

1 **Detection of Hemagglutinin H5 influenza A virus RNA and model of potential**
2 **inputs in an urban California sewershed**

3
4 Abigail P. Paulos¹, Stephen P. Hilton¹, Bridgette Shelden², Dorothea Duong²,
5 Alexandria B. Boehm³, Marlene K. Wolfe^{1*}

6
7 ¹ Gangarosa Department of Environmental Health, Rollins School of Public Health,
8 Emory University, 1518 Clifton Road, Atlanta, Georgia 30322, United States

9 ² Verily Life Sciences LLC, South San Francisco, California 94080, United States


10 ³ Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, 473 Via
11 Ortega, Stanford, California 94305, United States

12
13 * Author to whom correspondence should be addressed: marlene.wolfe@emory.edu

14
15 **TOC figure**

16

Influenza A H5 in wastewater



17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Abstract**

24 In 2024, the highly pathogenic avian influenza A H5N1 caused outbreaks in wild birds,
25 poultry, cows, and other mammals in the United States with 61 human cases also
26 reported by the CDC. Detection of influenza A H5 RNA in wastewater has been
27 previously reported in sewersheds in Texas and North Carolina with nearby impacted
28 dairy herds following the emergence of H5N1 in dairy cows. Here, we conduct
29 retrospective testing of total influenza A and H5 hemagglutinin genes in wastewater as
30 well presenting and applying new assays for detection of H1 and H3 genes across a
31 respiratory virus season in an urban California sewershed from September 2023 – May
32 2024. Total influenza A, H1, and H3 were regularly detected, while H5 was first detected
33 in March. We developed a model that uses Monte Carlo simulations and previously
34 published parameters to estimate numbers of infected people, poultry, wild birds, or
35 liters of H5-contaminated milk required to result in measured H5 concentrations in
36 wastewater. Our findings demonstrate that in this California sewershed, contaminated
37 milk or infected poultry were the most likely sources of H5 to wastewater. We created a
38 publicly available tool to apply the H5 input model in other sewersheds estimate
39 required inputs.

41 **Synopsis**

42 We developed a model to understand potential sources of influenza A H5 RNA in
43 wastewater, enabling interpretation of H5 RNA wastewater detections.

45 **Introduction**

46 Approximately 3-11% of the population in the United States is infected with influenza
47 virus each year, and Influenza A virus (IAV) is responsible for the majority of these
48 infections.¹ In recent years, wastewater monitoring of infectious diseases has emerged
49 as a powerful tool for tracking trends in disease incidence in the community. Previous
50 research has found that concentrations of total IAV genomic RNA in wastewater track
51 closely with occurrence of infections in the contributing community.²⁻⁵ IAV has subtypes
52 that are classified by both hemagglutinin (H) and neuraminidase (N) proteins.⁶ The H1
53 and H3 subtypes are most common in humans and swine, while many subtypes,
54 including H1, H3, H5, H7, H9, and H10, are common in avian populations.⁷ Given that
55 levels of total IAV (measurements that include all H subtypes) in wastewater have been
56 closely correlated with human disease, and municipal wastewater primarily consists of
57 anthropogenic inputs, the predominant source of IAV RNA in wastewater has thus far
58 been considered to be human.

60 The highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) A (H5N1) outbreak in birds began in the
61 United States in February 2022 and has resulted in the deaths of millions of poultry and
62 wild fowls.⁸ This outbreak in poultry has prompted concerns about increased spillover

63 into humans and the possibility of future human to human transmission, as humans
64 sporadically infected with H5N1 have experienced severe symptoms and high mortality
65 in the past.⁹ Other animal influenza strains have jumped from animal populations to
66 humans through mutations, adaptation, or reassortment events with human influenzas,
67 resulting in epidemics and pandemics.^{10,11} This concern has grown as outbreaks of
68 unknown illness in cattle in March 2024 were identified as infections caused by H5N1
69 later that month. Between March 1 and December 19, 2024, 865 infected dairy cow
70 herds and 61 human cases were reported in 16 states.¹² Human cases of H5N1 were
71 reported mostly among those who worked in close proximity to dairy cows and poultry;
72 human-to-human transmission has not been reported or suspected in any of the known
73 cases.¹³⁻¹⁵

