

1 **Public toilets have reduced enteric pathogen hazards in San Francisco**

2 Troy Barker^{1*}, Drew Capone^{2*}, Heather K. Amato³, Ryan Clark¹, Abigail Henderson³, David A.
3 Holcomb¹, Elizabeth Kim¹, Jillian Pape³, Emily Parker³, Thomas VanderYacht³, Jay Graham³,
4 and Joe Brown^{1**}

5
6 ¹Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Gillings School of Global Public
7 Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

8 ²Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, School of Public Health, Indiana
9 University Bloomington, Bloomington, IN, USA

10 ³Department of Environmental Health, School of Public Health, University of California –
11 Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

12
13 *These authors contributed equally to the manuscript.

14
15 **Corresponding author: Joe Brown, Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering,
16 Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. CB7431
17 Rosenau Hall, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7431, USA. Tel: +1 919 360 8752. Email:
18 joebrown@unc.edu

19
20 **KEYWORDS:** homelessness, urban sanitation, mtDNA, microbial hazards, environmental
21 exposures, environmental microbiology, dPCR, qPCR

22

23 **SYNOPSIS:** This paper describes enteric pathogen hazards from discarded feces on the streets
24 of San Francisco and estimates their reduction following a public toilet intervention.

25

26

27 **TOC/Abstract art:**

28 Created with BioRender and a photograph by author Jay Graham



29

30

31 **ABSTRACT**

32 Uncontained fecal wastes in cities may present exposure risks to the public. We collected
33 discarded feces from public spaces in San Francisco for analysis by RT-qPCR for a range of
34 enteric pathogens. Out of 59 samples, we found 12 (20%) were of human origin and 47 (80%)
35 were non-human; 30 of 59 stools were positive for ≥ 1 of the 35 pathogens assessed, including
36 pathogenic *E. coli*, *Shigella*, norovirus, *Cryptosporidium*, and *Trichuris*. Using quantitative
37 enteric pathogen estimates and data on observed fecal waste from a public reporting system, we
38 modeled pathogens removed from the environment attributable to a recently implemented
39 program of public toilet construction. We estimated that each new public toilet reduced the
40 annual number of enteric pathogens released into the immediate environment (within 500 m
41 walking distance), including 6.3×10^{12} enteropathogenic *E. coli* (95% CI: $4.0 \times 10^{12} - 7.9 \times$

42 10^{12}), 3.2×10^{11} enteroaggregative *E. coli* (95% CI: $1.3 \times 10^{11} - 6.3 \times 10^{11}$), and 3.2×10^8
43 *Shigella* ($6.3 \times 10^7 - 2.5 \times 10^9$). Improving access to public sanitation can reduce enteric
44 pathogen hazards in cities. Interventions must also consider the hygienic disposal of animal
45 waste to reduce microbial hazards with zoonotic infection potential.

46

47 **INTRODUCTION**

48 People experiencing homelessness are more likely than the general population to suffer from
49 communicable diseases¹, partly because they lack consistent access to basic infrastructure
50 including safe water and sanitation^{2, 3}. Nearly one million persons in US cities have insufficient
51 access to basic sanitation and over 600,000 cannot consistently access basic water infrastructure²,
52 primarily those lacking stable housing.

53

54 Nearly 130,000 people in California experience homelessness each day, and they are
55 disproportionately unsheltered compared to those in other states^{1, 4}. Like many US cities, San
56 Francisco does not have enough public toilets to meet demand⁵. Consistent access to sanitation
57 and soap and water for proper handwashing is necessary to prevent the spread of enteric
58 pathogens that may cause diarrheal disease⁶. Without safe, hygienic, and publicly accessible
59 toilets when and where people need them, open defecation is common⁷⁻⁹. As a result,
60 uncontained fecal waste can accumulate near where people live, work, and play, creating
61 opportunities for exposure to enteric pathogens through well-known direct and indirect
62 pathways¹⁰⁻¹³.

63

64 Fecal contamination on the streets of San Francisco is so common that the Department of Public
65 Works (DPW) created a well-used system to report feces in public spaces, where instances of
66 fecal waste can be reported by dialing 311 from a telephone (or, now, via a website or
67 Twitter)^{11,14}. Data since 2008 are publicly available at <https://datasf.org/opendata/>. As a step
68 toward addressing the well-publicized problem, DPW implemented the Pit Stop program
69 beginning in 2014, aiming to reduce open defecation in public spaces by installing staffed public
70 toilets in areas of high need.^{11,12} The intervention also includes animal waste bags and waste bins
71 for disposal. A full description of the program and its history is available at the Pit Stop website:
72 <https://sfpublicworks.wixsite.com/pitstop>. A recent impact assessment of the program estimated
73 that the installation of public latrines reduced 311 reports of fecal waste on the street by a mean
74 of 12.5 stools per week within 500 meters (walking distance) of newly installed Pit Stop
75 locations in the six months following installation, compared with a pre-intervention baseline¹⁵.
76 The greatest reduction in reports of fecal waste occurred in the Tenderloin neighborhood (i.e., 18
77 stools per week per new facility), which had 10 public toilets, the most of any neighborhood in
78 the program. The Tenderloin and South of Market (SoMa) had the highest counts of 311 reports
79 in the study period; together, these neighborhoods make up District 6, which had the highest
80 count of people experiencing homelessness (n=3,656) in SF as of 2019¹⁶. With only 3 Pit Stop
81 public facilities in SoMa, there was no significant reduction of 311 reports associated with the Pit
82 Stop intervention in this neighborhood. A recent independent analysis by the San Francisco
83 Chronicle of 311 data concluded that, while feces-related service requests for every other
84 neighborhood in San Francisco have gone up an average of 400% in the period from 2012-2021,
85 reports for the Tenderloin reduced by 29%, with pronounced further decreases in the area
86 immediately around three Pit Stop interventions¹⁴.

