



# <sup>22</sup>**Abstract**

23 Since its declaration, the COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in over 530 million cases and over 6 million 24 deaths worldwide. Predominant clinical testing methods, though invaluable, may create an inaccurate 25 depiction of COVID-19 prevalence due to inadequate access, testing, or most recently under-reporting 26 because of at-home testing. These concerns have created a need for unbiased, community-level 27 surveillance. Wastewater-based epidemiology has been used for previous public health threats, and more 28 recently has been established as a complementary method of SARS-CoV-2 surveillance. Here we describe 29 the application of wastewater surveillance for  $SARS-CoV-2$  in two university campus communities 30 located in rural Lincoln Parish, Louisiana. This cost-effective approach is especially well suited to rural 31 areas where limited access to testing may worsen the spread of COVID-19 and quickly exhaust the 32 capacity of local healthcare systems. Our work demonstrates that local universities can leverage scientific 33 resources to advance public health equity in rural areas and enhance their community involvement.

34

# <sup>35</sup>**Introduction**

36 Since the COVID-19 pandemic was declared, there have been over 530 million infections and over 6 37 million deaths worldwide [1]. Over the past two years, mutations during viral replication coupled with 38 the unchecked global spread of COVID-19 have led to the emergence of more transmissible variants of 39 concern. The first of these variants, the novel SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2 (Delta), was identified in India in 40 December 2020 [2]. This variant was the catalyst for a COVID-19 surge seen in July 2020 [3]. Similarly, 41 the novel SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.529 (Omicron) variant emerged in November 2021 and resulted in yet 42 another surge and a record number of cases across the United States [4].

<sup>44</sup>Rapid diagnostic testing is a critical tool for breaking viral transmission chains and provides data on the 45 prevalence and spread of infectious diseases that can inform public health decision making. However, in 46 the case of COVID-19, each surge was exacerbated by limited supply and access to testing in the US, 47 meaning that often the reports were underestimating the number of infected individuals. More at-home

48 testing and more mild or asymptomatic cases due to acquired immunity have further widened the 49 discrepancy between caseload reporting and actual infections [5]. All of this then points to a need for 50 additional community surveillance of SARS-CoV-2.

<sup>52</sup>Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE), used for decades to monitor chemicals and pathogens through 53 the analysis of sewage, has been propelled into the spotlight during the pandemic as a complementary tool 54 for estimating COVID-19 prevalence in a community [6–8]. Compared to large-scale diagnostic testing 55 programs, WBE avoids bias, is non-invasive, and is less constrained by limited testing capacity [9]. 56 Although the conversion of viral RNA copy number in sewage to infected individuals is complicated by 57 biological and sewershed variability [10], WBE can still capture near-real-time longitudinal trends. 58 Importantly, WBE has been shown to predict case surges by approximately 5-14 days, providing 59 opportunities for public health and epidemiologic intervention [11,12].

61 Rural areas that have fewer resources than urban areas have lagged in testing rates while also being home 62 to a more vulnerable population  $[13,14]$ . In a low testing environment, a WBE approach is especially <sup>63</sup>useful as it indicates infection levels and encourages allocation of resources to those communities to 64 prevent or at least minimize the impact of an outbreak. Here we report on the analysis of longitudinal 65 samples collected throughout the Delta and Omicron surges in rural Lincoln Parish, Louisiana. We assess 66 the effect of fecal normalization and compare temporal trends of SARS-CoV-2 in the wastewater to 67 confirmed cases to estimate the sensitivity of wastewater surveillance.

68

#### <sup>69</sup>**Methods:**

<sup>70</sup>Wastewater from the city of Ruston was collected and analyzed at Louisiana Tech University (LTU) and 71 wastewater from the city of Grambling and the Grambling State University campus was collected and <sup>72</sup>analyzed at Grambling State University (GSU). The same protocol was followed by the two laboratories 73 whenever possible with any differences described below.

#### <sup>75</sup>*Wastewater Sample Collection*

76 City of Ruston wastewater:

77 Wastewater samples were collected from the single wastewater treatment facility in Ruston, Louisiana, 78 the Ruston Water Treatment Plant. A total of 2.4 L of wastewater was collected with a refrigerated 79 autosampler over 12 hours from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm on the day of sampling. From that, a 100 mL 80 composite sample (2 50 mL tubes) was collected, and heat inactivated in a water bath at  $60^{\circ}$ C for 90 81 minutes with one turn at 45 minutes. Following inactivation, these samples were stored at 4<sup>°</sup>C to be 82 picked up that same week. Composite samples were collected from 5/26/2021 to 5/4/2022 and processed 83 at Louisiana Tech University (LTU).