74
75 Beginning in March 2024 and concurrent with cattle outbreaks, we detected the H5 IAV
76 subtype genomic RNA (hereafter, H5 RNA) in wastewater in multiple sites across the
77 United States.¹⁶ Prior to the H5N1 outbreaks in cattle, contributions to wastewater from
78 animals infected with H5N1 (such as poultry) were expected to be minimal. However,
79 cows infected with H5N1 shed the virus in milk, and IAV RNA has been detected both in
80 raw milk and in pasteurized milk available on store shelves.^{17,18} Because of the food
81 chain, a substantial amount of milk products enter sewers; it is estimated that 12% of
82 milk available for sale is wasted at retailers and 20% by consumers after purchase.¹⁹
83 Milk is commonly provided with breakfast and lunch to students at schools, and much of
84 this milk is wasted as well. Studies report that 45% of milk was wasted at kindergarten
85 and pre-kindergarten lunches,²⁰ and 13% by high school students.²¹ This wasted milk
86 may be disposed of down the drain, entering sewer systems and contributing detectable
87 viral RNA to wastewater. Food industries are also often permitted to dispose of waste
88 generated while processing dairy products into sewer systems. Contributions to
89 wastewater from birds are less likely because of the lack of connection between wild
90 bird habitats and domestic flocks to municipal sewer systems. However, wastewater
91 sewer systems that accept stormflow (“combined sewers”) are less common but may
92 receive fecal waste from wildfowl and other wild birds that mixes with runoff and enters
93 sewer systems. Both poultry and wildfowl can shed IAV in their feces when infected.^{22,23}
94 Wastewater treatment plants with open-air settling tanks, or that accept waste from
95 industries that generate standing water, may be susceptible to inputs of bird feces.
96 Therefore, we conclude that any one of cow’s milk, poultry feces, wildfowl feces, or
97 human contributions are the most likely sources of H5 in wastewater.

98
99 In this study, we present findings from retrospective testing of wastewater solids for total
100 IAV and H1, H3, and H5 IAV subtype RNA from September 2023 - May 2024 in a
101 publicly owned treatment work (POTW) in California. We also present findings from a
102 model developed to estimate the theoretical contributions of humans, cow milk, wildfowl

103 feces, and poultry feces to the wastewater system necessary to result in the observed
104 H5 RNA concentrations. Our objectives were to 1) identify the timing of the first H5
105 detection in the sewershed during a period with circulating human influenza and 2)
106 develop and implement a model of theoretical sources of H5 into the wastewater system
107 to contextualize our findings.

108

109 **Methods**

110 ***H1 and H3 Assay Design***

111 IAV H1 and H3 subtype genome sequences were downloaded from the National Center
112 for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) in January 2023 (H1 genomes) and December
113 2022 (H3 genomes) and supplemented with additional newer sequences available from
114 NCBI and GISAID in April 2024. Sequences were aligned, and primers and probes were
115 designed to target the hemagglutinin (HA) gene using Primer3Plus. Parameters used in
116 assay development (e.g., sequence length and GC content) are provided elsewhere.²⁴
117 The primers and probes (Table S1) were confirmed to be specific and sensitive for
118 influenza A containing the H1 and H3 subtypes of the HA gene *in silico* using NCBI
119 BLAST.

120

121 The H1 and H3 assays were tested *in vitro* against nucleic acids from a large collection
122 of respiratory pathogens including different influenza subtypes (Table S2). Nucleic acids
123 from these panels were extracted and purified as described below for wastewater solids
124 samples, then used as template in droplet digital RT-PCR assays. The panels were run
125 in a single well using the same ddPCR methods described below and elsewhere.^{16,24}

126

127 ***IAV M gene and H5 assays***

128 The H5 assay used has been described in detail elsewhere,¹⁶ as has the M gene
129 assay.²⁴ See the Supporting Information for information on primers, probes, and positive
130 control material. The influenza M gene assay detects all IAV subtypes and hereafter,
131 measurements made using the M gene assay will be interpreted as “total IAV RNA”.