87

88 These interventions may affect exposures to enteric pathogen hazards to the public from human
89 and animal fecal waste, including among people experiencing homelessness who may bear the
90 greatest direct risks. Our primary aim was to estimate the degree to which Pit Stop interventions
91 have reduced enteric pathogens in the immediate environment surrounding new toilet facilities.
92 To this end, we: (1) conducted a systematic survey of discarded feces in a pre-defined area; (2)
93 determined whether each fecal sample was of human or non-human origin; (3) quantified a range
94 of enteric pathogens in recovered fecal samples, using molecular methods; and (4) used the
95 intervention-attributable reduction in observed feces from 311 reports¹⁵ to estimate reductions of
96 the enteric pathogens we detected.

97

98 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

99 A previous longitudinal study estimated that the installation of public toilets in two San
100 Francisco neighborhoods resulted in a mean reduction of 18 stools per week within 500 meters
101 (walking distance) of each facility¹⁵. We systematically collected discarded stools in this area
102 and quantified a range of enteric pathogens in each sample. We used these data to model the
103 reduction of pathogen hazards attributable to each facility.

104

105 **Sample Collection.** We used 311 reports of fecal waste in San Francisco, CA in August 2020 to
106 identify hotspots for open defecation (OD) reports and design a systematic survey of discarded
107 stools for enteric pathogen analysis. The available 311 data include reports of any discarded
108 feces, including both suspected human and non-human fecal waste. The Tenderloin and SoMa
109 neighborhoods had the highest number of 311 reports and were therefore selected for sampling;

110 we matched observed feces with 311 reports to verify that 311 data reliably indicated instances
111 of fecal waste (Text S1). We prioritized 20 blocks, including both sidewalks on either side of the
112 street for collection (Figure S1, Figure S2). We generated a perimeter around the selected blocks,
113 with any block inside the perimeter potentially utilized if samples were not available on the 20
114 selected blocks. We collected biospecimens on four Wednesday mornings in September and
115 October of 2020 before street cleaning began. Stool samples were collected into one-liter
116 biohazard bags and stored in a cooler with ice packs. We transferred samples into 1.5 mL
117 cryotubes and stored them at -20°C within 4 hours of collection. Any confirmed animal stool
118 (e.g., if the team observed an animal defecating) was not collected.

119
120 **Sample preparation and analysis.** We used the QIAamp 96 Virus QIAcube HT Kit (Qiagen,
121 Hilden, Germany) to extract nucleic acids from 100 mg of stool using a pre-treatment step
122 previously validated for molecular detection of multiple enteric pathogens with both DNA and
123 RNA genomes (Text S2)^{17, 18}. We proceeded with extraction following the manufacturer's
124 protocol for the QIAamp 96 Virus QIAcube HT Kit, which we automated on the QIAcube
125 (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). We measured the concentration of dsDNA using the dsDNA HS
126 assay with a Qubit 4 Fluorometer (Invitrogen, Waltham, Massachusetts).

127
128 We quantified human mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) in each sample by dPCR to determine
129 whether feces were of presumptive human origin (Text S5, Figure S3) using an assay that
130 previously demonstrated 100% sensitivity and 97% specificity to human stool¹⁹. We normalized
131 mtDNA gene copy estimates to ng of dsDNA, and compared results against values reported in
132 the literature to categorize samples as human or non-human.¹⁹ Positive and negative PCR

133 controls²⁰ were run each day of analysis via qPCR (Text S3) and dPCR (Text S5, Table S7). We
134 developed and used custom TaqMan Array Cards (TAC) (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham,
135 MA) using published primer and probe sequences (Tables S2-S4) for a range of enteric bacteria,
136 viruses, protozoa, helminths, and controls. TAC is a 384-well array card with 8 ports for loading
137 samples and each 1.5 μ L well contains lyophilized primers and probes for the detection of pre-
138 defined targets. We analyzed extracted nucleic acids via TAC on the QuantStudio 7, generating
139 real-time RT-qPCR curves for each target for each sample (Text S3). Standard curve details and
140 95% limits of detection are presented in Table S3. We visually compared exponential curves and
141 multicomponent plots with positive control plots to validate positive amplification^{21, 22}. We
142 manually set thresholds to the point of inflection and considered targets amplifying at or below
143 35 cycles positive²³. We re-ran samples that did not amplify DNA/RNA extraction positive
144 controls as expected at a 1:10 dilution, and samples that did not then amplify controls were
145 excluded from analysis. We performed additional confirmatory analysis of samples positive for
146 soil-transmitted helminths via microscopy using the mini-FLOTAC method (Text S4, Figure
147 S4).¹⁶ We transformed cycle quantification (Cq) values into gene copy concentrations per gram
148 feces using pathogen-specific standard curves.