85 City of Grambling and GSU campus wastewater:

<sup>86</sup>The lift stations most proximal to the City of Grambling Wastewater Treatment Plant that convey 87 wastewater from the city sewershed (32.516403, -92.717004) and GSU campus sewershed (32.515078, -88 92.718722) were selected for weekly sampling. Composite samples (150 mL per hour for 24 hours) were 89 collected on ice from Tuesday morning to Wednesday morning each week from  $4/27/2021$  to  $5/3/2022$ 90 and immediately processed at GSU.

91

<sup>92</sup>*Wastewater Sample Processing* 

93 City of Ruston wastewater:

94 The heat-inactivated wastewater samples were centrifuged at  $4696 \times g$  for 30 minutes to remove debris. <sup>95</sup>The 2 50 mL samples were combined into one 20 mL aliquot of supernatant, and viral matter was 96 precipitated using 10% polyethylene glycol (PEG) and 2.25% NaCl with gentle inversion until reagents 97 dissolved based on the method described by Hebert [15]. This solution was stored at 4°C until 98 centrifugation at 12,000  $\times$  g for 120 minutes at 4°C. The resulting pellet was resuspended in 140 µL 99 nuclease-free water and stored at  $-80^{\circ}$ C until RNA extraction could be completed.



- 101 City of Grambling and GSU campus wastewater:
- 102 Viruses were concentrated from 60 mL of clarified supernatant via PEG/NaCl precipitation as at LTU.
- 103 The wastewater/PEG/NaCl solution was centrifuged at  $12,000 \times g$  for 99 minutes at 4°C. The resulting
- 104 pellet was resuspended in  $140 \mu L$  of PBS for immediate extraction.
- 
- <sup>106</sup>*Viral RNA Extraction*
- 107 City of Ruston wastewater:

108 Viral RNA was extracted from 140 µL of resuspended samples using the QIAGEN QIAmp MiniKit

<sup>109</sup>(#52904) according to the manufacturer's protocol. The extracted RNA was eluted from the column using

110 40 µL elution buffer. The RNA purity and yield was determined using the BioTek Cytation Take5 plate

111 reader.

113 City of Grambling and GSU campus wastewater:

114 Viral RNA was extracted as at LTU with one modification. The addition of 5.6  $\mu$ g of carrier RNA to the 115 lysis buffer was omitted from the initial sample to allow for quality assessment of the extracted RNA. 116 RNA integrity measured using the Invitrogen Qubit RNA IQ Assay indicated 61% large or structured 117 RNA and 39% small RNA.

- <sup>119</sup>*RT-qPCR and Fecal Normalization*
- 120 City of Ruston wastewater:

121 10 µL of viral RNA was used in a 20 µL reaction to create cDNA using the Applied Biosystems High-122 Capacity Reverse Transcription Kit with RNAse Inhibitor (#4368814) according to the manufacturer's 123 protocol. The resulting cDNA was stored at −20°C for up to a week prior to quantification of SARS-CoV-

- 124 2 RNA presence. SARS-CoV-2 presence was measured via qPCR detection using the IDT 2019-nCoV
- 125 RUO Kit (#10006713) containing the CDC 2019-nCoV diagnostic primer/probe mixes for the N1 and N2

126 gene targets (IDT #10006625) with the TaqMan Universal PCR Master Mix (Thermo Fisher #4304437) 127 according to the manufacturer's protocol. Each reaction contained 10  $\mu$ L master mix, 1.5  $\mu$ L primer/probe 128 mix for N1 or N2, 2  $\mu$ L target sample, and brought to a total volume of 20  $\mu$ L using nuclease-free water. 129 Reactions were run at 95°C for 10 minutes, 50 cycles of 95°C for 15 seconds followed by 60°C for 1 130 minute. For qPCR detection of PMMoV, a primer/probe mix previously described by Haramoto et al. was 131 used instead of the N1 or N2 primer/probe mixes [16]. Amplification parameters were  $25^{\circ}$ C for 10 132 minutes, 95°C for 3 minutes, 45 cycles of 95°C for 15 seconds followed by 60°C for 1 minute. All qPCR 133 reactions were done in triplicate. The reactions were prepared in an Applied Biosystems MicroAmp Fast 134 96 well reaction plate (#4346906) sealed with MicroAmp clear optical adhesive film (#4311971) and 135 analyzed on an Applied Biosystems StepOnePlus RT-qPCR machine. N1 and N2 samples were quantified 136 using a serial dilution for each gene target. IDT 2019-nCoV N positive control plasmid (#10006625) was 137 used at concentrations ranging from  $4 \times 10^5$  to  $4 \times 10^1$  copies per reaction. PMMoV samples were 138 quantified using a 68 bp DNA oligo containing the target region in a serial dilution ranging from  $2.4 \times 10^7$ 139 to 2.4  $\times$  10<sup>1</sup> copies per reaction [15]. For fecal normalization, the genome copies or GC/mL of N1 and N2 140 were divided by the GC/mL of PMMoV to obtain a unitless ratio of SARS-CoV-2 to PMMoV [17].

