ames Research Center. Exposure risk ratios using CEAT were calculated for 73 different scenarios (i.e. various locations and operations) at NASA ARC. The variables used for all ten steps are depicted for each scenario highlighting how various inputs affect the exposure risk ratios. The data for this figure is available in Table S3.

690

Figure 5. NASA Ames Research Center (ARC) Accepted Exposure Risk in Relation to Community Case Rates. Exposure risk ratios were calculated on a biweekly basis for 76 different scenarios (i.e. various locations and operations) at NASA ARC starting March 1, 2020 upon approval to RTOW through September 1, 2021. Biweekly reassessments included changes in community conditions such as case rate, variant prevalence, and vaccination rates in California. The median of all projected exposure risk ratios was calculated on a biweekly

697	basis to establish a "NASA ARC Accepted Median Exposure Risk" (blue). These values were				
698	plotted along with the California state 7-day case rate per 100 thousand (orange). Notations				
699	were made designating major events and/or policy changes that may have influenced trends				
700	and deviations. The background shading of the plot indicates whether the data points are				
701	considered low risk (light blue) or medium risk (yellow) for COVID-19 exposure.				
702					
703	Table 1. Summary of Factors. Mechanistic and epidemiological factors included in the				
704	Nomogram Model that affect exposure and inhalation dose.				
705					

- 706 Table 2. Reported COVID-19 transmission events.
- 707

708 Supplemental Figures and Tables

Figure S1. The different box models for CEAT. A) Factors Included in COVID-19 Exposure Assessment Tool Interface (CEAT). A summary of the factors and mechanisms affecting the comparative dose and exposure risks. B) Single Zone Well-Mixed Box Model. Basic box model assumes emissions are instantaneously well mixed. C) Near Field (NF) and Far Field (FF) Box Model. "Box-within-a-box" approach provides localized higher concentration in the vicinity of the source.

715

716 Figure S2. CEAT Concentration Model Performance. A) Modeled results vs. measured 717 concentrations using CEAT concentration model in cases when ACH was less than or equal to than 0.75 hr⁻¹, applying the relationship between ACH, room size and eddy diffusivity 718 719 according to Venkatram and Weil, 2021. Results are normalized by dividing by the emission 720 rate. B) Modeled results vs. measured concentrations using CEAT concentration model in cases when ACH was greater than 0.75 hr⁻¹ and assuming 4 vents per 100 meters² of room area, 721 applying the relationship between ACH, room size and eddy diffusivity according to Foats et 722 723 al., 2021. Results are normalized by dividing by the emission rate. C) Modeled results vs. 724 measured concentrations using CEAT concentration model for all cases.

725

Figure S3. Dimensions and sources for the box model. A) Near Field (NF) and Far Field
(FF) Box Dimensions with Two People. B) The application of the principle of superposition
with Near Field (NF) and Far Field (FF). C) Near Field (NF) Triangular Prisms for the 1st Ring

729 of the Group. NF triangular prisms for the 1st ring of the group that have a height and base of D_{tot} , in a triangular grid with each side length of D_{tot} . The first ring's triangular prisms have 730 a base area of A1 = $\frac{1}{2} D_{tot}^2$. **D**) Near Field (NF) Triangular Prisms for the 2nd Ring of the 731 Group. NF triangular prisms for the 2^{nd} ring of the group that is equally spaced D_{tot} . The second 732 ring's triangular prisms have areas $A2 = \frac{1}{2} 2D_{tot}^2$ and $A2 = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{3} D_{tot}^2$. These average to 733 $A2 = 0.9330 D_{tot}^2$. E) Source perspective with two sources shown. Under an assumption of 734 isotropy assuming no predominate flow and a sufficient averaging period, the sources emit in 735 736 all directions equally. F) The same two triangles that impact the receptor in the source 737 perspective can be turned 180 degrees and are part of the potential set of triangles in each ring. 738 The dimensions and parameters are identical between both views.

739

Table S1. OSHA Risk Classifications. OSHA's classifications offer a means of comparing
exposures to a scenario that can be defined as high risk (US OSHA 2020).

742

743 **Table S2. Baseline Scenario Approach.** Mechanisms affecting the exposure risk.

744

Table S3. NASA Ames Research Center (ARC) CEAT Data. Calculated exposure risk ratios
and CEAT assessment variables for different scenarios varied by location and operation at
NASA ARC. The data in this figure is used in Fig. 4.

748

749 Table S4. Comparison of Three Simple Approaches to Modeling a Continuous Point

Release. In each of the three cases, the equations for concentration are nearly identical.

751

752 Table S5. Triangular Prism Parameters and Equations for Each Ring

753 STAR★Methods

754 **RESOURCE AVAILABILITY**

755 Lead Contacts

Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will
be fulfilled by the Lead Contacts, Afshin Beheshti (<u>afshin.beheshti@nasa.gov</u>) and Brian
Schimmoller (<u>bschimmoller@signaturescience.com</u>).

759

760 Materials Availability

761 This study did not generate new unique reagents.

762

763 Data and Code Availability

The published article includes all datasets generated and analyzed during this study. Any additional information required to reanalyze the data reported in this paper is available from the lead contact upon request.

767

768 METHOD DETAILS

769 Relative Dose Ratio Approach and Exposure Risk Model Derivation

CEAT's relative dose ratio approach is based upon a mechanistic dose-response
framework. The starting point for the inhalation dose model is to use the relationship that
defines group-wide inhalation dose as a linear system where:

773

$$E_{Group \ Dose} = \underline{C} \times \underline{Q}_{Inhalation} \times \Delta t \times Pe_{Total} \quad Eq.S1$$

and $Q_{Inhalation}$ is the average inhalation rate for the group, <u>C</u> is the average concentration of 774 the agent (in this case, aerosols containing SARS-CoV-2), Δt is the duration of group exposure, 775 and Pe_{Total} is the number of people exposed in the group, which we assume is equal to the 776 777 total number of people in the group . The $E_{Group Dose}$ represents the total mass of contaminant 778 that enters the respiratory tracts of all of the group by inhalation over the duration of the 779 potential exposure or event. The fate or dynamics of the virus within the respiratory tract are not considered in the model and would be part of a transmission process. The critical variable 780 781 that must be estimated by the model is the concentration of virus-containing aerosols that 782 occurs as a result of the exhalation (i.e., breathing, speaking, coughing, singing) from people 783 who are in close proximity and build up in a room over time.

784 There are a variety of ways of estimating concentration of contaminants in the air. Several 785 commonly used methods include well-mixed box (WMB) models (Reinke and Keil 2009), 786 computational fluid dynamic (CFD) models (Anthony 2009), and gaussian dispersion models 787 (Stockie 2011). Computational fluid dynamics based models uses numerical solutions of the 788 first principle equations of fluid flow and contaminant transport that are tailored to the specific 789 geometry, scale and temporal lengths, and flow regimes, and are capable of modeling the 790 complexities of particle dynamics, inhalation, exhalation, and interaction with flows in a 791 building (Anthony 2009). Gaussian models use an explicit solution of the contaminant transport 792 equations, and are, therefore, computationally fast compared to CFD models. Gaussian models are typically used at larger scale lengths (100s of meters or more) and are used in outside environments, not typically used in indoor modeling (Zannetti 1990). The WMB model is a simple model that can be used to estimate concentrations of contaminants in the air. It treats a room as if it were a continuous stirred-tank reactor (CSTR) and uses the basic equations for concentration that were developed for modeling continuous reactors in chemical engineering.

The WMB (or zone) approach is widely used, and, for example, is the basis for the National Institutes of Standard and Technology's (NIST's) CONTAM indoor air quality model (Dols and Polidoro 2015). NIST has also applied a single zone WMB approach in its Fate and Transport of Indoor Microbiological Aerosols (FaTIMA), where it assumes rooms are single well-mixed zones (Dols et al. 2020).

803 The basic equation for the single zone WMB is shown below:

$$Vdt = \dot{M}dt - Q_{Vent} C dt \quad Eq. S2$$

805 where V is the volume of the box, Q_{vent} is the ventilation rate (in units of volume per time) 806 through the box, and \dot{M} is the emission rate (in units of mass per time) (**Fig. S1B**).

807 If we assume the emission rate is constant starting at time equals zero, the time varying 808 equation takes the form:

809
$$C(t) = \frac{\dot{M}}{Q_{Vent}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{Q_{Vent}}{V}t}\right) \quad Eq.S3$$

810 Once enough time has passed to achieve equilibrium, the model takes the simple form:

811
$$\underline{C}_{eq} = \frac{M}{Q_{Vent}} Eq.S4$$

812 The basic simplifying assumption of the WMB model is that it assumes that a contaminant 813 is instantaneously completely mixed throughout a volume of air. This instantaneously well-814 mixed assumption is a significant limitation when looking to determine the exposure between 815 people in a room or space if they are in close proximity relative to the size of the room. The 816 single zone well-mixed assumption results in the same exposure no matter how close or far 817 people are located. Accordingly, methods that can assess the potential for higher concentrations 818 (and exposures) that would result between closely clustered people would be useful for 819 quantifying exposure, doses and associated risks.

820

821 Near Field (NF) and Far Field (FF) Box Model

822 In the field of industrial hygiene, it is recognized that the single zone box model may 823 underestimate exposures experienced by receptors (i.e., people) close to a hazard, since it

824 assumes that the concentration is instantaneously well-mixed over the volume of the room 825 (Jaycock et al., 2011). While computational fluid dynamics is one option to resolve the spatial 826 complexity of dispersion and mixing of a contaminant, industrial hygienists have devised a 827 simpler way of estimating the high concentrations near a source using a "box within a box," 828 with an inner box or near field (NF) box containing the contaminant source and a receptor, and 829 a larger, far field (FF), box that represents entire volume (e.g., room). (Fig. S1C) The time 830 dependent concentration at the receptor is estimated by adding the NF and FF concentration 831 contributions (Nicas 2009a; Nicas 2014).

832
$$C(t) = C(t)_{NF} + C(t)_{FF} = \frac{\dot{M}}{Q_{NF}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{Q_{NF}}{V_{NF}}\Delta t}\right) + \frac{\dot{M}}{Q_{FF}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{Q_{FF}}{V_{FF}}\Delta t}\right) Eq.S5$$

833 where, \dot{M} is the continuous mass release rate per minute of the contaminant of concern, Q_{NF} 834 (or as referred to by Nicas as β) is the NF volumetric flow rate (m³ per minute), Q_{FF} is the FF 835 volumetric flow rate (m³ per minute), V_{NF} is the NF volume (m³), V_{FF} is the FF volume (or 836 volume of the room or activity space) (m³), and Δt (minutes) is the elapsed time since the 837 start of the release.