132

133 ***Retrospective analysis of samples***

134 Biobanked nucleic-acid extracts obtained from wastewater solids samples collected
135 between September 1, 2023 and May 13, 2024 from a POTW (Southeast San
136 Francisco) were retrospectively analyzed for total IAV (M gene), H1, H3, and H5 (n=110
137 samples). Nucleic-acids were stored between 1 and 10 months at -80°C before
138 analysis. Samples consisted of grab samples of settled solids from the primary clarifier.
139 Samples were collected using sterile methods and stored at 4°C prior to nucleic-acid
140 extraction. The POTW is located in an urban area and serves 750,000 people, and
141 services a geographic area with combined stormwater and sanitary sewer systems


142 meaning that stormwater and urban dry weather runoff (generated via irrigation or car
143 washing, for example) may enter the POTW.

144
145 Sample processing methods are described in detail elsewhere.²⁴⁻²⁶ Briefly, nucleic acids
146 were extracted from the solid fraction of each sample using the Chemagic Viral
147 DNA/RNA 300 Kit H96 (PerkinElmer, Shelton, CT) followed by inhibition removal (Zymo
148 OneStep PCR Inhibitor Removal Kit, Irvine, CA).²⁵ Nucleic-acid extraction occurred
149 immediately within 24 h of sample collection. Between 0.5-1g of the dewatered solids
150 were dried at 110°C for 19-24 h to determine the dry weight. Concentrations of total IAV
151 (M gene), H1, H3, and H5 RNA were measured in multiplex using droplet digital 1-step
152 RT-PCR (dd-RT-PCR) run on an AutoDG Automated Droplet Generator (Bio-Rad,
153 Hercules, CA), Mastercycler Pro (Eppendorf, Enfield, CT) thermocycler, and a QX600
154 Droplet Reader (Bio-Rad). Ten ddPCR replicates were run for each sample. Only wells
155 with over 10,000 droplets were included; all wells met this criterion. Extraction and PCR
156 positive and negative controls were run on each 96-well plate. Positive controls
157 consisted of Twist synthetic controls (M gene, H1, H3) and custom gene blocks (H5;
158 IDT); see the SI for full details. Negative controls consisted of no template controls
159 (NTC) containing nuclease free water. Bovine coronavirus (BCoV) was spiked into
160 samples and measured as an internal control, and pepper mild mottle virus (PMMoV)
161 was measured using ddPCR as an endogenous internal control. We used the
162 QuantaSoft Analysis Pro software (Bio-Rad) to threshold droplets, and a sample had to
163 have 3 or more positive droplets to be considered positive. Three positive droplets
164 corresponds to a concentration between 500-1000 copies/g. Values were converted to
165 gene copies/dry g using dimensional analysis. See the SI for reaction chemistry and
166 cycling parameters.

167
168 ***Model of theoretical inputs***

169 We developed a model to estimate the H5 RNA inputs into the system that would be
170 required to result in the measured H5 RNA concentrations in wastewater solids. We
171 considered inputs from humans, cow milk, poultry feces, and waterfowl feces, as each
172 input type had a plausible mechanism for entering wastewater. We note that these
173 inputs may enter wastewater in a number of ways, including from household uses,
174 businesses, industrial discharges, and, in some cases, environmental sources.