142 City of Grambling and GSU campus wastewater:

143 Reverse transcription was performed as at LTU. The cDNA was stored at −20°C for 1 to 3 days prior to 144 analysis for SARS-CoV-2 and 1 to 8 weeks prior to analysis for PMMoV. SARS-CoV-2 and PMMoV 145 were quantified as at LTU using the IDT 2019-nCoV RUO kit but with the IDT PrimeTime Gene 146 Expression Master Mix (#1055772) according to the manufacturers' protocols. All qPCR reactions were 147 assembled in triplicate. Samples were prepared in a Bio-Rad HSP9601 clear well plate sealed with a Bio-148 Rad MSB1001 adhesive optical film and analyzed on a Bio-Rad CFX Connect instrument. Quantification 149 cycle (Cq) was determined using Bio-Rad CFX Manager 3.1. N1 and N2 in the samples were quantified 150 using serial dilutions of two standards: (1) the IDT 2019-nCoV\_N positive control plasmid containing the **151** complete nucleocapsid gene at concentrations ranging from  $2 \times 10^4$  to  $2 \times 10^1$  plasmid copies per reaction

152 and (2) the ATCC VR3276SD synthetic RNA, reverse transcribed following the same protocol as sample **153** RNA, at concentrations ranging from  $2 \times 10^4$  to  $2 \times 10^1$  RNA copies input to reverse transcription <sup>154</sup>(Supplemental Figure 1). PMMoV quantification and normalization was performed as described at LTU.

- 
- <sup>156</sup>**Results**

157 Ruston, a city in rural Lincoln Parish, Louisiana with a population of approximately 22,000 people, is 158 home to Louisiana Tech University, a public university with an enrollment of approximately 12,000 159 students. The city of Ruston has a single wastewater treatment facility that services wastewater for over 160 90% of the population. To carry out wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2, we collaborated with the 161 city's wastewater treatment facility to obtain samples for analysis. Samples were not able to be collected 162 every week due to inclement weather, critical mechanical difficulties at the treatment facility, or absence 163 of staff (Supplemental Table 1). The city of Grambling, also in Lincoln Parish, has a population of 5,150 164 residents as of the July 8, 2021, census. Grambling State University (GSU) has an enrollment of 5,438 165 students with 2,005 students living on campus and 226 faculty and 367 staff members working on campus 166 during the Fall 2021 academic term, and 1,818 students, 197 faculty, and 374 staff members on campus 167 during the Spring 2022 academic term.

169 We determined the concentration (genome copies or GC/L) of pepper mild mottle virus (PMMoV), a 170 fecal indicator that is frequently used to normalize wastewater testing and account for fluctuations in 171 population or precipitation during the collection period (Fig 1). PMMoV is highly abundant in raw 172 wastewater with concentrations ranging from  $10^5$  to  $10^9$  GC/L typically being reported in the literature 173 [18]. We detected PMMoV in all samples from all sites with average concentrations in the order of  $10^8$ 174 GC/L in Ruston and  $10^6$  GC/L in the smaller Grambling community. In Grambling, the PMMoV 175 concentrations in the city mirrored the GSU campus, which in turn were highly dependent on the 176 academic calendar with a high of  $2.7 \times 10^7$  GC/L detected during Homecoming week and a low of 2.4  $\times$  $177 \t10^3$  GC/L detected during the Thanksgiving Break. PMMoV concentrations in Ruston were not as

178 coupled to the LTU academic calendar and various events in the community that brought people to 179 Ruston, LA may account for spikes in the wastewater signal.