838 If one assumes both boxes to be at equilibrium, the equation takes the simpler form:

839
$$\underline{C}_{eq} = C_{eq,NF} + C_{eq,FF} = \frac{\dot{M}}{Q_{NF}} + \frac{\dot{M}}{Q_{FF}} Eq.S6$$

840 Calculating the ventilation rates, Q_{NF} (or as referred to by Nicas as β) and Q_{FF} using the 841 room volume and appropriate air change rate specific for each volume yields:

842
$$\underline{C}_{eq} = \frac{\dot{M}}{V_{NF} \frac{ACH_{NF}}{60}} + \frac{\dot{M}}{V_{FF} \frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}} Eq.S7$$

843 where ACH_{NF} is the NF air change rate (hr⁻¹), and ACH_{FF} is the FF air change rate (hr⁻¹). For 844 the time dependent form, since the volumes in the exponential term cancel themselves out, the 845 following results:

846
$$C(t) = \frac{\dot{M}}{V_{NF} \frac{ACH_{NF}}{60}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF}}{60}\Delta t}\right) + \frac{\dot{M}}{V_{FF} \frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}\Delta t}\right) Eq.S8$$

847

848 In the application of NF and FF models, it is recommended (Nicas 2009a; Nicas 2016) that 849 the NF flow rate, Q_{NF} (or β), be equal to $\frac{1}{2} \times S \times FSA$ where FSA is the free surface area of 850 the assumed NF control volume and S is a random air speed (instantaneous in random direction) 851 at the interface of the NF and FF zones and $\frac{1}{2}$ is used assuming that half of the air volume is 852 entering the control volume and half of the air is leaving the control volume. Further, Nicas 853 recommends using s=15.1 meters per minute (50 feet per minute) when strong air currents are 854 present and s=3.0 meters per minute (10 feet per minute) when air currents are lacking near the 855 NF zone (Nicas 2014). A median random air speed for indoor office and home spaces was 856 observed by Baldwin and Mayard, 1998 (Baldwin and Maynard 1998) to between 0.05 and 0.1 857 meters per second. Nicas, 2014 (Nicas 2014), referencing Baldwin and Mayard, 1998 (Baldwin 858 and Maynard 1998), recommends that the typical value of 0.06 meters per second (3.6 meters 859 per minute), may be used with the FSA approach in indoor settings. Accordingly, in ACH_{NF} can be calculated using the *FSA* approach as follows: 860

861
$$ACH_{NF} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \times s \times FSA \times 60}{V_{NF}} \quad Eq. S9$$

862 As we will show, the FSA approach when applied using typical values for median random 863 airspeed did not predict concentrations that align well with measured data. Accordingly, we 864 have devised an alternative way of calculating the ACH_{NF} using an effective value for the 865 random air speed we call s_{eff} that varies with distance from the source and is derived from 866 an estimate of the eddy diffusivity. To do this we examined the gaussian/ eddy diffusivity 867 equations and show that the NF/FF equations can equivalent in certain cases to the continuous, 868 gaussian solution of the dispersion equation when there is no advection (i.e., mean wind speed 869 is equal to zero). Through this analysis, we can formulate a NF/FF model that uses eddy 870 diffusivity rather than relying on the Baldwin and Mayard, 1998 reported random air speed to 871 provide the mixing dynamics. To illustrate this, we start with side-by-side derivations for 1) a 872 continuous point release using the gaussian approach, 2) the NN/FF model using a spherical 873 NF volume, and 3) the NN/FF model using a hexagonal prism NF volume, as shown in Table 874 S4. In all three cases, we arrive at equations for concentration that are nearly identical. 875 Assuming the same values were used for K and distance from the source, all three 876 representations would provide nearly the same result – even the hexagonal prism representation 877 since 6 is within five percent of 2π .

878 The challenge in using an eddy diffusivity model is determining the appropriate value 879 for *K* (Nicas 2009b). It is important to note that in the derivation of the gaussian solution, the 880 value for *K* is assumed to be constant over the domain (Stockie 2011). The form of the 881 equation for *K* that we arrive at, $K = x \cdot s$, is similar to the form suggested by 882 Venkatram and Weil, 2021 (Venkatram and Weil 2021), $K = \alpha \cdot u \cdot l$. Venkatram and 883 Weil, 2021 (Venkatram and Weil 2021) describe α as a dimensionless value that would be determined experimentally; u is a representative velocity, and I was a representative length. For now we will assume that $\alpha = 1$, such that in our case $K = D \cdot s$.

Cheng et al. 2011 (Cheng et al. 2011) show a relationship between the air change rate 886 for a room and the eddy diffusivity using experimental measurements of carbon monoxide 887 888 released in two indoor environments. The data from these experiments are presented in their paper and in Acevedo-Bolton et al. 2012 (Acevedo-Bolton et al. 2012). These approaches 889 890 capture the additional turbulent kinetic energy that is added to the system through the higher 891 air changes through ventilation or increased mixing of the air (e.g., through the HVAC 892 system circulating the air) (Cheng et al. 2011; Venkatram and Weil 2021). This approach 893 provides for a constant eddy diffusivity within the room and does not suggest dependency of 894 the eddy diffusivity on the distance from the source. The recommend the eddy diffusivity $(m^2 \text{ sec}^{-1})$ is calculated using the mechanical ACH_{FF} (air change rate in hr⁻¹) and, V, the 895 overall volume of the room (m³), as follows: 896

897
$$K = (0.52 ACH_{FF}/3600 + 8.61 \times 10^{-5}) V^{2/3} Eq.S10$$

898 Venkatram and Weil, 2021(Venkatram and Weil 2021), using the same datasets suggest a899 more simple but similar relationship:

900 $K = V^{2/3} A C H_{FF} / 3600 Eq. S11$

Foat, et al., 2020 (Foat et al. 2020) recommend a similar relationship that was arrived atthrough CFD simulations over a wide of range of indoor parameters:

903 $K = 0.824 V^{2/3} N^{-2/3} ACH_{FF} / 3600 Eq. S12$

where *N* equals to the number of inlet vents for the room. Foat, et al., 2020 (Foat et al. 904 2020) looked at a range of room volumes between 50 m³ and 5000 m³, floor aspect ratios 905 (length/width) between 1-3, height/(floor area)² ratio between 0.1 and 1.5, and air change rate 906 907 between 0.6 and 19.9 hr⁻¹. In most modern buildings, the number of vents would increase with 908 increasing volume or area. Across the range of 235 scenarios that were modeled, the number of vents per 100 m² of area ranged from 3.8 to 8 vents per 100 m² (excluding the four extreme 909 values of approximately 50 vents per 100 m²), and averaged 4.6 vents per 100 m². To limit the 910 number of variables that the user needs to know or determine to use CEAT, we replace N with 911 912 a relationship between the area of the room and a reasonable number of vents per unit area, examining values ranging from 3 to 8 vents per 100 m^2 . 913

914 By combining the two representations of the eddy diffusivity equations and assuming that the product of D and s is a constant, we can calculate an effective velocity s_{eff} (in m min⁻¹) 915 that is consistent with a constant eddy diffusivity at all distances from the source. 916 917 $D \cdot s_{eff} = K$ Eq.S13918 $s_{eff} = \frac{K}{D} = Eq.S14$ 919 920 921 Below are the Venkatram and Weil, 2021(Venkatram and Weil 2021) and Foat, et al., 2020 (Foat et al. 2020) solutions for K expressed as s_{eff} (in m min⁻¹): 922 $s_{eff} = \frac{V^{2/3} A C H_{FF} / 60}{D} Eq. S15$ 923 924 $s_{eff} = \frac{0.824 \ V^{2/3} \ N^{-2/3} \ ACH_{FF} \ /60}{D} Eq. S16$ 925 926 927 Since all three K and ACH relationships are constant with respect to D, the product of D. s_{eff} is a constant, thus any change in s is inversely proportional with the change in D. 928 929 Therefore, as D increases moving away from a source, the value of s_{eff} decreases. Now we come back to the relationship of $K = \alpha \cdot u \cdot l$ or expressed in our variables 930

930 Now we come back to the relationship of $K = \alpha \cdot u \cdot t$ of expressed in our variables 931 $K = \alpha \cdot s_{eff} \cdot D$ and define α , adjustments for the eddy diffusivity, as a means of 932 capturing any dependency of K on distance from the source and adjustment to the dependence 933 on ACH in the form (should measurement data indicate there are dependencies):

934
$$\alpha = \lambda \ x^{\mu} \cdot \varepsilon \ ACH_{FF}^{\gamma} \ Eq. S17$$

935

936 Substituting the equation for K into our original equation and rearranging so that the FSA937 of the hexagon is still calculated, we arrive at:

938
$$\underline{C}_{eq} = = \frac{\dot{M}}{\frac{6}{2}(D^2 + D h_{bz}) \ \alpha \cdot s_{eff}} \quad Eq. S18$$

939 and ACH_{NF} is

940
$$ACH_{NF} = \frac{\frac{6}{2} (D^2 + D h_{bz}) \alpha \cdot s_{eff} \cdot 60}{V_{NF}} Eq. S20$$

941 To calculate an average inhalation dose over a period of time, assuming that the initial 942 concentration is zero (C(0) = 0) from a single source, we estimate the average dose by 943 calculating the concentration at the midpoint of the duration, $\frac{\Delta t}{2}$.

944
$$\underline{C}_{AVE} = \frac{\dot{M}}{V_{NF} \frac{ACH_{NF}}{60}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF}\Delta t}{60}^2} \right) + \frac{\dot{M}}{V_{FF} \frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}^2} \right) Eq.S21$$

As the duration increases, the factors $\left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60-2}}\right)$ and $\left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60-2}}\right)$ will converge on 1. Given that ACH_{NF} is likely greater than ACH_{FF} the factor $\left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF}\Delta t}{60-2}}\right)$ will converge faster than the factor $\left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60-2}}\right)$. Meaning, the near field term will achieve equilibrium faster than the far field term.

949

950 Validation the of the Single Source Equation with Measurement Data

951 We compare predictions calculated using Equation S20 to measurements of chemical and 952 aerosol releases in indoor environments that characterize concentrations at various distances 953 from sources. We included data from carbon monoxide (CO) releases in two homes (Acevedo-Bolton et al. 2012; Cheng et al. 2014)(Acevedo-Bolton, et al., 2012), toluene releases in a test 954 955 chamber (Zhang et al. 2009), benzene releases in an industrial environment (Nicas et al. 2007) 956 and liquid aerosols containing lactose released to simulate an actual COVID-19 transmission 957 incident that occured in a Swiss court room (Vernez et al. 2021). The study of carbon monoxide 958 (CO) releases (Cheng et al. 2011; Acevedo-Bolton et al. 2012; Cheng et al. 2014) occurred in 959 two residential homes where seventeen separate 8-hour tests with continuous emission rates 960 were conducted. Measurement distances from the source ranged from 0.25 meters through to 961 5 meters. The chamber tests conducted by Zhang, et al., 2007 involved simultaneous 962 measurements at four points that were 0.1 meters from a release point. Across the dataset, the 963 distance from the source varied between 0.1 meters and 5 meters, the room volumes varied between 3 m³ and 50,000 m³, and the air changes per hour between 0.17 and 218 hr⁻¹. We also 964 965 examined an example case that was presented by Nicas 2009 (Nicas 2009a), where the 966 conventional NF/FF approach is applied.