175



176
177 **Figure 1.** Conceptual image of sources of H5N1 to the POTW.
178

179 *Mass Balance*

180 We assume that the concentrations measured in wastewater relate to inputs from
181 humans, birds, and cow's milk according to the following equation:

182
183 where F_{H5} indicates the daily flux of H5 RNA (gene copies/day) through the POTW
184 and F_H , F_P , F_W , and F_M indicate the daily contribution (gene
185 copies/day) of humans, poultry, wild birds, and milk, respectively, to the POTW.
186

187 *Calculations of daily H5 wastewater fluxes,*

188 We assume that both the liquid and solid portions of wastewater contain H5 RNA when
189 detected in solids and calculate total H5 RNA content across both phases. The
190 concentration in liquids is calculated using the Freundlich isotherm:²⁷

191 where C_L indicates the H5 RNA concentration in liquids (gene copies/mL), C_S indicates
192 the H5 RNA concentration in solids (gene copies/dry gram), and K indicates the
193 Freundlich partitioning coefficient (mL/dry gram).
194

195 Total daily H5 RNA flux through the POTW (gene copies/day) is calculated as the sum
196 of H5 RNA in solids (gene copies/day) and in liquids (gene copies/day). We obtain the
197 daily flow rate (in millions of gallons per day) and total suspended solids (TSS; mg/L)

198 from the POTW for each day. The total daily flux of solids through the POTW is
199 calculated as:

$$M_s = \frac{F_{L_{day}} \times TSS}{10^3} \#3$$

200 where $F_{L_{day}}$ is the daily flow rate in terms of L/day, TSS is the total suspended solids
201 (mg/L), and the 10^3 factor is to convert from mg/day to g/day. The daily flux of H5 RNA
202 in the solids (gene copies/day) is calculated by:

$$H5_s = M_s \times C_s \#4$$

203

204 The daily flux of H5 RNA in the liquids (gene copies/day) is calculated by:

$$H5_l = F_{L_{day}} \times C_l \#5$$

205

206 The total daily flux of H5 RNA through the POTW (gene copies/day) is calculated by:

$$F_{wwtp,d} = H5_s + H5_l \#6$$

207 *Human inputs*

208 We consider human contributions to the POTW from saliva, sputum, and feces, such
209 that:

$$F_{human,d} = N_{human,d} \times (C_f \times V_f \times FS_f + C_{sp} \times V_{sp} \times FS_{sp} + C_{sal} \times V_{sal} \times FS_{sal}) \#7$$

210 where N indicates the number of infected people contributing to wastewater, C indicates
211 concentration in that excretion type (gene copies per mL or per g), V indicates volume
212 of that excretion type entering the wastewater system per day per person (mL or g), and
213 FS indicates the fraction of infected persons shedding influenza by that route (unitless).
214 F refers to feces, sp refers to sputum, and sal refers to saliva.

215

216 Assuming no contribution to the POTW from birds or milk, we can simplify Eq. 1 to:

$$F_{wwtp,d} = F_{human,d} \#8$$

217

218 and, plugging in Eq. 7:

$$F_{wwtp,d} = N_{human,d} \times (C_f \times V_f \times FS_f + C_{sp} \times V_{sp} \times FS_{sp} + C_{sal} \times V_{sal} \times FS_{sal}) \#9$$

219

220 Rearranging to solve for the number of infected individuals (N):

$$N_{human,d} = \frac{F_{wwtp,d}}{C_f \times V_f \times FS_f + C_{sp} \times V_{sp} \times FS_{sp} + C_{sal} \times V_{sal} \times FS_{sal}} \#10$$

221

222 *Poultry inputs*

223 We consider inputs from poultry to the POTW through feces:

$$F_{poultry,d} = N_{poultry,d} \times (C_{CS} \times CF_{SG} \times V_f) \#11$$

224

225 Where C_{CS} indicates the concentration of influenza reported in cloacal swabs collected
226 from domestic poultry (gene copies/swab), CF_{SG} indicates a conversion factor from

227 concentration/swab to concentration/g (swab/gram), and V_f indicates the volume of
228 feces produced by birds per day (grams).