180

*Fig 1. Pepper mild mottle virus (PMMoV) in wastewater. PMMoV concentrations expressed as genome copies or GC/L in the wastewater of Ruston (A), Grambling (B), and Grambling State University (C). The timeline is annotated with key events and dates including dates when no wastewater samples were collected or PMMoV amplification failed. For full table of reporting in Ruston see Supplemental Table*  <sup>185</sup>*S1.* 

186

187 The non-normalized wastewater concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in Ruston, Grambling, and GSU are 188 expressed as GC/L in Fig 2. In Ruston, N1 or N2 genes were detected in 45 of 46 wastewater samples 189 with values ranging from  $1 \times 10^3$  GC/L to  $1.1 \times 10^6$  GC/L. In January and February 2022, the 190 concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 detected were unexpectedly low considering this was during the peak of 191 the Omicron surge in Louisiana. In Grambling, N1 or N2 was only detected in 19 of 51 wastewater 192 samples and at much lower concentrations than in Ruston, often only exceeding the limit of detection 193 when viral loads were relatively high in the GSU campus sewershed. On the GSU campus, we observed 194 two spikes in the wastewater signal associated with the Delta and Omicron surges against a low baseline 195 signal in 29 of 51 wastewater samples.

<sup>197</sup>*Fig 2. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater. N1 and N2 concentrations expressed as genome copies or GC/L in*  <sup>198</sup>*the wastewater of Ruston (A), Grambling (B), and Grambling State University (C).* 

200 The PMMoV-normalized wastewater concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 expressed as unitless ratios are 201 presented with city caseload data (Fig 3). Normalizing for fecal load reveals that SARS-CoV-2 202 concentrations in Ruston wastewater during the Omicron surge were comparable to those detected during 203 the Delta surge. The low GC/L observed in the non-normalized data may have been due to viral losses in

204 the sewage system. In the Grambling community, there was little correlation between normalized SARS-<sup>205</sup>CoV-2 concentration in city wastewater and confirmed infections in the city as both appear to be 206 primarily driven by the influx and efflux of people on the GSU campus. Because SARS-CoV-2 can be 207 shed in feces early in the course of COVID-19 infection, it has been proposed that wastewater 208 surveillance can serve as an early warning system [19–21]. On the GSU campus however, the wastewater 209 signal appeared to lag or at best coincide with the increase in confirmed infections during the Delta surge. 210 The sudden influx of thousands of students at the beginning of the academic year, all of whom were 211 screened if moving into campus housing, precludes using wastewater surveillance as a forecasting tool in 212 this instance. There was no data collected from the campus sewershed during Winter Break, but it is 213 reasonable to expect a similar lack of predictive power during the initial Omicron surge which coincided 214 with the return of students to campus. Other limitations of our study include the lack of a matrix control 215 to assess viral recovery and the lack of normalization for daily wastewater flow.

*Fig 3. PMMoV-normalized SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater and weekly caseloads. N1 and N2 concentrations in the wastewater of Ruston (A), Grambling (B), and Grambling State University (C) were divided by PMMoV concentrations to obtain a unitless ratio that normalizes for fecal load. All ratios are relative to the lowest ratio set arbitrarily as*  $10^0$  *and plotted on the left Y axis. Total weekly caseloads in zip codes 71270 and 71273 (Ruston) and zip code 71245 (Grambling/Grambling State University) are plotted on the right Y axis.* 

# <sup>224</sup>**Conclusion**

225 Here we demonstrate the ability of smaller universities to serve as public health resources in their 226 community by engaging undergraduate students in wastewater surveillance. Monitoring of wastewater 227 for SARS-CoV-2 is especially critical as we enter a time of at-home testing and generally less official 228 reporting. This is a trend confirmed by data from The Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, our 229 analysis of which suggests that during the peak of the Delta surge, approximately 41% of cases are

230 estimated to have been reported, compared to roughly 21% during the peak of the Omicron surge, and 231 less than 10% toward the end of this study period [22]. Ruston, Grambling, and GSU all saw an increase 232 in viral wastewater concentrations in January and February 2022, corresponding to increased regional and 233 national caseloads. However, in looking at the data (Fig 3), the same relative genome copies 234 corresponded to higher local caseloads in earlier months than what was being reported in April and May 235 2022, suggesting more recent under-reporting of COVID-19 cases in communities. This is a significant 236 problem because under-reporting may lead to a false sense of security among the public and hinder data-237 driven decisions by policymakers. Overall, this study indicates the need to continue regular surveillance 238 and heed the warnings of viral genome concentrations in the wastewater as a representative indicator of 239 community health. Smaller communities do not always have access to the same resources or information 240 available in larger cities. In these cases, it is critical that the university community become engaged in 241 monitoring and supporting public health initiatives. The ability for two campuses to initiate this type of 242 surveillance and train undergraduate students to be a part of the research programs establishes a model for 243 this type of work going forward that will allow universities to participate in public health.

244

### <sup>245</sup>**Acknowledgements**

246 We would like to thank Helaina Desentz, Louisiana Department of Health, Region 8 Epidemiologist for 247 providing local caseload data and Casey Jackson for wastewater sampling through the duration of this 248 project.