Examination of the performance of the three eddy diffusivity models (assuming that no adjustment is necessary and that value of $\alpha = 1$ for the expression in **Eq. S17**) shows that the best model above 0.75 hr⁻¹ is the Foat, et al., 2020 (Foat et al. 2020) equation with an R² = 0.94

(Fig. S2B) when the number of vents per 100 m² is equal to 4. The best model below 0.75 hr⁻¹ 970 is the Venkatram and Weil, 2021 (Venkatram and Weil 2021) model, with an $R^2 = 0.92$ (Fig. 971 972 S2A). Acevedo-Bolton, et al. 2012 (Acevedo-Bolton et al. 2012) show in their analysis that the 973 carbon monoxide sensors (measuring at 15 second time intervals) at 0.25 meters were likely 974 seeing concentrations that were above the upper limits of the instrument's data logger (between 975 128 and 150 ppm), resulting in an underestimate of average reported concentration. Our model 976 systematically overpredicts the concentrations, as compared to the measured data, at 0.25 977 meters and to a lesser degree at 0.5 meters. Consequently, we remove the 0.25 data from the 978 dataset.

979 The major difference between the two models is the inclusion of a factor that captures the 980 number of vents. It is reasonable to assume that spaces with very low air change rates do not 981 have vents (or do not have functional vents), so the inclusion of the number of vents in the 982 equation is not meaningful and in low air change rates the Venkatram and Weil, 983 2021(Venkatram and Weil 2021) equation is sufficient. Also, the lower limit of the air change rate in the Foat, et al., 2020 (Foat et al. 2020) dataset was 0.6 hr⁻¹ and only three of the 235 984 modeled scenarios analyzed had air change rates less than 0.75 hr⁻¹. Given that (1) most 985 commercial and institutional facilities will have air change rates that are greater than 1 hr^{-1} , (2) 986 987 would have an additional air change rate term to account for HVAC recirculation and filtration, and (3) these facilities' HVAC systems will include inlet vents, it is important to use a method 988 989 that addresses the effect of vents on dispersion and is accurate at high air change rates. Also, 990 given that the risks of COVID-19 exposure are highest when the air change rates are low such 991 as when natural ventilation is relied upon, it is important to have a method that works well in 992 those conditions. The Acevedo-Bolton, et al., 2012 (Acevedo-Bolton et al. 2012) dataset and 993 the Venkatram and Weil, 2021 (Venkatram and Weil 2021) estimate for eddy diffusivity cover 994 those low air change rate scenarios.

Based upon these factors and our analysis, in the CEAT model, we use the unadjusted Venkatram and Weil, 2021 (Venkatram and Weil 2021) model to estimate eddy diffusivity at air change rates at or below 0.75 hr^{-1} and the Foat, et al., 2020 model (Foat et al. 2020) to estimate eddy diffusivity above 0.75 hr^{-1} with an assumption of 4 vents per 100 m². The results of this combined model compared to the measured data, are shown in **Fig. S2C**.

1000 Multiple Sources

Equation S21 provides an estimate of the average concentration from one person's emission at a receptor, but not the contribution of how multiple people's emissions would affect the 1003 concentration. To address multiple sources in combination, the additivity property of the 1004 "superposition principle of linear systems" can be applied (Illingworth 1991), which enables 1005 that the effect of each person's emissions at a receptor can be calculated separately and 1006 summed. The superposition principle has been applied to outdoor air pollution dispersion 1007 modeling (Stockie 2011) and provides the theoretical basis for modeling complex scenarios 1008 involving multiple emission sources in outdoor gaussian plume models such as EPA's 1009 AIRMOD (US EPA 2019). The logic is, therefore, if a NF and FF approach can be used to 1010 estimate the higher concentration in the close proximity of one person to another person, then 1011 if *n* people were added to the system, and *n* additional NF boxes were added, the terms would be added to the equation for each person (i.e., emission source), with each being independent 1012 1013 and summing to total concentration, as shown below:

1014
$$C_{AVE} = \sum_{Pe=1}^{N} \left[\left(\frac{\dot{M}}{V_{NF} \frac{ACH_{NF}}{60}} \right) \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF}\Delta t}{60-2}} \right) + \left(\frac{\dot{M}}{V_{FF} \frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}} \right) \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60-2}} \right) \right]_{N}$$
1015
$$Eq.S22$$

1016 The superposition principle also includes a homogeneity property, which allows us to 1017 apply a scalar factor across all emission sources resulting in the concentration at the receptor changing proportionally to the value of the scalar. This property provides the conceptual basis 1018 1019 that allows one to conclude that if the emission rate from each source is increased or decreased 1020 by a factor, that one could assume the concentration would increase or decrease by the same 1021 factor. The scalar could also be the product of several scalars, including a probability factor. 1022 CEAT will use this property defining a scalars, \dot{M} and φ (phi), to adjust both the emission rate 1023 and the probability of the emission rate, assuming that the emission rate and the probability of 1024 emission rate are constant for all sources for a given scenario, resulting in the following 1025 equation:

1026
$$C_{AVE} = \varphi \dot{M} \times \sum_{So = 1}^{N} \left[\left(\frac{1}{V_{NF} \frac{ACH_{NF}}{60}} \right) \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF}\Delta t}{60}} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{V_{FF} \frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}} \right) \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}} \right) \right]_{N}$$

1027 $Eq.S23$

1028 In a two-source system with one receptor, where the distance between the two receptors 1029 and the source equidistant shown in Fig. S3A, the following equation can be written:

1030
$$C_{AVE} = \varphi \dot{M} \times \sum_{So = 1}^{2} \left[\left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF}\Delta t}{60}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF} \frac{ACH_{NF}}{60}} \right) \right]$$

$$+\left(1-e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}}\right)\right] \quad Eq. S24$$

1032 Using a hexagonal prism for the NF volume allows one to place the system of equations on a regular grid of equidistant triangles (Fig S3A). Using a regular grid of equidistant triangles, 1033 1034 as compared to a regular rectangular grid, has advantages since all nodes are equidistant from 1035 their nearest neighbors. This equidistant neighbor feature is particularly useful given the 1036 objective to assess various distancing options. The use of a triangular grid allows one to conveniently draw a hexagonal prism that is made up of six triangular prisms that approximates 1037 1038 a cylinder, with each centered on the six closest nodes to the receptor, (Fig. S3B). The 1039 orientation of the triangular prism within the box makes no difference to the calculations. 1040 Accordingly, we can rotate each of the triangular prisms 180 degrees for visual convenience 1041 (Fig. S3C). We do this because we can define the system identically from two perspectives, 1042 the source view and the receptor view.

1043 The system shown in Fig. S3D can be used to evaluate both the NF and FF concentrations1044 from up to six sources at the receptor in the center, using the equation below.

1045
$$C_{AVE} = \varphi \dot{M} \times \sum_{So = 1}^{6} \left[\left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF} \Delta t}{60}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}} \frac{ACH_{NF-1st}}{60} \right) + \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF} \Delta t}{60}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}} \frac{ACH_{NF-1st}}{60} \right) \right]_{Fa} Eq. S25$$

1046
$$+\left(1-e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}}\right)\right] \quad Eq.S25$$

1047 We can calculate the ACH_{NF} using the equation derived earlier for a hexagon:

1048
$$ACH_{NF-1st\ Ring} = \frac{\frac{6}{2} \left(D^2 + D h_{bz}\right) \alpha \cdot s_{eff} \cdot 60}{V_{NF}} Eq.S26$$

1049 By substituting for the V_{NF} ,

1050
$$ACH_{NF-1st Ring} = \frac{\frac{6}{2} (D^{-2} + D - h_{bz}) \alpha \cdot s_{eff} \cdot 60}{\frac{6}{2} (D^{-2} (h_{bz}))} Eq. S27$$

1051 Which simplifies to:

1052
$$ACH_{NF-1st Ring} = \alpha \times s_{eff} \times (\frac{1}{h_{bz}} + \frac{1}{D}) \times 60 \ Eq.S28$$

In the same way that a six source system was devised, a 12-source system that still keeps each person in the system *D* distance apart, but in this case is located two *D* away from the receptor. In this case, instead of a hexagon, a dodecagonal prism (12-sided prism) is drawn (**Fig. 3F**). In the 12-source system, we take 1/12th of the emissions and use 1/12 of the total dodecagonal prism volume. The ACH_{NF} is calculated using the dimension of the 1/12 triangular wedge which is derived as follows.

1059
$$ACH_{NF-2nd} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \times \alpha \times s_{eff} \times (2 \times 0.933 \ (D)^2 + h_{bz} \times D) \times 60}{0.933 \ (D)^2 \ (h_{bz})} Eq.S29$$

1060 Which simplifies to:

1061
$$ACH_{NF-2nd} = \alpha \times s_{eff} \times \left(\frac{1}{h_{bz}} + \frac{1}{1.866 \times D}\right) \times 60 \quad Eq. S30$$

Successive rings, out to nine rings are included in CEAT, to allow up to a maximum of 270 people. Each ring adds 6 additional people more than the previous ring (i.e, the first ring holds for people, the second ring holds 12 people, the third ring holds 18, etc.) (**Fig S3E**). **Table S5** has the equations for the area of each of the triangular prisms, along with the equation used to calculate the ACH_{NF} for each ring.

Applying the superposition principle, the contribution of each person on the receptor at the
center can be calculated. Going out to 60 sources (four rings) we get:

1070
$$C_{AVE} = \varphi \dot{M} \times \left(\sum_{So=1}^{6} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-1st}\Delta t}{60}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-1st}}{60}}\right) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-1st}}{60}}\right) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-1st}}{10}}\right) +$$

1071
$$e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}}\left(\frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}}\right) +$$

1072
$$\sum_{So=7}^{18} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-2nd\Delta t}}{60}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-2nd}}{60}}\right) + \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}}\right) +$$

1073
$$\sum_{So=19}^{36} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-3rd}\Delta t}{60}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-3rd}}{60}}\right) + \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}}\right) + \frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}} + \frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}}\right) + \frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}} + \frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}$$

1074
$$\sum_{So=37}^{60} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-4th}\Delta t}{60}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-4th}}{60}}\right) + \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}}\right) Eq.S31$$

1075 The formula may be simplified by pulling out the factors common in the two terms and1076 rearranging as follows:

1077
$$C_{AVE} = \varphi \dot{M} So_{Total} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}}\right) + \varphi \dot{M} \left(\sum_{So=1}^{6} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}}\right)\right)$$

1078
$$e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-1st}\Delta t}{60}^2}\left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-1st}}{60}}\right) +$$

1079
$$\sum_{So=7}^{18} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-2nd\Delta t}}{60}^2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-2nd}}{60}}\right) +$$

1080
$$\sum_{So=19}^{36} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-3rd}\Delta t}{60}^2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF} \frac{ACH_{NF-3rd}}{60}}\right) +$$

1081
$$\sum_{So=37}^{60} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-4th}\Delta t}{60}^2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-4th}}{60}}\right) Eq. S32$$

1082 Calculating the effective ACH_{FF} and ACH_{NF} to address sinks and turbulence

For the purposes of calculating the far field concentration term, the ACH_{FF} should include any mechanisms that remove air from the space (e.g., natural ventilation, infiltration mechanical ventilation), mechanisms that remove the contaminant from the space (e.g., filtration and deposition), and mechanisms inactivate contaminants (e.g., reaction, temperature, humidity, radiation).