149
150 **Stochastic model.** We estimated the annual number of pathogens diverted from the environment
151 attributable to the Pit Stop intervention program using R version 4.1.0²⁴. We transformed gene
152 copies (gc) into genomic units (i.e., discrete pathogens) using published values for gene copies
153 per genome (Table S5, model parameters)²³. We treated non-detects as true zeroes. Using the
154 `fitdistrplus` package in R²⁵, we used maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) to fit log-normal
155 distributions to the quantity of pathogens per gram of stool in fecal samples, obtaining separate

156 estimates of the mean and standard deviation of log-pathogens per gram of presumptively human
157 and non-human stool, respectively, for each pathogen detected. We thus generated an estimated
158 mean and standard deviation for the number of pathogens per gram of feces. However, we
159 assigned upper bound thresholds to the distributions of pathogen concentrations in feces based
160 on biological plausibility (i.e., bacteria: 10^9 /gram; viruses: 10^{12} /gram; protozoa: 10^7 /gram;
161 helminths: 10^6 /gram) and to prevent outliers in the distribution from driving the overall annual
162 estimate. We modeled an estimate of 18 stools per week that were diverted from the
163 environment¹⁵ due to each new toilet facility across 52 weeks, because this was the reduction
164 reported by Amato *et al.* 2022¹⁵ for the Tenderloin and SOMA neighborhoods. Using a Monte
165 Carlo Simulation, we applied a binomial distribution to estimate whether each unique diverted
166 stool (of 18) contained a specific pathogen. For each stool simulated to contain a given pathogen,
167 we estimated the concentration using the corresponding MLE-generated distribution. We fit a
168 log-normal distribution to the mass of human defecation events reported in Cummings *et al.*
169 1992 to stochastically estimate the mass of each stool²⁶. For pathogens detected in only one of
170 the collected samples, we used the number of pathogens per gram of stool for the single stool in
171 place of an MLE-generated mean and the average MLE standard deviation from plurally
172 detected pathogens (Table S5). We repeated the process 52 times to estimate pathogens reduced
173 over a year. We then summed the number of estimated pathogens across the entire year to
174 estimate the number of pathogens diverted annually, repeating the process 1000 times to generate
175 95% confidence intervals.

176

177 **RESULTS**

178 We tested 60 stool samples, but excluded one whose assays lacked positive control
179 amplification, leaving 59 samples for analysis. Positive controls exhibited consistent
180 amplification (Cq~20) and no amplification was observed in our negative controls, except for the
181 16S assay (Cq~35, Text S6), which is a known contaminant in mastermix containing the
182 TaqMan polymerase^{27,28}. Pathogen prevalence disaggregated by human mtDNA results is shown
183 in Table 1; we determined that 12 samples were of human origin and 47 were from non-human
184 sources. Out of 35 pathogens analyzed using TAC, 30/59 samples (51%) contained one or more
185 pathogens, 21/59 (36%) contained two or more pathogens, 8/59 (14%) contained 3 or more
186 pathogens, and 1/59 (2%) contained 5 pathogens. The most prevalent pathogens were atypical
187 enteropathogenic *E. coli* (EPEC) at 37% (22/59), typical EPEC and *Acanthamoeba spp.* each at
188 12% (7/59), *Cryptosporidium* at 8% (5/59), and *Giardia* at 7% (4/59).

189
190 The mtDNA dPCR assay indicated 12 samples were likely human in origin and 47 were likely
191 animal in origin (Figure S3). The prevalence of atypical EPEC was higher in human stools (42%)
192 than in the non-human stools (36%). Typical EPEC, tied for second most abundant pathogen
193 found, was absent in human stools, as were *Salmonella*, Norovirus, *Cryptosporidium*, *Giardia*,
194 and *Balantidium coli*. The pathogens *Helicobacter pylori*, *Shigella spp./EIEC* (enteroinvasive
195 *Escherichia coli*), *Plesiomonas shigelloides*, and *Yersinia enterocolitica* were only found in
196 human fecal samples.

197
198 Two samples were TAC-positive for *Trichuris*, one of which was presumptively of human
199 origin. Due to a borderline initial Cq value (34.4), a negative microscopy result, and inhibited or
200 negative results on subsequent TAC runs for *Trichuris* for this sample, we excluded the result in

201 our prevalence calculations. Microscopy for the other (non-human) *Trichuris*-positive sample
202 revealed *Trichuris vulpis*, *Toxocara canis*, and hookworm ova (Figure S4).

203
204 We estimated the annual number of pathogens prevented from release into the local environment
205 as a result of each Pit Stop intervention under three scenarios (Table 2): (1) that fecal waste
206 reduced was both human and animal, since Pit Stop interventions also include animal waste bags
207 and bins (2) that all fecal waste reduced was of human origin; and (3) (i) that all fecal waste
208 reduced was of animal origin. These results of the three scenarios were similar due to the high
209 concentration of pathogen shedding in feces, except for the instances where we only detected a
210 pathogen in human or non-human feces (e.g., *Cryptosporidium*) (Table 2). The estimated
211 reduction in pathogens released to environment in the scenario that considered both fecal waste
212 sources varied from 1×10^7 (95% CI: 1.6×10^6 , 1.3×10^8) for *Trichuris* to 6.3×10^{12} (95% CI:
213 4.0×10^{12} , 7.9×10^{12}) for atypical enteropathogenic *E. coli*.