250 254 1. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard [Internet]. [cited 2022 Jun 2]. Available from: <sup>255</sup>https://covid19.who.int

- 256 2. Lou F, Li M, Pang Z, Jiang L, Guan L, Tian L, et al. Understanding the Secret of SARS-CoV-2
- <sup>257</sup>Variants of Concern/Interest and Immune Escape. Frontiers in Immunology [Internet]. 2021
- 258 [cited 2022 May 28];12. Available from:
- 259 https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fimmu.2021.744242
- 260 3. Mlcochova P, Kemp SA, Dhar MS, Papa G, Meng B, Ferreira IATM, et al. SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2
- 261 Delta variant replication and immune evasion. Nature. 2021 Nov;599(7883):114–9.
- 262 4. Molecular basis of immune evasion by the Delta and Kappa SARS-CoV-2 variants [Internet]. [cited] <sup>263</sup>2022 May 28]. Available from: https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abl8506
- 264 5. Jetelina K. State of Affairs: Can we trust case numbers? [Internet]. Your Local Epidemiologist. 2022
- 265 [cited 2022 Jun 2]. Available from: https://yourlocalepidemiologist.substack.com/p/state-of-
- 266 affairs-can-we-trust-case
- 267 6. Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, Bibby K, Bivins A, O'Brien JW, et al. First confirmed detection of
- 268 SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater
- 269 surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. Science of The Total Environment. 2020 Aug
- 1;728:138764.
- 271 7. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in 272 Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic 273 in The Netherlands. Environ Sci Technol Lett. 2020 May 20;acs.estlett.0c00357.
- 274 8. Wurtzer S, Waldman P, Levert M, Cluzel N, Almayrac JL, Charpentier C, et al. SARS-CoV-2 genome <sup>275</sup>quantification in wastewaters at regional and city scale allows precise monitoring of the whole 276 outbreaks dynamics and variants spreading in the population. Sci Total Environ. 2022 Mar
- 1;810:152213.
- 278 9. Larsen DA, Wigginton KR. Tracking COVID-19 with wastewater. Nat Biotechnol. 2020 279 Oct;38(10):1151-3.
- 280 10. Li X, Zhang S, Shi J, Luby SP, Jiang G. Uncertainties in estimating SARS-CoV-2 prevalence by
- <sup>281</sup>wastewater-based epidemiology. Chemical Engineering Journal. 2021 Jul 1;415:129039.



- 284 12. Nemudryi A, Nemudraia A, Wiegand T, Surya K, Buyukyoruk M, Cicha C, et al. Temporal Detection
- 285 and Phylogenetic Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 in Municipal Wastewater. CR Med [Internet].
- 286 2020 Sep 22 [cited 2022 Jan 6];1(6). Available from: https://www.cell.com/cell-reports-
- 287 medicine/abstract/S2666-3791(20)30124-5
- 288 13. Cuadros DF, Branscum AJ, Mukandavire Z, Miller FD, MacKinnon N. Dynamics of the COVID-19 289 epidemic in urban and rural areas in the United States. Annals of Epidemiology. 2021 Jul
- 290 1;59:16–20.
- 291 14. Souch JM, Cossman JS. A Commentary on Rural-Urban Disparities in COVID-19 Testing Rates per 292 100,000 and Risk Factors. J Rural Health. 2021 Jan; 37(1):188–90.
- 293 15. T.T. Hebert. Precipitation of plant viruses by polyethylene glycol. 1963;53:362.
- 294 16. Haramoto E, Kitajima M, Kishida N, Konno Y, Katayama H, Asami M, et al. Occurrence of Pepper
- 295 Mild Mottle Virus in Drinking Water Sources in Japan. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2013
- 296 Dec;79(23):7413–8.
- 297 17. CDC. National Wastewater Surveillance System [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and
- 298 Prevention. 2022 [cited 2022 Jun 6]. Available from:
- 299 https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/surveillance/wastewater-surveillance/data-reporting-300 analytics.html
- 301 18. Kitajima M, Sassi HP, Torrey JR. Pepper mild mottle virus as a water quality indicator. npj Clean 302 Water. 2018 Oct 15;1(1):1–9.
- <sup>303</sup>19. Peccia J, Zulli A, Brackney DE, Grubaugh ND, Kaplan EH, Casanovas-Massana A, et al.
- 304 Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks community infection dynamics. Nat
- 305 Biotechnol. 2020 Oct;38(10):1164–7.



A.





**B.** 

# $\mathbf{C}$





Α.

SARS-



**Collection date** 

В.