1088
$$ACH_{FF} = ACH_{Nat.l Vent} + ACH_{Infiltr.} + ACH_{Mech.Vent} + ACH_{HVAC Re.} + ACH_{Inact.}$$

1089 $+ ACH_{Dep} Eq.S33$

1090 The $ACH_{HVAC Re}$ be based upon the flow rate and the portion of the recirculated air from which 1091 any contaminants has been removed ($ACH_{HVAC Re} \times Ef_{Filter}$):

1092
$$ACH_{FF} = ACH_{Nat.l Vent} + ACH_{Infiltr.} + ACH_{Mech.Vent} + ACH_{HVAC Re.} \times Ef_{Filter}$$

$$+ ACH_{Inact} + ACH_{Dep} Eq. S34$$

For the purposes of calculating the eddy diffusivity, the ACH_{FF} should only include mechanisms that result in actual air flow. So the $ACH_{Inact.}$ and ACH_{Dep} have not been included and the unreduced $ACH_{HVAC Recirc}$ should be used, as shown.

1097
$$ACH_{FF_{Eddy Diff}} = ACH_{Nat.l Vent} + ACH_{Infiltr.} + ACH_{Mech.Vent} + ACH_{HVAC Re.} Eq. S35$$

1098 For the final ACH_{NF} , the $ACH_{Inact.}$ and ACH_{Dep} should be added back in, as shown below 1099 for the 1st Ring of sources:

1100
$$ACH_{NF-1st Ring} = \alpha \times s_{eff} \times (\frac{1}{h_{bz}} + \frac{1}{D}) \times 60 + ACH_{Inact.} + ACH_{Dep} Eq.S36$$

1101 Dose Model

1102 As stated earlier, we employ a basic inhalation dose model:

$$\underline{D}_{Quanta} = \underline{C}_{AVE} \times Q_{inhale} \times \Delta t \ Eq. S37$$

1104 Where, \underline{D}_{Quanta} is the quantity of inhaled infectious material, \underline{C}_{AVE} is average air 1105 concentration over the duration (mass/m³), Q_{inhale} the inhalation rate (m³/min), and Δt is the 1106 duration of exposure (min).

1107 Since we are looking at this model from a worker safety perspective, we can also look at 1108 the total inhalation dose of all people in an activity space by multiplying the total number of 1109 people, assuming we are using, ideally, an average concentration and the same duration in the 1110 activity space.

1127

$$\underline{D}_{Quanta} = \underline{C}_{AVE} \times Q_{inhale} \times \Delta t \times Pe_{Total} \quad Eq. S38$$

The concentration contributions are calculated for a person assumed to be at the center of a triangular grid where people are spaced equidistantly (based upon the distancing specified). We assume the concentration at the center is representative for all people in the group since: 1) each person's location is likely not static during the activity and 2) exposure is driven mostly by the close-in sources (i.e., other people) and all people have close-in sources.

1117 If we include mask effectiveness in the model, recognizing that there is an effect on both 1118 the inhalation side $(1 - Ef_{in})$ and on the exhalation side $(1 - Ef_{out})$, the equation takes the 1119 following form:

1120
$$\underline{D}_{Quanta} = (1 - Ef_{out}) \times C_{AVE} \times Q_{inhale} \times (1 - Ef_{in}) \times \Delta t \times Pe_{Total} \quad Eq.S39$$

1121 This equation calculates the total inhalation dose that a worst-case person (located at a 1122 receptor at the center of all rings) would receive if all people were emitting at a rate \dot{M} for the 1123 exposure duration. It assumes that all people are emitters (i.e., infected), when in fact only a 1124 few may be emitters. Based upon the *homogeneity property* of the *principle of superposition*, 1125 φ , in the expanded dose equation can be the likelihood that a person is infected, as shown 1126 below.

$$\underline{D}_{Quanta} = (1 - Ef_{out}) \times Q_{inhale} \times (1 - Ef_{in}) \times \Delta t \times Pe_{Total} \times$$

1128
$$(\varphi \dot{M} P e_{Emitting} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}}\right) + \varphi \dot{M} \left(\sum_{Pe=1}^{6} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}}\right)\right)$$

1129
$$e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-1st}\Delta t}{60}}\left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-1st}}{60}}\right)+$$

1130
$$\sum_{Pe=7}^{18} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-2nd\Delta t}}{60}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-2nd}}{60}}\right) +$$

1131
$$\sum_{Pe=19}^{36} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-3rd}\Delta t}{60}2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-3rd}}{60}}\right) +$$

1132
$$\sum_{Pe=37}^{60} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-4th}\Delta t}{60}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-4th}}{60}}\right) \dots) Eq. S40$$

1133 or written more succinctly,

1134
$$\underline{D}_{Quanta} = (1 - Ef_{out}) \times Q_{inhale} \times (1 - Ef_{in}) \times \Delta t \times Pe_{Total} \times \varphi \dot{M}$$
1135
$$\times \sum_{1}^{Pe_{Total}-1} (FF_{Factor} + NF_{Factor}) Eq.S41$$

1136 where,

1137
$$FF_{Factor} = \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{FF}\Delta t}{60}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{FF}\frac{ACH_{FF}}{60}}\right) Eq.S43$$

1138
$$NF_{Factor} = \sum_{Pe=1}^{6} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-1st}\Delta t}{60}^{2}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-1st}}{60}}\right) +$$

1139
$$\sum_{Pe=7}^{18} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-2nd}\Delta t}{60}^2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-2nd}}{60}}\right) +$$

1140
$$\sum_{Pe=19}^{36} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-3rd}\Delta t}{60}^2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-3rd}}{60}}\right) +$$

1141
$$\sum_{Pe=37}^{60} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{ACH_{NF-4th}\Delta t}{60}^2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{V_{NF}\frac{ACH_{NF-4th}}{60}}\right) \dots Eq.S44$$

Additional terms can be added to Eq. S44 for each hexagonal ring as more people are added. CEATallows up to 250 people.

1144 Impact of Prevalence of Infection in Community

1145 Critical to the exposure assessment is the consideration of the likelihood that any individual 1146 member of the group is infectious at the start of the scenario or modeled event, with the 1147 likelihood of infection represented by the variable φ . In the CEAT model, the range of 1148 likelihood of infectiousness in the group can range from 1.0 (certain infectiousness) on the high 1149 end, to a value on the low end that is 100 times less than what is estimated as the community 1150 average infectiousness. In all of the cases, we assume that at least one person is not infectious, 1151 so the population that could be infectious is the size of the group, Pe, minus 1.

1152 We estimate the community average infectiousness by using the reported 7-day average 1153 per 100,000 of diagnosed cases (*Cases*_{Per 100000}), an estimate of the ratio of the undiagnosed 1154 cases over the diagnosed cases (R_{Undiag}), and the average length of an infectiousness in days, 1155 (D_{Inf}), multiplied by the subgroup factor, which is the adjustment of the subgroup's rate of 1156 infectiousness as compared to the rate of infectiousness of the community.

$$\varphi = \left(1 - (1 - R_{Undiag} \times \frac{Cases_{Per\ 100000}}{100,000})^{D_{Inf}}\right) 100,000 \times \text{Group Factor} \ Eq.S45$$

We assume that within a community, the population can be subdivided into subpopulationsas follows:

- Group Factor = 0.01 The Group is composed of people who, prior to the event are
 estimated as having a likelihood COVID-19 infection that is 100 times lower than the
 community's average due to their adhering to public health guidance on distancing,
 masking, and exposure to crowds/people.
- 1164 2. Group Factor = 0.1 The Group is composed of people who, prior to the event are
 1165 estimated as having a likelihood COVID-19 infection that is 10 times lower than the
 1166 community's average due to their adhering to public health guidance on distancing,
 1167 masking, and exposure to crowds/people.
- 3. Group Factor = 1 The Group is composed of people who, prior to the event are
 estimated as having a likelihood COVID-19 infection that is equal to the community's average.
- 4. Group Factor = 0.1 The Group is composed of people who, prior to the event are
 estimated as having a likelihood COVID-19 infection that is 10 times higher than the
 community's average due to their not adhering to public health guidance on distancing,
 masking, and exposure to crowds/people.
- 1175 5. $\varphi = 1$ The group is composed of people who are known to be infectious.

1176 **Impact of Variants**

1177 We handle the current community prevalence of variants and the relative infectiousness of the prevalent variants by assuming that some variants may be significantly more or less 1178 1179 transmissive than other variants. For the fraction of total cases of more infectious variants, we 1180 can adjust the fractional exposure upward or downward to account for its infectiousness.

1181

Efficacy of Immunity 1182

1183

Immunities, including vaccination and recovered cases, are addressed in two ways:

- 1184 1. It reduces the rate of virus shedding of immunized persons who do become infected, thus reducing the emission rate, \dot{M} , for the fraction of people with immunity; this is 1185 based upon a 3 times reduction in shedding observed by (Levine-Tiefenbrun et al. 1186 1187 2021).
- 1188 2. The immunity is treated as a barrier to infection with an effectiveness that is equal to 1189 its published efficacy based conceptually on the model used by the EPA for dose and exposure definition (US EPA 2019). 1190
- 1191 We are assuming that immunity gained by recovery from COVID is equal to the immunity 1192 gained from vaccination.
- 1193

1194 **Efficacy of Testing**

We address the efficacy and timing of testing regimes, relative to the days an individual is 1195 1196 expected to be infectious. We assume that if an individual is infectious, at the time of the event, the timing of the infection prior to the event is a uniform distribution. For example, if D_{Inf} = 1197 5, and they were tested three days prior to the event, there is a 3/5 chance they were infected 1198 1199 when they were tested and a 2/5 chance they got infected after they were tested (in the two 1200 subsequent days before the event). Assuming a testing false negative rate ($R_{False Nea.}$) of 10%, 1201 the testing adjustment factor, which assumes testing was performed three days before the event, is computed as follows: 1202

- If $D_{Inf} < 3$, there is no adjustment to the likelihood that an individual is infectious 1203 because testing was performed prior to anyone becoming infectious. 1204
- 1205 • If the $D_{Inf} \geq 3$, the testing adjustment is computed as the weighted likelihood of either (a) having been infected at the 1206

time of testing and obtaining a false negative test or (b) becoming infected after 1207 1208 the test:

1209
$$Test_{Adjust} = \frac{(D_{Inf} - 2)}{D_{Inf}} R_{False Neg.} + \frac{2}{D_{Inf}}$$

1210 where $R_{False Neg}$ is currently set to 0.10.