214
215 Because the Pit Latrine intervention includes animal waste bags and bins, it is plausible that
216 these facilities may also result in reductions in enteric pathogens observed only in animal feces,
217 including EPEC (typical), *Salmonella* spp., norovirus, *Cryptosporidium* spp., *Giardia* spp.,
218 *Balantidium coli*, and *Trichuris* spp. Assuming that the Pit Stop facilities reduce both human and
219 animal feces in the same proportion that they appear in our fecal samples (20% human, 80%
220 non-human), we estimate quantitative reductions of the broad range of pathogens represented
221 across all samples (Table 2).

222
223

224
225
226
227
228
229

Pathogen	All fecal samples (n=59)	Presumptively human ^e (n=12)	Presumptively non-human ^e (n=47)
Bacteria			
EPEC ^a (atypical)	37%	42%	36%
EPEC ^a (typical)	12%	0%	15%
EAEC ^b (aaiC/aatA)	3%	8%	2%
ETEC ^c (LT/ST)	3%	8%	2%
<i>Helicobacter pylori</i>	3%	17%	0%
<i>Shigella spp./EIEC^d</i> (ipaH)	2%	8%	0%
<i>Plesiomonas shigelloides</i>	2%	8%	0%
<i>Salmonella spp.</i>	2%	0%	2%
<i>Yersinia enterocolitica</i>	2%	8%	0%
Virus			
norovirus (GI/II)	2%	0%	2%
Protozoa			
<i>Acanthamoeba spp.</i>	12%	17%	11%
<i>Cryptosporidium spp.</i>	8%	0%	11%
<i>Giardia spp.</i>	7%	0%	9%
<i>Blastocystis spp.</i>	3%	8%	2%
<i>Balantidium coli</i>	2%	0%	2%
Soil-transmitted helminth			
<i>Trichuris spp.</i>	2%	0%	2%
^a Enteropathogenic <i>Escherichia coli</i> ^b Enteroggregative <i>Escherichia coli</i> ^c Enterotoxigenic <i>Escherichia coli</i> ^d Enteroinvasive <i>E. coli</i> ^e Classified based on the concentration of human mitochondrial DNA (Supporting Information, Text S5) ¹⁹			
Not detected in any sample: <i>Campylobacter jejuni/coli</i> , <i>Clostridium difficile</i> , <i>E. coli</i> O157:H7, astrovirus, rotavirus, sapovirus (I/II/IV/V), SARS-CoV-2, <i>Cystoisospora belli</i> , <i>Cyclospora cayetanensis</i> , <i>Enterocytozoon bieneusi</i> , <i>Encephalitozoon intestinalis</i> , <i>Entamoeba histolytica</i> , <i>Entamoeba spp.</i> , <i>Ancylostoma duodenale</i> , <i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i> , <i>Enterobius vermicularis</i> , <i>Hymenolepis nana</i> , <i>Necator americanus</i> , and <i>Strongyloides stercoralis</i>			

230 **Table 1.** Prevalence of pathogens in collected stool samples.

231

232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243

Pathogen	All fecal samples (n=59)		Presumptively human ^e (n=12)		Presumptively non-human ^e (n=47)	
	prevalence	median (95% CI)	prevalence	median (95% CI)	prevalence	median (95% CI)
EPEC ^a (atypical)	22/59	6.3x10 ¹² (4.0x10 ¹² , 7.9x10 ¹²)	5/12	6.3x10 ¹² (5.0x10 ¹² , 7.9x10 ¹²)	17/47	5.0x10 ¹² (4.0x10 ¹² , 7.9x10 ¹²)
EPEC ^a (typical)	7/59	1.0x10 ¹¹ (4.0x10 ¹⁰ , 2.5x10 ¹¹)	2/12	1.6x10 ¹¹ (7.9x10 ¹⁰ , 3.2x10 ¹¹)	5/47	1.0x10 ¹¹ (4.0x10 ¹⁰ , 2.5x10 ¹¹)
<i>Acanthamoeba</i> spp.	7/59	7.9x10 ⁶ (6.3x10 ⁶ , 1.0x10 ⁷)	1/12	5.0x10 ⁶ (4.0x10 ⁶ , 7.9x10 ⁶)	6/47	7.9x10 ⁶ (6.3x10 ⁶ , 1.0x10 ⁷)
<i>Cryptosporidium</i> spp.	5/59	1.6x10 ¹⁰ (1.0x10 ¹⁰ , 2.5x10 ¹⁰)	0/12	0	5/47	2.0x10 ¹⁰ (1.3x10 ¹⁰ , 3.2x10 ¹⁰)
<i>Blastocystis</i> spp.	2/59	5.0x10 ¹¹ (1.3x10 ¹¹ , 1.0x10 ¹²)	1/12	1.3x10 ¹² (6.3x10 ¹¹ , 2.0x10 ¹²)	1/47	3.2x10 ¹¹ (4.0x10 ¹⁰ , 7.9x10 ¹¹)
<i>Giardia</i> spp.	4/59	4.0x10 ⁹ (1.6x10 ⁹ , 7.9x10 ⁹)	0/12	0	4/47	5.0x10 ⁹ (2.0x10 ⁹ , 7.9x10 ⁹)
EAEC ^b	2/59	3.2x10 ¹¹ (1.3x10 ¹¹ , 6.3x10 ¹¹)	1/12	7.9x10 ¹¹ (5.0x10 ¹¹ , 1.3x10 ¹²)	1/47	2.0x10 ¹¹ (6.3x10 ¹⁰ , 4.0x10 ¹¹)
ETEC ^c	2/59	2.5x10 ⁷ (1.3x10 ⁷ , 4.0x10 ⁷)	1/12	4.0x10 ⁷ (3.2x10 ⁷ , 7.9x10 ⁷)	1/47	1.6x10 ⁷ (6.3x10 ⁶ , 2.5x10 ⁷)
<i>Helicobacter pylori</i>	2/59	7.9x10 ⁸ (4.0x10 ⁸ , 1.3x10 ⁹)	0/12	0	2/47	1.0x10 ⁹ (6.3x10 ⁸ , 1.6x10 ⁹)
<i>Shigella</i> spp./EIEC ^d	1/59	3.2x10 ⁸ (6.3x10 ⁷ , 2.5x10 ⁹)	1/12	2.0x10 ⁹ (1.0x10 ⁹ , 6.3x10 ⁹)	0/47	0
<i>Plesiomonas shigelloides</i>	1/59	3.2x10 ⁹ (6.3x10 ⁸ , 2.5x10 ¹⁰)	0/12	0	1/47	5.0x10 ⁹ (1.3x10 ⁹ , 3.2x10 ¹⁰)
<i>Salmonella</i> spp.	1/59	1.0x10 ⁹ (2.5x10 ⁸ ,	0/12	0	1/47	1.6x10 ⁹ (3.2x10 ⁸ ,