1211 **Relative Dose Ratio Approach: How we establish the baseline**

Rather than directly calculating a dose-response, we use a comparative dose approach. We 1212 1213 compare all scenarios to a baseline scenario discussed in Table S2. The model's results are 1214 aligned with the US OSHA classifications of exposure risks (US OSHA 2020), by 1215 benchmarking the dose calculations to a baseline scenario that is considered high risk by US 1216 OSHA. We define the baseline scenario to represent a person (i.e., medical worker) who is 1217 exposed to a COVID-19 infected person. We apply assumptions to this scenario, addressing 1218 each of the factors in **Table S2**, to arrive at a baseline inhalation dose value. The inhalation 1219 dose for other scenarios is compared to the baseline dose by a simple ratio. Below is the full 1220 ratio equation with the "i th" scenario in the numerator and the baseline (BL) in the 1221 denominator. We can rearrange the terms in each of the *i* scenario ($\underline{E}_{mass i}$) and the baseline 1222 $(E_{mass BL})$:

1223
$$\frac{\underline{D}_{Quanta\,i}}{\underline{D}_{Quanta\,BL}} = \frac{\varphi_i}{\varphi_{BL}} \times \frac{\dot{M}_i}{\dot{M}_{BL}} \times \frac{\sum_{1}^{(Pe_{Total}-1)}}{\sum_{1}^{(Pe_{Total}-1)}} (FF_{Factor} + NF_{Factor})_{i}} \times \frac{(1 - Ef_{out})_i}{(1 - Ef_{out})_{BL}} \times \frac{(1 - Ef_{out})_i}{(1 - Ef_{out})_{BL}}$$

1224

$$\times \frac{(1 - Ef_{in})_i}{(1 - Ef_{in})_{BL}}$$

$$\xrightarrow{Pe_{Exposed}} \Delta t_i \quad Variant_{Adi} \quad Immunity_{Adi} \quad Test_{Adi}$$

1225
$$\times \frac{Q_{inhalation_{i}}}{Q_{inhalation_{BL}}} \times \frac{Pe_{Exposed_{i}}}{Pe_{Exposed_{BL}}} \times \frac{\Delta t_{i}}{\Delta t_{BL}} \times \frac{Variant_{Adj_{i}}}{Variant_{Adj_{BL}}} \times \frac{Immunity_{Adj_{i}}}{Immunity_{AdtBL}} \times \frac{Test_{Adj_{i}}}{Test_{Adj_{BL}}}$$
1226
$$Eq.S46$$

1226

1227 **Emission Rate Approach**

1228 Deterministic dose-response models provide estimations of the intake dose and estimations of the probability of infection for the intake dose. These models require a means of quantifying 1229 1230 the dose and quantifying the pathogen-host interaction via a dose response (i.e., a tolerance 1231 dose - the dose above which someone is certain to be infected or a threshold dose - minimum 1232 dose needed to initiate a chance of infection in any person) (Sze To and Chao 2010). To calculate risks using a dose-response approach, similar to what was done by Parhizkar, et al., 1233 1234 2021, the following is needed: (1) an explicit mass rate or particle count rate emitted from an 1235 infected person, (2) information on particle size emitted and particle size distribution, and (3) the explicit response threshold dose or tolerance dose. Determining these data requires 1236 1237 environmental measurement and epidemiological studies of transmission. While CEAT is also 1238 based upon a deterministic dose-response framework, it does not use explicit values for 1239 emission rate and dose response. Instead it calculates a dose ratio (using Equation S44), based upon comparing a baseline scenario that has been defined as high risk to an evaluated scenario 1240 1241 (i.e., ith scenario). This simplification provides a means to rapidly deploy a comprehensive risk model during an infectious disease outbreak ahead of public health and medical authorities 1242 1243 having detailed data on the explicit viral emission rates and dose responses. The CEAT model 1244 does, however, require that a public health authority (e.g., Occupational Safety and Health 1245 Administration (OSHA), Centers of Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), or other governmental health department) or other expert defines an exposure and dose scenario that is 1246 1247 consistent with high risk exposure. In CEAT, we have used the OSHA classifications of 1248 exposure risks (US OSHA 2020) for this purpose.

1249 While the ratio model does not directly use Wells-Riley approach, it does benefit from the 1250 data that have been empirically-derived from use of the Wells-Riley approach, allowing us to 1251 adjust the CEAT dose ratio results and exposure risk results for various activities and 1252 vocalization intensities. We use the back-calculated quanta per hour from Buonanno, et al., 1253 2020a and Buonanno, et al., 2020b to inform the ratio of emission rates, $\frac{\dot{M}_i}{\dot{M}_{BL}}$. We make the 1254 assumption that these empirically-derived ratios would be correlated with explicit mass or 1255 particle count ratios that would be appropriate for deterministic dose-response models.

It is instructive to note that the CEAT approach does not require a means of varying the 1256 1257 emission rate ratios. If Wells-Riley-derived emissions for various activities and vocalization 1258 intensities were not available, the assumption could be made that emission rate was constant (i.e., $\frac{\dot{M}_i}{\dot{M}_{RI}} = 1$). All of the other ratio factors in Eq 46 could still be used to evaluate the ith dose 1259 scenario versus the baseline scenario. The majority cases that the CEAT was employed 1260 assumed that the Step 5 vocalization intensity was "standing and speaking" which uses in $\frac{\dot{M}_i}{\dot{M}_{Pl}}$ = 1261 1 in the model's calculations. The fact that Wells-Riley-derived data are not essential to use 1262 1263 CEAT is a benefit of the CEAT approach.

1264

1265 QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

1266 Gathering Scenario

To determine the gathering scenario, we considered three different counties for the date of 1267 1268 1/31/2022 that were in different regions of the US with very low COVID-19 cases (Montgomery County, MD), very high COVID-19 cases (Knox County, TN), and a county 1269 1270 with cases in between the two (Suffolk County, MA). In this analysis, we estimated that a 1271 typical gathering will last 5 hours and can be held both indoors or outdoors. The indoor scenario 1272 is considered to take place in a room (i.e. 30ft x 30ft x 9ft or 9.14m x 9.14m x 2.74m). We 1273 utilized the COVID ActNow tracker (U.S. COVID Risk & Vaccine Tracker) to determine the 1274 latest number of cases and vaccination rates on 1/31/2022. In addition, we utilized CDC's Nationwide Commercial Laboratory Seroprevalence Survey (U.S. COVID Risk & Vaccine 1275 1276 Tracker) to determine the current population recovered from COVID-19, and CDC's Variant Proportions Tracker (U.S. COVID Risk & Vaccine Tracker) to determine the estimated 1277 1278 percentage of existing SARS-CoV-2 variants that exist in the infected population in each 1279 region. At the time of analysis for all counties the Omicron variant accounts for >99% of 1280 COVID-19 cases (U.S. COVID Risk & Vaccine Tracker). It is estimated that the Omicron 1281 variant is 440% more transmissible than the original SARS-CoV-2 reference strain (Araf et al. 1282 2022). We analyzed for the following different parameters to account for multiple different scenarios that gatherings can take place: distancing ranging from 1.5ft to 10ft, masks usage 1283 1284 (i.e. no masks, average masks, and N95/KN95 masks), and if the group of people are either 1285 "following all public health guidance" or "equal to the community average". In addition, we 1286 also considered testing to be included with one of the scenarios. All data was recorded in 1287 Microsoft Excel 2019 and all data analyses were completed using R version 4.0.3, RStudio 1288 version 1.4.1717, and ggplot2 v3.3.5 (Wickham 2016).

1289

1290 NASA Ames Research Center CEAT Tool Usage

In initial assessments, utilizing CEAT V B.6 that was released on November 25, 2020 Step ("The group is composed of people who...") was generally selected as "You think are following all public health guidance". Step 2 ("Number of People Sharing Activity Space") was set to the requested number of personnel required to conduct the operation in-person. In general this was 2 to 4 people per location per operation. Selected distance (Step 3) was set to 6 feet ("-6 distancing adjustment") unless specified otherwise. For Mask Efficacy (Step 4) "cloth masks" worn by all personnel were selected as cloth was the most likely utilized (-5 and 1298 -3, respectively). Very few projects were using surgical masks and masks were required to be worn by everyone on campus at this time. Vocalization (Step 5) and breathing (Step 6) 1299 1300 adjustment rates, as well as Duration of Activity (Step 7) were based on the operations reported 1301 in the RTOW plan submission. Typical operations are conducted while "standing", "speaking", 1302 and "passive" (0 and 0) for 8 hours. Ventilation rates (Step 8) and Adjustment for room sizes 1303 (Step 9) were based on location of the operation reported in the RTOW plan submission. Step 1304 10 ("Calculate Adjustment to Local Community's Current Conditions") was based on the State 1305 of California (US State of California 2022a). The California case rate was chosen instead of 1306 the local county case rate as the majority of the NASA ARC workforce resides in the general Bay Area which encompasses nine counties, some of which have weekly case rates more 1307 similar to California than to the local county. After inputting these desired values for the 1308 variables in Steps 1-10, the relative exposure ratio for a given condition was recorded and 1309 1310 analyzed in Microsoft Excel 365.

1311 CEAT V B.14 was released on December 13, 2020 the inputs were similar to that of V B.6,1312 the difference being that for Step 9 actual room dimensions could be entered.

1313 CEAT V B.29 was released on May 6, 2021 Step 1 ("The group is composed of people 1314 who...") was selected as "Are following all public health guidance". However, since the 1315 percent vaccination rate was unknown, it was not checked. Step 2 ("Number of People Sharing Activity Space") was set to the requested number of personnel required to conduct the operation 1316 1317 in-person. In general this was 2 to 4 people per location per operation. Selected distance (Step 3) was set to 6 feet unless specified otherwise. For "Mask Type and Prevalence" (Step 4) "cloth 1318 1319 masks" worn by all personnel were selected as cloth was the most likely utilized. Very few projects were using surgical masks and masks were required to be worn by everyone on campus 1320 1321 for all but a 6 week window where masks were optional for vaccinated personnel. Vocalization (Step 5) and breathing (Step 6) adjustment rates, as well as Duration of Activity (Step 7) were 1322 1323 based on the operations reported in the RTOW plan submission. Typical operations are conducted while "standing", "speaking", and "passive" for 8 hours. Ventilation rates (Step 8) 1324 1325 and Adjustment for room sizes (Step 9) were based on location of the operation reported in the 1326 RTOW plan submission. Step 10 ("Calculate Adjustment to Local Community's Current 1327 Conditions") was based on the State of California (US State of California 2022a), (US State of California 2022b) and variant information was input from CDC data (CDC 2020c). When 1328 variant prevalence was introduced into the CEAT in later iterations, the three most prevalent 1329 variants in Health and Human Services (HHS) Region 9 were used (CDC 2020c). Specifically, 1330 1331 the variant prevalence data from Nowcast was utilized. Instead of utilizing the predetermined

1332 variants provided in the CEAT, NASA ARC input data from the three most prevalent variants in the HHS Region 9. The "Protection Effectiveness of Immunity (%)" in Step 10 was set to 1333 1334 66% based on published research regarding the Pfizer-BioNTech, Moderna, and Janssen 1335 vaccine against the Delta variant (Fowlkes 2021). After inputting these desired values for the 1336 variables in Steps 1-10, the relative exposure ratio for a given condition was recorded and 1337 analyzed in Microsoft Excel 365. Although CEAT V B.32 was released on August 29, 2021 it 1338 was not used in this analysis. To generate a graphical representation of the data (Fig. 4) we 1339 associated numerical values to the different parameters in the table and utilized R version 4.03, 1340 RStudio version 1.4.1717 with the following R packages: ggplot2 v3.3.5 (Wickham 2016).

For the longitudinal review of the NASA ARC "Centerwide Accepted Median Exposure 1341 Risk Ratio" in relation to the community case rates CEAT V B.6, V B.14, and V B.29 were 1342 utilized, this was dependent on the newest version available. Initial inputs at the time of the 1343 RTOW plan were utilized and Step 10 ("Calculate Adjustment to Local Community's Current 1344 1345 Conditions") rates were updated on a biweekly basis based on the State of California (US State 1346 of California 2022a). The median of all project exposure risk ratios was used instead of the 1347 average to account for the high fluctuations in exposure risk ratios. Hypothetical exposure risk 1348 ratios were back-calculated to March 2020. Only projects that had been approved to RTOW, 1349 along with projects that were deemed mission essential and were exempt from the work from 1350 home policy (e.g. Security Guards, Security Operations Center) were included in the calculated 1351 biweekly median risk ratio. The relative exposure ratio for a given condition was recorded, the 1352 median exposure ratio was calculated biweekly, and the correlation coefficient compared to the 1353 community case rates was calculated in Microsoft Excel 365. The median of all project 1354 exposure risk ratios was used instead of the average to account for the high fluctuations. 1355 Although the CEAT was not used at NASA ARC until December 2020, hypothetical exposure risk ratios were back-calculated to March 2020, when NASA ARC enacted their mandatory 1356 1357 work from home policy, for each project using the known historic California case rates. Only projects that had been approved to RTOW, along with projects that were deemed mission 1358 1359 essential and were exempt from the work from home policy (e.g. Security Guards, Security 1360 Operations Center) were included in the calculated biweekly median exposure risk ratio. A plot 1361 was generated for this data (Fig. 5) using R version 4.0.3, RStudio version 1.4.1717 with the following R packages: ggplot2 v3.3.5 (Wickham 2016). 1362

- 1363
- 1364
- 1365

1366 References

1367 Acevedo-Bolton V, Cheng K-C, Jiang R-T, Ott WR, Klepeis NE, Hildemann LM. 2012. 1368 Measurement of the proximity effect for indoor air pollutant sources in two homes. J. 1369 Environ. Monit. 14:94-104. 1370 Adenaiye OO, Lai J, Mesquita PJB de, Hong F, Youssefi S, German J, Tai S-HS, Albert B, 1371 Schanz M, Weston S, et al. Infectious SARS-CoV-2 in Exhaled Aerosols and Efficacy 1372 of Masks During Early Mild Infection. Clin. Infect. Dis. Off. Publ. Infect. Dis. Soc. 1373 Am. [Internet]. Available from: 1374 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC8522431/ Anthony TR. 2009. Computational Fluid Dynamics Modeling. In: Mathematical Models for 1375 1376 Estimating Occupational Exposure to Chemicals. 2nd ed. Fairfax, Virginia: American 1377 Industrial Hygiene Association. p. 137–150. 1378 Araf Y, Akter F, Tang Y-D, Fatemi R, Parvez MSA, Zheng C, Hossain MG. 2022. Omicron 1379 variant of SARS-CoV-2: Genomics, transmissibility, and responses to current 1380 COVID-19 vaccines. J. Med. Virol. Atrubin D. 2020. An Outbreak of COVID-19 Associated with a Recreational Hockey Game 1381 1382 - Florida, June 2020. MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep. [Internet] 69. Available 1383 from: https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6941a4.htm 1384 Bahl R, Eikmeier N, Fraser A, Junge M, Keesing F, Nakahata K, Reeves L. 2021. Modeling COVID-19 spread in small colleges. PloS One 16:e0255654. 1385 1386 Baldwin PEJ, Maynard AD. 1998. A survey of wind speeds in indoor workplaces. Ann. Work 1387 *Expo. Health* 42:303–313. Bargain O, Aminjonov U. 2020. Trust and compliance to public health policies in times of 1388 COVID-19. J. Public Econ. 192:104316. 1389 1390 Bazant MZ, Bush JWM. 2021. A guideline to limit indoor airborne transmission of COVID-1391 19. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. [Internet] 118. Available from: 1392 https://www.pnas.org/content/118/17/e2018995118 Biryukov J, Boydston JA, Dunning RA, Yeager JJ, Wood S, Reese AL, Ferris A, Miller D, 1393 1394 Weaver W, Zeitouni NE, et al. 2020. Increasing Temperature and Relative Humidity Accelerates Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 on Surfaces. mSphere [Internet] 5. 1395 1396 Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC7333574/ Brlek A, Vidovič Š, Vuzem S, Turk K, Simonović Z. 2020. Possible indirect transmission of 1397 1398 COVID-19 at a squash court, Slovenia, March 2020: case report. Epidemiol. Infect.

1399	148·e120						
1400	Brooks IT Butler IC 2021 Effectiveness of Mask Wearing to Control Community Spread						
1401	SARS-CoV-2. JAMA 325:998–999						
1402	Brooks-Pollock E, Christensen H, Trickey A, Hemani G, Nixon E, Thomas AC, Turner K,						
1403	Finn A, Hickman M, Relton C, et al. 2021. High COVID-19 transmission potential						
1404	associated with re-opening universities can be mitigated with lavered interventions.						
1405	<i>Nat. Commun.</i> [Internet] 12. Available from:						
1406	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC8371131/						
1407	CDC. 2003. Guidelines for Environmental Infection Control in Health-Care Facilities.						
1408	Available from:						
1409	https://www.cdc.gov/infectioncontrol/guidelines/environmental/appendix/air.html						
1410	CDC. 2020a. COVID Data Tracker: COVID-19 Integrated County View. <i>Cent. Dis. Control</i>						
1411	Prev. [Internet]. Available from: https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#county-						
1412	view?list_select_state=all_states&list_select_county=all_counties&data-						
1413	type=Cases&metric-cases=cases_per_100K_7_day_count_change						
1414	CDC. 2020b. Scientific Brief: SARS-CoV-2 Transmission. Cent. Dis. Control Prev.						
1415	[Internet]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-						
1416	ncov/science/science-briefs/sars-cov-2-transmission.html						
1417	CDC. 2020c. COVID Data Tracker: Variant Proportions. Cent. Dis. Control Prev. [Internet].						
1418	Available from: https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#variant-proportions						
1419	CDC. 2022. COVID Data Tracker. Cent. Dis. Control Prev. [Internet]. Available from:						
1420	https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker						
1421	CDC, 2021 August 24. Community, Work, and School. Cent. Dis. Control Prev. [Internet].						
1422	Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/index.html						
1423	CDC, 2021 July 2. Public Health Guidance for Potential COVID-19 Exposure Associated						
1424	with Travel. Cent. Dis. Control Prev. [Internet]. Available from:						
1425	https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/risk-assessment.html						
1426	CDC, 2021 March 1. 2022. Quarantine & Isolation. Cent. Dis. Control Prev. [Internet].						
1427	Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/your-health/quarantine-						
1428	isolation.html						
1429	CDC, 2021 September 10. Interim Guidance for Managing Healthcare Personnel with SARS-						
1430	CoV-2 Infection or Exposure to SARS-CoV-2. Cent. Dis. Control Prev. [Internet].						
1431	Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/guidance-risk-						
1432	assesment-hcp.html						

1433	Chande A, Gussler W, Harris M, Lee S, Rishishwar L, Hilley T, Jordan IK, Andris CM,					
1434	Weitz JS. 2020. COVID-19 Event Risk Assessment Planning Tool. Available from:					
1435	https://covid19risk.biosci.gatech.edu/					
1436	Chande A, Lee S, Harris M, Nguyen Q, Beckett SJ, Hilley T, Andris C, Weitz JS. 2020. Real-					
1437	time, interactive website for US-county-level COVID-19 event risk assessment. Nat.					
1438	Hum. Behav. 4:1313–1319.					
1439	Chen PZ, Bobrovitz N, Premji Z, Koopmans M, Fisman DN, Gu FX. 2021. Heterogeneity in					
1440	transmissibility and shedding SARS-CoV-2 via droplets and aerosols. <i>eLife</i>					
1441	10:e65774.					
1442	Cheng K-C, Acevedo-Bolton V, Jiang R-T, Klepeis NE, Ott WR, Fringer OB, Hildemann					
1443	LM. 2011. Modeling Exposure Close to Air Pollution Sources in Naturally Ventilated					
1444	Residences: Association of Turbulent Diffusion Coefficient with Air Change Rate.					
1445	Environ. Sci. Technol. 45:4016–4022.					
1446	Cheng K-C, Acevedo-Bolton V, Jiang R-T, Klepeis NE, Ott WR, Kitanidis PK, Hildemann					
1447	LM. 2014. Stochastic modeling of short-term exposure close to an air pollution source					
1448	in a naturally ventilated room: An autocorrelated random walk method. J. Expo. Sci.					
1449	Environ. Epidemiol. 24:311–318.					
1450	CIRES. 2020. COVID-19 Airborne Transmission Tool Available. CIRES [Internet].					
1451	Available from: https://cires.colorado.edu/news/covid-19-airborne-transmission-tool-					
1452	available					
1453	Coleman KK, Tay DJW, Tan KS, Ong SWX, Son TT, Koh MH, Chin YQ, Nasir H, Mak					
1454	TM, Chu JJH, et al. Viral Load of SARS-CoV-2 in Respiratory Aerosols Emitted by					
1455	COVID-19 Patients while Breathing, Talking, and Singing. Clin. Infect. Dis. Off.					
1456	Publ. Infect. Dis. Soc. Am. [Internet]. Available from:					
1457	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC8436389/					
1458	Deckert A, Anders S, Allegri M de, Nguyen HT, Souares A, McMahon S, Boerner K, Meurer					
1459	M, Herbst K, Sand M, et al. 2021. Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of four					
1460	different strategies for SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in the general population (CoV-					
1461	Surv Study): a structured summary of a study protocol for a cluster-randomised, two-					
1462	factorial controlled trial. Trials [Internet] 22. Available from:					
1463	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC7791150/					
1464	Din RU, Shah K, Ahmad I, Abdeljawad T. 2020. Study of transmission dynamics of novel					
1465	COVID-19 by using mathematical model. Adv. Differ. Equ. [Internet] 2020. Available					
1466	from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC7327217/					

1467	Dols W, Polidoro B. 2015. CONTAM User Guide and Program Documentation Version 3.2.						
1468	Dols WS, Polidoro BJ, Poppendieck D, Emmerich SJ. 2020. A tool to model the Fate and						
1469	Transport of Indoor Microbiological Aerosols (FaTIMA). Gaithersburg, MD:						
1470	National Institute of Standards and Technology Available from:						
1471	https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/TechnicalNotes/NIST.TN.2095.pdf						
1472	Doyle K, Teran RA, Reefhuis J, Kerins JL, Qiu X, Green SJ, Choi H, Madni SA, Kamal N,						
1473	Landon E, et al. 2021. Multiple Variants of SARS-CoV-2 in a University Outbreak						
1474	After Spring Break — Chicago, Illinois, March-May 2021. Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.						
1475	70:1195.						
1476	Fabregat A, Gisbert F, Vernet A, Dutta S, Mittal K, Pallarès J. 2021. Direct numerical						
1477	simulation of the turbulent flow generated during a violent expiratory event. Phys.						
1478	Fluids [Internet] 33. Available from:						
1479	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC7976052/						
1480	Fabregat A, Gisbert F, Vernet A, Ferré JA, Mittal K, Dutta S, Pallarès J. 2021. Direct						
1481	numerical simulation of turbulent dispersion of evaporative aerosol clouds produced						
1482	by an intense expiratory event. Phys. Fluids 33:033329.						
1483	Feyman Y, Bor J, Raifman J, Griffith KN. 2020. Effectiveness of COVID-19 shelter-in-place						
1484	orders varied by state. PLoS ONE [Internet] 15. Available from:						
1485	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC7775080/						
1486	Foat T, Drodge J, Nally J, Parker S. 2020. A relationship for the diffusion coefficient in eddy						
1487	diffusion based indoor dispersion modelling. Build. Environ. 169:106591.						
1488	Fowlkes A. 2021. Effectiveness of COVID-19 Vaccines in Preventing SARS-CoV-2						
1489	Infection Among Frontline Workers Before and During B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant						
1490	Predominance — Eight U.S. Locations, December 2020-August 2021. MMWR Morb.						
1491	Mortal. Wkly. Rep. [Internet] 70. Available from:						
1492	https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7034e4.htm						
1493	Hamner L. 2020. High SARS-CoV-2 Attack Rate Following Exposure at a Choir Practice —						
1494	Skagit County, Washington, March 2020. MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.						
1495	[Internet] 69. Available from:						
1496	https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6919e6.htm						
1497	Harvard IQSS. 2020. CovidU. Available from: https://harvard-covid-model.herokuapp.com/						
1498	Hernández-Hernández AM, Huerta-Quintanilla R. 2021. Managing school interaction						
1499	networks during the COVID-19 pandemic: Agent-based modeling for evaluating						
1500	possible scenarios when students go back to classrooms. PLoS ONE [Internet] 16.						