		6.3x10 ⁹)				7.9x10 ⁹)
<i>Yersinia enterocolitica</i>	1/59	1.6x10 ¹⁰ (3.2x10 ⁹ , 1.0x10 ¹¹)	1/12	1.0x10 ¹¹ (4.0x10 ¹¹ , 2.5x10 ¹¹)	0/47	0
norovirus (GI/II)	1/59	4.0x10 ⁸ (7.9x10 ⁷ , 3.2x10 ⁹)	0/12	0	1/47	6.3x10 ⁸ (1.3x10 ⁸ , 4.0x10 ⁹)
<i>Balantidium coli</i>	1/59	2.5x10 ⁹ (5.0x10 ⁸ , 1.6x10 ¹⁰)	0/12	0	1/47	4.0x10 ⁹ (7.9x10 ⁸ , 2.0x10 ¹⁰)
<i>Trichuris</i> spp.	1/59	1.0x10 ⁷ (1.6x10 ⁶ , 1.3x10 ⁸)	0/12	0	1/47	1.6x10 ⁷ (2.5x10 ⁶ , 1.3x10 ⁸)
^a Enteropathogenic <i>Escherichia coli</i> ^b Enteroadgregative <i>Escherichia coli</i> ^c Enterotoxigenic <i>Escherichia coli</i> ^d Enteroinvasive <i>E. coli</i> ^e Classified based on the concentration of human mitochondrial DNA (Supporting Information, Text S5) ¹⁹						

244 **Table 2.** Modeled annual pathogens prevented from release into the environment per Pit Stop in
 245 study area (within 500 m walking distance).
 246

247
 248

249 DISCUSSION

250 We detected a wide range of enteric pathogens in the fecal samples we collected, with
 251 approximately half (51%) of all samples positive for one or more of the pathogens we sought.
 252 Based on our pathogen analysis of fecal wastes and previously estimated reductions in fecal
 253 wastes on the street¹⁵, the Pit Stop intervention has likely reduced the number of pathogens
 254 released into the environment within 500 m walking distance of each new toilet facility installed.
 255 Reducing pathogen hazards in a densely populated environment can prevent disease
 256 transmission, especially for the most vulnerable population: people experiencing homelessness,
 257 particularly unsheltered people living in the study area who previously lacked accessible public
 258 sanitation and hygiene facilities.

259

260 Four out of five samples were non-human in origin, with *Giardia*, *Cryptosporidium*, and EPEC
 261 (typical) occurring only in animal stools, though each of these has zoonotic potential^{12, 29}.

262 Microscopy results also revealed a high burden of helminth infection in a presumptive canine
263 sample. Humans are not the definitive host of *Toxocara* and canine hookworm, but humans can
264 be infected by them^{30, 31}. While provision of public toilets has the potential to reduce human open
265 defecation, control of animal feces requires different interventions. Although the Pit Stop
266 intervention included animal waste bag distribution and disposal bins, further measures are
267 probably required, including public education, enforcement, environmental controls, or other
268 measures. Stray or feral animals may also contribute fecal waste. Based on our detection of a
269 range of potentially zoonotic enteric pathogens in non-human fecal waste with the potential for
270 human contact, control of animal feces should be considered in this setting^{12, 29}.