1501	Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC8372954/						
1502	Heydari ST, Zarei L, Sadati AK, Moradi N, Akbari M, Mehralian G, Lankarani KB. 2021.						
1503	The effect of risk communication on preventive and protective Behaviours during the						
1504	COVID-19 outbreak: mediating role of risk perception. BMC Public Health [Internet]						
1505	21. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC7787415/						
1506	Hijnen D, Marzano AV, Eyerich K, GeurtsvanKessel C, Giménez-Arnau AM, Joly P,						
1507	Vestergaard C, Sticherling M, Schmidt E. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission from						
1508	Presymptomatic Meeting Attendee, Germany. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 26:1935–1937.						
1509	Howard J, Huang A, Li Z, Tufekci Z, Zdimal V, Westhuizen H-M van der, Delft A von, Price						
1510	A, Fridman L, Tang L-H, et al. 2021. An evidence review of face masks against						
1511	COVID-19. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. [Internet] 118. Available from:						
1512	https://www.pnas.org/content/118/4/e2014564118						
1513	Illingworth V. 1991. The Penguin dictionary of physics. London: Penguin Books						
1514	Jang S, Han SH, Rhee J-Y. 2020. Cluster of Coronavirus Disease Associated with Fitness						
1515	Dance Classes, South Korea. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 26:1917.						
1516	Jayaweera M, Perera H, Gunawardana B, Manatunge J. 2020. Transmission of COVID-19						
1517	virus by droplets and aerosols: A critical review on the unresolved dichotomy.						
1518	Environ. Res. 188:109819.						
1519	Keskinocak P, Oruc BE, Baxter A, Asplund J, Serban N. 2020. The impact of social						
1520	distancing on COVID19 spread: State of Georgia case study. PLoS ONE [Internet] 15.						
1521	Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC7549801/						
1522	Khan K, Bush JWM, Bazant MZ. 2021. COVID-19 Indoor Safety Guideline. Available from:						
1523	https://indoor-covid-safety.herokuapp.com/						
1524	Khanh NC, Thai PQ, Quach H-L, Thi N-AH, Dinh PC, Duong TN, Mai LTQ, Nghia ND, Tu						
1525	TA, Quang LN, et al. 2020. Transmission of SARS-CoV 2 During Long-Haul Flight.						
1526	Emerg. Infect. Dis. 26:2617.						
1527	Khoury DS, Cromer D, Reynaldi A, Schlub TE, Wheatley AK, Juno JA, Subbarao K, Kent						
1528	SJ, Triccas JA, Davenport MP. 2021. Neutralizing antibody levels are highly						
1529	predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nat. Med.						
1530	27:1205–1211.						
1531	Kwon KS, Park JI, Park YJ, Jung DM, Ryu KW, Lee JH. 2020. Evidence of Long-Distance						
1532	Droplet Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by Direct Air Flow in a Restaurant in Korea.						
1533	J. Korean Med. Sci. 35:e415.						
1534	Levine-Tiefenbrun M, Yelin I, Katz R, Herzel E, Golan Z, Schreiber L, Wolf T, Nadler V,						

1535	Ben-Tov A, Kuint J, et al. 2021. Initial report of decreased SARS-CoV-2 viral load						
1536	after inoculation with the BNT162b2 vaccine. Nat. Med. [Internet]. Available from:						
1537	http://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-021-01316-7						
1538	Li R, Pei S, Chen B, Song Y, Zhang T, Yang W, Shaman J. 2020. Substantial undocumented						
1539	infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2).						
1540	Science 368:489–493.						
1541	Li X, Lester D, Rosengarten G, Aboltins C, Patel M, Cole I. 2022. A spatiotemporally						
1542	resolved infection risk model for airborne transmission of COVID-19 variants in						
1543	indoor spaces. Sci. Total Environ. 812:152592.						
1544	Li Y, Leung GM, Tang JW, Yang X, Chao CYH, Lin JZ, Lu JW, Nielsen PV, Niu J, Qian H,						
1545	et al. 2007. Role of ventilation in airborne transmission of infectious agents in the						
1546	built environment - a multidisciplinary systematic review. Indoor Air 17:2–18.						
1547	Marot S, Malet I, Leducq V, Zafilaza K, Sterlin D, Planas D, Gothland A, Jary A, Dorgham						
1548	K, Bruel T, et al. 2021. Rapid decline of neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2						
1549	among infected healthcare workers. Nat. Commun. [Internet] 12. Available from:						
1550	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC7870823/						
1551	Miller GF, Greening B, Rice KL, Arifkhanova A, Meltzer MI, Coronado F. 2022. Modeling						
1552	the Transmission of COVID-19: Impact of Mitigation Strategies in Prekindergarten-						
1553	Grade 12 Public Schools, United States, 2021. J. Public Health Manag. Pract.						
1554	<i>JPHMP</i> 28:25–35.						
1555	Miller SL, Nazaroff WW, Jimenez JL, Boerstra A, Buonanno G, Dancer SJ, Kurnitski J, Marr						
1556	LC, Morawska L, Noakes C. 2021. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by inhalation of						
1557	respiratory aerosol in the Skagit Valley Chorale superspreading event. Indoor Air						
1558	31:314–323.						
1559	Mutambudzi M, Niedwiedz C, Macdonald EB, Leyland A, Mair F, Anderson J, Celis-						
1560	Morales C, Cleland J, Forbes J, Gill J, et al. 2020. Occupation and risk of severe						
1561	COVID-19: prospective cohort study of 120 075 UK Biobank participants. Occup.						
1562	Environ. Med.: oemed-2020-106731.						
1563	Ng OT, Marimuthu K, Koh V, Pang J, Linn KZ, Sun J, Wang LD, Chia WN, Tiu C, Chan M,						
1564	et al. 2021. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and transmission risk factors among high-						
1565	risk close contacts: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet Infect. Dis. 21:333-343.						
1566	Nicas M. 2009a. The Near Field/Far Field (Two Box) Model with a Constant Contaminant						
1567	Emission Rate. In: Mathematical Models for Estimating Occupational Exposure to						
1568	Chemicals. 2nd ed. Fairfax, Virginia: American Industrial Hygiene Association. p.						

1569	47–52.					
1570	Nicas M. 2009b. Turbulent Eddy Diffusion Models. In: Mathematical Models for Estimating					
1571	Occupational Exposure to Chemicals. 2nd ed. Fairfax, Virginia: American Industrial					
1572	Hygiene Association. p. 53-65.					
1573	Nicas M. 2014. Estimating Exposure for On-Site Worker Health Risk Estimates. Available					
1574	from: https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/compliance/vocs/exempts/toxic-					
1575	symp					
1576	Nicas M. 2016. The near field/far field model with constant application of chemical mass and					
1577 1578	exponentially decreasing emission of the mass applied. J. Occup. Environ. Hyg. 13:519–528.					
1579	Nicas M, Plisko MJ, Spencer JW. 2007. Estimating Benzene Exposure at a Solvent Parts					
1580	Washer. J. Occup. Environ. Hyg. [Internet]. Available from:					
1581	https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15459620600637390					
1582	NIPH. 2021. Preliminary findings from study after Christmas party in Oslo. Nor. Inst. Public					
1583	Health [Internet]. Available from: https://www.fhi.no/en/news/2021/preliminary-					
1584	findings-from-outbreak-investigation-after-christmas-party-in-o/					
1585	Parhizkar H, Van Den Wymelenberg KG, Haas CN, Corsi RL. 2021. A Quantitative Risk					
1586	Estimation Platform for Indoor Aerosol Transmission of COVID-19. Risk Anal. Off.					
1587	Publ. Soc. Risk Anal.					
1588	Park SY, Kim Y-M, Yi S, Lee S, Na B-J, Kim CB, Kim J-I, Kim HS, Kim YB, Park Y, et al.					
1589	2020. Coronavirus Disease Outbreak in Call Center, South Korea. Emerg. Infect. Dis.					
1590	26:1666–1670.					
1591	Phillips B, Browne DT, Anand M, Bauch CT. 2021. Model-based projections for COVID-19					
1592	outbreak size and student-days lost to closure in Ontario childcare centres and primary					
1593	schools. Sci. Rep. [Internet] 11. Available from:					
1594	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC7973423/					
1595	Qian H, Miao T, Liu L, Zheng X, Luo D, Li Y. 2021. Indoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2.					
1596	Indoor Air 31:639–645.					
1597	Ratnesar-Shumate S, Williams G, Green B, Krause M, Holland B, Wood S, Bohannon J,					
1598	Boydston J, Freeburger D, Hooper I, et al. 2020. Simulated Sunlight Rapidly					
1599	Inactivates SARS-CoV-2 on Surfaces. J. Infect. Dis. 222:214.					
1600	Reinke PH, Keil CB. 2009. Well-Mixed Box Model. In: Mathematical Models for Estimating					
1601	Occupational Exposure to Chemicals. 2md ed. Fairfax, Virginia: American Industrial					
1602	Hygiene Association. p. 23–31.					

- 1603 Riley EC, Murphy G, Riley RL. 1978. Airborne spread of measles in a suburban elementary
 1604 school. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 107:421–432.
- 1605 Rudnick SN, Milton DK. 2003. Risk of indoor airborne infection transmission estimated from
 1606 carbon dioxide concentration. *Indoor Air* 13:237–245.
- Safe Air Spaces. 2022. Safe Air Spaces Estimator. *Safeairspaces* [Internet]. Available from:
 https://safeairspaces.com/safeairspaces-estimator
- Shen Y, Li C, Dong H, Wang Z, Martinez L, Sun Z, Handel A, Chen Z, Chen E, Ebell MH, et
 al. 2020. Community Outbreak Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission Among
 Bus Riders in Eastern China. *JAMA Intern. Med.* 180:1665–1671.
- 1612 Stockie JM. 2011. The Mathematics of Atmospheric Dispersion Modeling. *SIAM Rev.*1613 53:349–372.
- Sun Z, Di L, Sprigg W, Tong D, Casal M. 2020. Community venue exposure risk estimator
 for the COVID-19 pandemic. *Health Place* 66:102450.
- Sze To GN, Chao CYH. 2010. Review and comparison between the Wells–Riley and doseresponse approaches to risk assessment of infectious respiratory diseases. *Indoor Air*20:2–16.
- 1619 Teran RA, Ghinai I, Gretsch S, Cable T, Black SR, Green SJ, Perez O, Chlipala GE,
- 1620 Maienschein-Cline M, Kunstman KJ, et al. 2020. COVID-19 Outbreak Among a
- 1621 University's Men's and Women's Soccer Teams Chicago, Illinois, July-August
 1622 2020. MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep. 69:1591–1594.
- 1623 The White House. 2021. Executive Order on Requiring Coronavirus Disease 2019
- 1624 Vaccination for Federal Employees. *White House* [Internet]. Available from:
- 1625 https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-
- 1626 actions/2021/09/09/executive-order-on-requiring-coronavirus-disease-2019-
- 1627 vaccination-for-federal-employees/
- 1628 U.S. COVID Risk & Vaccine Tracker. U.S. COVID Risk & Vaccine Tracker. *Covid Act Now*1629 [Internet]. Available from: https://covidactnow.org
- 1630 US DHS. 2022. Estimated Airborne Decay of SARS-CoV-2 | Homeland Security. Available
- 1631 from: https://www.dhs.gov/science-and-technology/sars-airborne-calculator
- 1632 US EPA O. 2019. Guidelines for Human Exposure Assessment. Available from:
- 1633 https://www.epa.gov/risk/guidelines-human-exposure-assessment
- 1634 US OSHA. 2020. Guidance on Preparing Workplaces for COVID-19. Available from:
- 1635 https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/osha3990.pdf
- 1636 US State of California. 2022a. Tracking COVID-19 in California. Available from:

1637	https://covid19.ca.gov/state-dashboard/						
1638	US State of California. 2022b. Tracking COVID-19 in California: Vaccination data.						
1639	Available from: https://covid19.ca.gov/vaccination-progress-data/						
1640	Venkatram A, Weil J. 2021. Modeling turbulent transport of aerosols inside rooms using						
1641	eddy diffusivity. Indoor Air [Internet] n/a. Available from:						
1642	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ina.12901						
1643	Vernez D, Schwarz S, Sauvain J-J, Petignat C, Suarez G. 2021. Probable aerosol transmission						
1644	of SARS-CoV-2 in a poorly ventilated courtroom. Indoor Air [Internet]. Available						
1645	from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ina.12866						
1646	Wagner J, Sparks TL, Miller S, Chen W, Macher JM, Waldman JM. 2021. Modeling the						
1647	impacts of physical distancing and other exposure determinants on aerosol						
1648	transmission. J. Occup. Environ. Hyg. 18:495-509.						
1649	Wang Y, Deng Z, Shi D. 2021. How effective is a mask in preventing COVID-19 infection?						
1650	Med. Devices Sens.:e10163.						
1651	Wells CR, Townsend JP, Pandey A, Moghadas SM, Krieger G, Singer B, McDonald RH,						
1652	Fitzpatrick MC, Galvani AP. 2021. Optimal COVID-19 quarantine and testing						
1653	strategies. Nat. Commun. [Internet] 12. Available from:						
1654	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC7788536/						
1655	Whaley CM, Cantor J, Pera M, Jena AB. 2021. Assessing the Association Between Social						
1656	Gatherings and COVID-19 Risk Using Birthdays. JAMA Intern. Med. 181:1090-						
1657	1099.						
1658	Wickham H. 2016. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag New York						
1659	Available from: https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org						
1660	Yamayoshi S, Yasuhara A, Ito M, Akasaka O, Nakamura M, Nakachi I, Koga M, Mitamura						
1661	K, Yagi K, Maeda K, et al. 2021. Antibody titers against SARS-CoV-2 decline, but do						
1662	not disappear for several months. EClinicalMedicine [Internet] 32. Available from:						
1663	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC7877219/						
1664	Zannetti P. 1990. Air Pollution Modeling: Theories, Computational Methods and Available						
1665	Software. Springer, Boston, MA						
1666	Zhang Y, Banerjee S, Yang R, Lungu C, Ramachandran G. 2009. Bayesian Modeling of						
1667	Exposure and Airflow Using Two-Zone Models. Ann. Occup. Hyg. 53:409-424.						
1668							





 $\frac{\overline{D}_{quanta\,i}}{\overline{D}_{quanta\,BL}} = \frac{\varphi_i}{\varphi_{BL}} \times \frac{\dot{M}_i}{M_{BL}} \times \frac{\sum_{1}^{Pe-1}(FF_{Factor\,i} + NF_{Factor\,i})}{\sum_{1}^{e-1}(FF_{Factor\,BL} + NF_{Factor\,BL})} \times \frac{(1 - Ef_{out})_i}{(1 - Ef_{out})_{BL}} \times \frac{Q_{inhale_i}}{Q_{inhale_{BL}}} \times \frac{\Delta t_i}{\Delta t_{BL}} \times \frac{Variant_{Adj_i}}{Variant_{Adj_{BL}}} \times \frac{Immunity_{Adj_{BL}}}{Immunity_{Adj_{BL}}} \times \frac{Test_{Adj_i}}{Test_{Adj_{BL}}}$



 $\overline{D}_{\text{quanta}i} = \varphi_i \times \dot{M}_i \times \sum_{1}^{\text{Pe}-1} (FF_{Factor\,i} + NF_{Factor\,i}) \times (1 - Ef_{out})_i \times (1 - Ef_{in})_i \times Q_{inhale_i} \times \Delta t_i \times Variant_{Adj_i} \times Immunity_{Adj_i} \times Test_{Adj_i}$ (Eq. 5)

4 Individual Dose with One Index Case, No Masking

(before variant emergence, vaccination, and use test protocols)

$$\overline{p}_{quanta\,i} = \varphi_i \times \dot{M}_i \times \sum_{1}^{Pe-1} (FF_{Factor\,i} + NF_{Factor\,i}) \times Q_{inhale_i} \times \Delta t_i$$
(Eq. 6)

 $\varphi_i = 1/(Pe_{total i} - 1)$



COVID-19 Exposure Assessment for Gatherings of 5 hours

Very High Risk, High Risk, Medium Risk, Low Risk



Data from 1/31/2022

Location Indoors Outdoors

Masks

- Fitted N95
- Average Masks
- No Masks

Distancing (ft)

1.5
3.0
6.0
10.0





Factors considered in Exposure Dose Calculation	Factor Type	CEAT Step #	Basis and/or Range of Values used in CEAT
Likelihood of Infectious persons present in the group	Stochastic	1	Ranges over 5 orders of magnitude from the lowest (0.0001%) assumed for people adhering strictly to public health guidance, to the highest (100%) for those known to be infected.
Number of people in the group	Mechanistic/ Stochastic	2	Ranges from 2 to 250 people.
Distance between people	Mechanistic	3	Users are given discrete options: 4.5 m (~15 ft), 3 m (~10 ft), 2 m (~6ft), 1 m (~3 ft), and 0.5 m (~1.5 ft).
Mask effect iveness	Mechanistic	4	Range of mask effectiveness values based on published data for cloth, surgical, and N-95 masks. (CDC, 2020) (Mueller et al., 2020)
Mask compliance on the group	Stochastic	4	Ranges between 0 and 100 percent.
Emission rate of Infectious aerosols released through respiration	Mechanistic	5	Range of viral RNA emissions rates by activity in viral quanta per hour (Buonanno, et al., August 2020) (Buonanno et al., December 2020)
Inhalation rate	Mechanistic	6	Typical inhalation rates for adults at various activity intensities (US EPA, 2015)
Duration of exposure	Mechanistic	7	Varies between 5 minutes and 12 hours
Indoors or outdoors activity	Mechanistic	8	Indoor or Outdoor options affect the form of the concentration model used.
Ventilation rates (air changes per hour [ACH] or air exchange rate [AER])	Mechanistic	8	(Values based on published sources (CDC, 2019) (ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2019, 2020) (Howard-Reed et al., 2002)
Aerosol settling rate	Mechanistic	8	Removal by deposition on surfaces (CIRES, 2020)
Virus degradation rate	Mechanistic	8	An ACH contribution from viral aerosol degradation (CIRES, 2020)
Recirculating room filtration rate and removal efficiency	Mechanistic	8	Recirculation of filtered air assumed to occur at a rate of 5 [L/s]/m ² (1 cfm/ft ²) (ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1-2019, 2020)

Volume of room or activity space	Mechanistic	9	Varies based on user-specified dimensions, with constraints based on number of people and specified distancing. Ceiling height ranges between 2.15 meters (7 feet) and 20 meters (65 feet). Room side dimensions range between 2 meters (7 feet) and 200 meters (650 feet).
Prevalence of COVID-19 in the community	Epidemiologi cal /Stochastic	10	Active cases per 100,000 is estimated by the published "Average Daily Cases per 100,000 in the Last Week" available from various sources and estimates of the "Average Days Infectious" and "Undiagnosed Factor." (REF)
Difference in the variants transmission rates versus wild type virus	Epidemiologi cal	10	Users can adjust the equivalent exposure dose upward by a factor proportional to the reported increased variant transmission.
Impact of community's or group's immunity from recovery and vaccination	Epidemiologi cal	1 and 10	Immunities are addressed in two ways: 1) Reduced shedding (3x reduction is used) (Levine- Tiefenbrun, et al., 2021); 2) User can enter value vaccine efficacy (from Graniss, et al., 2021 and Scobie, et al., 2021) to function as "effective immunity barrier" at a level consistent with its
Impact of surveillance testing for the group	Epidemiologi cal	1	Estimate (Need to come up with a reference for this)

 Table 1. Summary of Factors considered in CEAT. Mechanistic, stochastic, epidemiological factors are accounted for the model exposure and inhalation dose

Case Number	Event Description	Volume of Room or Facility (m ³)	People at Event	Total Cases Attributed to the event (Secondary Cases)	Total Infected Total Susceptible	Primary Reference
Case 1	Bus, Zhejiang Province, China, 19 Jan 2020	80.0	68	23	34%	Shen, et al., 2020
Case 2	Restaurant, Guangzhou, China, 24 Jan 2020	480.4	89	9	10%	Li, et al., 2021
Case 3	Meeting, Munich, Germany, 21 February 2020	210.0	13	12	100%	Hijnen, et al., 2020
Case 4	Commercial Aircraft, Flight VN54 (London, UK - Hanoi, Vietnam), 1 March 2020	662.2	217	16	7%	Khanh, et al. 2020
Case 5	Recreational Squash Game, Maribor, Slovenia, 4 March 2020	458.5	2	1	100%	Brlek, et al., 2020
Case 6	Call Center, South Korea, 8 March 2020	3267.0	216	94	44%	Park, et al., 2020
Case 7	Choir Rehearsal, Skagit Valley, WA, USA, 10 March 2020	808.0	61	32	53%	Miller, et al., 2021
Case 8	Recreational Hockey, Tampa Bay, Florida USA 16 June 2020	14452.7	24	15	65%	Atrubin, et al. 2020
Case 9	Restaurant, Jeonju, South Korea, 17 June 2020	184.8	13	3	25%	Kwon, et al, 2020
Case 10	Court Room, Vaud, Switzerland,	149.5	10	4	44%	Vernez, et al., 2021

	30 Sep 2020					
Case 11 (Omicron)	Holiday Party, Oslo, Norway, 30 Nov 2021	1062.7	111	80	72%	Norwegian Institute of Public Health, 2021

 Table 2. Reported COVID-19 transmission events.