271
272 Our findings should be considered alongside some limitations and caveats. First, though we
273 tested for a range of important enteric pathogens, we selected these targets *a priori* and they are a
274 subset of pathogens that may be relevant in this context, especially considering the widespread
275 presence of non-human fecal wastes. Other potential zoonoses, including *Toxoplasma gondii*,
276 *Toxocara*, and canine hookworm may have been present and future studies should consider
277 them^{12, 29}. Second, the frequency of detection of these pathogens cannot be assumed to represent
278 prevalence of infection in any population: multiple fecal samples in the study area may well have
279 been from a single individual, and our quantitative estimations are based on a limited number of
280 samples. Third, detection of pathogen-associated nucleic acids does not and cannot indicate
281 viability or infectivity. These data cannot be used directly in assessing risk of exposure, without
282 further assumptions beyond the scope of our analysis. Fecal samples were apparently fresh when
283 sampled, but pathogens can be inactivated in the environment. Fourth, even without public
284 toilets, many discarded stools will go on to be collected and safely disposed of through street and

285 sidewalk cleaning, being effectively removed from the environment and therefore unlikely to
286 result in exposure. For this reason and others, we cannot conclude that the reduction in pathogen
287 hazards associated with feces would necessarily result in changes to human exposures, infection,
288 or disease, only that the potential exists.

289

290 Fifth, we treated non-detects on TAC as true zeroes, so our estimates might be conservative
291 given the lower limit of detection for targets using these assays (Table S3). While TAC uses the
292 same highly sensitive and specific probe-based RT-qPCR chemistry that has been widely
293 adopted for pathogen detection and quantification in both clinical and research settings across a
294 range of sample matrices, the physical constraints of the platform result in much smaller reaction
295 volumes (~1.5 μL) than for traditional tube-based approaches (20 μL – 50 μL). The reduced
296 reaction volume may negatively impact analytical sensitivity (i.e., increase the probability of
297 false negatives at low target concentrations) and likewise increase the variability of estimated
298 target quantities at lower concentrations. However, TAC has previously been shown to compare
299 favorably with traditional qPCR approaches in terms of quantification linearity as well as
300 pathogen-specific sensitivity and specificity in stool samples^{21, 23, 32}. We observed similar
301 linearity of quantification with our standard curves for all but two assays, which were excluded
302 from the analysis (Table S3), suggesting that our estimated pathogen gene copy concentrations in
303 positive samples were sufficiently reliable for the purposes of parametrizing the log-normal
304 pathogen concentration distributions (which operate on the scale of order-of-magnitude
305 differences in pathogen quantity) we employed in our stochastic models.

306

307 Finally, in our quantitative model estimating pathogen reductions attributable to the Pit Stop
308 intervention, we assumed that our stool samples (their pathogen content over time, and
309 human/animal origin) are representative of the fecal wastes reduced due to public toilet
310 construction. This may or may not be the case. Our samples were from a narrow window in time,
311 when some pathogens may be more prevalent than others, and this may not be representative of
312 what is being shed over time in the populations contributing fecal wastes to the streets in our
313 study area. We assumed a mean reduction of 18 instances of OD within 500 meters of newly
314 installed Pit Stop locations¹⁵ in our study area, per week, throughout the modeled period of one
315 year based on six months of observational data. We first estimated reductions in pathogen
316 hazards assuming all contained waste was of human origin, given the Pit Stop's primary
317 ostensible role in serving people. We also estimated hazard reductions based on enteric pathogen
318 quantification across all samples, which from our collection effort were determined to be 20%
319 human origin and 80% animal origin. The Pit Stop interventions included both toilet facilities as
320 well as bags and bins for animal waste control, so both types of stools could plausibly be reduced
321 in the immediate surroundings. We observed differences between pathogens detected according
322 to presumptive human versus animal sources, with some pathogens appearing in only human
323 stools and others occurring in non-human stool only. For example, *Helicobacter pylori* and
324 *Shigella*/EIEC were detected only in presumptively human stools.

325
326 Clean water, safe sanitation, and adequate hygiene are not universal in American cities^{2, 33, 34},
327 with gaps most apparent among those experiencing homelessness^{2, 7}. San Francisco deserves
328 credit for proactively working to solve this problem, which is not inexpensive^{14, 15} and can be
329 politically contentious as cities grapple with the growing crisis of homelessness. Water and

330 sanitation are human rights³⁵ that are essential to living a dignified life. Construction of publicly
331 accessible, safe toilets is a commonsense approach to reducing enteric pathogen hazards in
332 cities⁹, though the primary reason to continue to invest in public sanitation facilities is to support
333 the physical, mental, and social well-being of people – much of which is difficult or impossible
334 to measure in practice – and because it is the right and humane thing to do. Moreover, sanitation
335 is a biological necessity that is needed wherever people live. The waste must go somewhere: an
336 adult weighing 80 kg (near the mean body mass in North America) will produce an average of
337 approximately 38 kg of feces per year^{36, 37}, 100% of which should be effectively and safely
338 managed to protect all members of the community from infectious disease. Cities should also
339 consider interventions aimed at reducing animal feces, which are an underappreciated source of
340 enteric pathogen hazards in urban spaces. Our findings demonstrate that a wide range of
341 pathogens with zoonotic potential may be present in discarded animal waste, with uncertain
342 implications for human exposure and disease transmission.

343

344

345 REFERENCES

- 346 1. Fazel, S.; Geddes, J. R.; Kushel, M., The health of homeless people in high-income countries:
347 descriptive epidemiology, health consequences, and clinical and policy recommendations. *Lancet* **2014**,
348 *384*, (9953), 1529-40.
- 349 2. Capone, D.; Cumming, O.; Nichols, D.; Brown, J., Water and Sanitation in Urban America, 2017–
350 2019. *American Journal of Public Health* **2020**, *110*, (10), 1567-1572.
- 351 3. Yin, S.; Barker, L.; Ly, K. N.; Kilmer, G.; Foster, M. A.; Drobeniuc, J.; Jiles, R. B., Susceptibility to
352 Hepatitis A Virus Infection in the United States, 2007-2016. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**, *71*, (10), e571-e579.
- 353 4. Liu, C. Y.; Chai, S. J.; Watt, J. P., Communicable disease among people experiencing
354 homelessness in California. *Epidemiol Infect* **2020**, *148*, e85.
- 355 5. Park, Y. S.; Bliss, D. Z., Availability of Public Toilets in Parks and Recreational Sites in Selected US
356 Cities. *Journal of Wound Ostomy & Continence Nursing* **2019**, *46*, (3), 235-239.
- 357 6. Bartram, J.; Cairncross, S., Hygiene, sanitation, and water: forgotten foundations of health. *PLoS*
358 *Med* **2010**, *7*, (11), e1000367.

- 359 7. Capone, D.; Ferguson, A.; Gribble, M. O.; Brown, J., Open Defecation Sites, Unmet Sanitation
360 Needs, and Potential Sanitary Risks in Atlanta, Georgia, 2017–2018. *American Journal of Public Health*
361 **2018**, *108*, (9), 1238-1240.
- 362 8. Frye, E. A., Capone, D., and Evans, D.P., Open Defecation in the United States: Perspectives from
363 the Streets. *Environmental Justice* **2019**, *12*, (5), 226-230.
- 364 9. Moreira, F. D.; Rezende, S.; Passos, F., On-street toilets for sanitation access in urban public
365 spaces: A systematic review. *Utilities Policy* **2021**, *70*, 101186.
- 366 10. Brown, J.; Cairncross, S.; Ensink, J. H., Water, sanitation, hygiene and enteric infections in
367 children. *Arch Dis Child* **2013**, *98*, (8), 629-34.
- 368 11. Ginn, O.; Rocha-Melogno, L.; Bivins, A.; Lowry, S.; Cardelino, M.; Nichols, D.; Tripathi, S. N.; Soria,
369 F.; Andrade, M.; Bergin, M.; Deshusses, M. A.; Brown, J., Detection and Quantification of Enteric
370 Pathogens in Aerosols Near Open Wastewater Canals in Cities with Poor Sanitation. *Environ Sci Technol*
371 **2021**, *55*, (21), 14758-14771.
- 372 12. Penakalapati, G.; Swarthout, J.; Delahoy, M. J.; McAliley, L.; Wodnik, B.; Levy, K.; Freeman, M. C.,
373 Exposure to Animal Feces and Human Health: A Systematic Review and Proposed Research Priorities.
374 *Environ Sci Technol* **2017**, *51*, (20), 11537-11552.
- 375 13. Wagner, E. G.; Lanoix, J. N., Excreta disposal for rural areas and small communities. *Monogr Ser*
376 *World Health Organ* **1958**, *39*, 1-182.
- 377 14. Rezal, A., Poop complaints have swelled in all San Francisco neighborhoods — except this one.
378 *San Francisco Chronicle* 23 August 2022, 2022.
- 379 15. Amato, H. K.; Martin, D.; Hoover, C. M.; Graham, J. P., Somewhere to go: assessing the impact of
380 public restroom interventions on reports of open defecation in San Francisco, California from 2014 to
381 2020. *BMC Public Health* **2022**, *22*, (1), 1673.
- 382 16. Research, A. S. *San Francisco Homeless Count & Survey Comprehensive Report*;
383 www.appliedsurveyresearch.org: San Jose, California, 2019; p 76 pages.
- 384 17. Capone, D.; Berendes, D.; Cumming, O.; Knee, J.; Nalá, R.; Risk, B. B.; Stauber, C.; Zhu, K.; Brown,
385 J., Analysis of Fecal Sludges Reveals Common Enteric Pathogens in Urban Maputo, Mozambique.
386 *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* **2020**, *7*, (12), 889-895.
- 387 18. Knee, J.; Sumner, T.; Adriano, Z.; Anderson, C.; Bush, F.; Capone, D.; Casmo, V.; Holcomb, D.;
388 Kolsky, P.; MacDougall, A.; Molotkova, E.; Braga, J. M.; Russo, C.; Schmidt, W. P.; Stewart, J.; Zambrana,
389 W.; Zuin, V.; Nalá, R.; Cumming, O.; Brown, J., Effects of an urban sanitation intervention on childhood
390 enteric infection and diarrhea in Maputo, Mozambique: A controlled before-and-after trial. *eLife* **2021**,
391 *10*, e62278.
- 392 19. Zhu, K.; Suttner, B.; Pickering, A.; Konstantinidis, K. T.; Brown, J., A novel droplet digital PCR
393 human mtDNA assay for fecal source tracking. *Water Res* **2020**, *183*, 116085.
- 394 20. Borchardt, M. A.; Boehm, A. B.; Salit, M.; Spencer, S. K.; Wigginton, K. R.; Noble, R. T., The
395 Environmental Microbiology Minimum Information (EMMI) Guidelines: qPCR and dPCR Quality and
396 Reporting for Environmental Microbiology. *Environmental Science & Technology* **2021**, *55*, (15), 10210-
397 10223.
- 398 21. Lappan, R.; Henry, R.; Chown, S. L.; Luby, S. P.; Higginson, E. E.; Bata, L.; Jirapanjwat, T.; Schang,
399 C.; Openshaw, J. J.; O'Toole, J.; Lin, A.; Tela, A.; Turagabeci, A.; Wong, T. H. F.; French, M. A.; Brown, R.
400 R.; Leder, K.; Greening, C.; McCarthy, D., Monitoring of diverse enteric pathogens across environmental
401 and host reservoirs with TaqMan array cards and standard qPCR: a methodological comparison study.
402 *Lancet Planet Health* **2021**, *5*, (5), e297-e308.
- 403 22. Lappan, R.; Jirapanjwat, T.; Williamson, D. A.; Lange, S.; Chown, S. L.; Greening, C.,
404 Simultaneous detection of multiple pathogens with the TaqMan Array Card. *MethodsX* **2022**, *9*, 101707.
- 405 23. Liu, J.; Gratz, J.; Amour, C.; Nshama, R.; Walongo, T.; Maro, A.; Mduma, E.; Platts-Mills, J.;
406 Boisen, N.; Nataro, J.; Haverstick, D. M.; Kabir, F.; Lertsethtakarn, P.; Silapong, S.; Jeamwattanalert, P.;

- 407 Bodhidatta, L.; Mason, C.; Begum, S.; Haque, R.; Praharaj, I.; Kang, G.; Houpt, E. R., Optimization of
408 Quantitative PCR Methods for Enteropathogen Detection. *PLOS ONE* **2016**, *11*, (6), e0158199.
- 409 24. Team, R. C., R: A language and environment for statistical computing (Version 4.0. 5)[Computer
410 software]. *R Foundation for Statistical Computing* **2021**.
- 411 25. Delignette-Muller, M. L.; Dutang, C., fitdistrplus: An R Package for Fitting Distributions. *Journal*
412 *of Statistical Software* **2015**, *64*, (4), 1 - 34.
- 413 26. Cummings, J. H.; Bingham, S. A.; Heaton, K. W.; Eastwood, M. A., Fecal weight, colon cancer risk,
414 and dietary intake of nonstarch polysaccharides (dietary fiber). *Gastroenterology* **1992**, *103*, (6), 1783-9.
- 415 27. Corless, C. E.; Guiver, M.; Borrow, R.; Edwards-Jones, V.; Kaczmarek, E. B.; Fox, A. J.,
416 Contamination and sensitivity issues with a real-time universal 16S rRNA PCR. *J Clin Microbiol* **2000**, *38*,
417 (5), 1747-52.
- 418 28. Philipp, S.; Huemer, H. P.; Irschick, E. U.; Gassner, C., Obstacles of Multiplex Real-Time PCR for
419 Bacterial 16S rDNA: Primer Specificity and DNA Decontamination of Taq Polymerase. *Transfus Med*
420 *Hemother* **2010**, *37*, (1), 21-28.
- 421 29. Prendergast, A. J.; Gharpure, R.; Mor, S.; Viney, M.; Dube, K.; Lello, J.; Berger, C.; Siwila, J.;
422 Joyeux, M.; Hodobo, T.; Hurt, L.; Brown, T.; Hoto, P.; Tavengwa, N.; Mutasa, K.; Craddock, S.; Chasekwa,
423 B.; Robertson, R. C.; Evans, C.; Chidhanguro, D.; Mutasa, B.; Majo, F.; Smith, L. E.; Hirai, M.; Ntozini, R.;
424 Humphrey, J. H.; Berendes, D., Putting the "A" into WaSH: a call for integrated management of water,
425 animals, sanitation, and hygiene. *Lancet Planet Health* **2019**, *3*, (8), e336-e337.
- 426 30. Borg, O. A.; Woodruff, A. W., Prevalence of infective ova of *Toxocara* species in public places. *Br*
427 *Med J* **1973**, *4*, (5890), 470-2.
- 428 31. Woodruff, A. W., Toxocariasis. *British Medical Journal* **1970**, *3*, (5724), 663-669.
- 429 32. Liu, J.; Gratz, J.; Amour, C.; Kibiki, G.; Becker, S.; Janaki, L.; Verweij, J. J.; Taniuchi, M.; Sobuz, S.
430 U.; Haque, R.; Haverstick, D. M.; Houpt, E. R., A laboratory-developed TaqMan Array Card for
431 simultaneous detection of 19 enteropathogens. *J Clin Microbiol* **2013**, *51*, (2), 472-80.
- 432 33. Mueller, J. T.; Gasteyer, S., The widespread and unjust drinking water and clean water crisis in
433 the United States. *Nature Communications* **2021**, *12*, (1), 3544.
- 434 34. Meehan, K.; Jurjevich, J. R.; Chun, N. M. J. W.; Sherrill, J., Geographies of insecure water access
435 and the housing–water nexus in US cities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
436 **2020**, *117*, (46), 28700-28707.
- 437 35. Nations, U., The Human Rights to Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation: Resolution In Council, H.
438 R., Ed. UN General Assembly: 2018.
- 439 36. Berendes, D. M.; Yang, P. J.; Lai, A.; Hu, D.; Brown, J., Estimation of global recoverable human
440 and animal faecal biomass. *Nature Sustainability* **2018**, *1*, (11), 679-685.
- 441 37. Yang, P. J.; LaMarca, M.; Kaminski, C.; Chu, D. I.; Hu, D. L., Hydrodynamics of defecation. *Soft*
442 *Matter* **2017**, *13*, (29), 4960-4970.
- 443