229

230 Assuming no contribution to the POTW from humans or milk, we can simplify Eq. 1 to:

$$F_{wwtp,d} = F_{poultry,d} \#12$$

231 and, plugging in Eq. 11:

$$F_{wwtp,d} = N_{poultry,d} \times (C_{CS} \times CF_{SG} \times V_f) \#13$$

232

233 Rearranging to solve for the number of infected birds (N):

234

$$N_{poultry,d} = \frac{F_{wwtp,d}}{C_{CS} \times CF_{SG} \times V_f} \#14$$

236

237 *Wild bird inputs*

238 We consider inputs from wild birds to the POTW through feces:

$$F_{bird,d} = N_{bird,d} \times (C_{CS} \times CF_{SG} \times V_f) \#15$$

239

240 Where C_{CS} indicates the concentration of influenza reported in cloacal swabs collected
241 from domestic poultry (gene copies/swab), CF_{SG} indicates a conversion factor from
242 concentration/swab to concentration/g (swab/gram), and V_f indicates the volume of
243 feces produced by birds per day (grams).

244

245 Assuming no contribution to the POTW from humans or milk, we can simplify Eq. 1 to:

$$F_{wwtp,d} = F_{bird,d} \#16$$

246 and, plugging in Eq. 15:

$$F_{wwtp,d} = N_{bird,d} \times (C_{CS} \times CF_{SG} \times V_f) \#17$$

247

248 Rearranging to solve for the number of infected birds (N):

249

$$N_{bird,d} = \frac{F_{wwtp,d}}{C_{CS} \times CF_{SG} \times V_f} \#18$$

250

251 *Cow milk inputs*

252 We estimate the daily flux of H5 RNA from cow milk (gene copies/day) by:

253

$$F_{milk,d} = C_{MILK} \times V_{MILK} \times CF_{milk} \#19$$

254

255 where C_{MILK} refers to the H5 concentration in cow's milk, V_{MILK} indicates the volume of
256 milk entering the wastewater system per day, and CF_{milk} is a conversion factor from the
257 EID50/mL units C_{MILK} is reported in to gene copies/mL units.

258
 259 Assuming no contribution to the POTW from humans or birds, we can simplify Eq. 1 to:

$$F_{wwtp,d} = F_{milk,d} \quad \#20$$

260 and, plugging in Eq. 19:

$$F_{wwtp,d} = C_{MILK} \times V_{MILK} \times CF_{milk} \quad \#21$$

261 Rearranging to solve for the daily volume of infected milk entering the POTW:

$$V_{MILK} = \frac{F_{wwtp,d}}{C_{MILK} \times CF_{milk}} \quad \#22$$

262
 263 *Data Sources*

264 Using previously published systematic reviews and parameters on daily human waste
 265 input into the system, we identified a distribution of human IAV shedding into
 266 wastewater per day per infected individual (**Table 1**).^{28,29} For cow milk, we identified a
 267 distribution of H5N1 RNA per gallon of pasteurized milk using published reports on
 268 H5N1 EID50 content in pasteurized cow milk^{17,18} and a conversion from EID50 to RNA
 269 gene copies.³⁰ Distributions of daily H5 RNA shedding in the feces of poultry and
 270 waterfowl were separately estimated from studies reporting IAV shedding in each bird
 271 type (**Table S4**).^{22,23} Blue-winged teal were used as the model species for wild birds,
 272 per Humphreys *et al.*³¹ Raw data for empirical distributions are provided in the Stanford
 273 Digital Repository (<https://purl.stanford.edu/ks454rq5640>).

274
 275 **Table 1.** Model parameters for human wastewater inputs

Category	Parameter	Unit	Distribution	Parameters	Reference
HUMANS					
<i>HUMAN WASTEWATER INPUTS</i>					
Sputum	mL sputum produced to sewer per person	mL / day	Uniform	min = 0.1, max = 1	29
Saliva	tooth brushing events/day	Tooth brushing events/day	Discrete	[(0,0.02),(1,0.29),(2,0.55),(3+,0.14)]	29
Saliva	mL saliva to sewer per tooth brushing event	mL/Tooth brushing event	Point	1	29
Stool	stool production per day per person	Log g/day	Truncated Log Normal	meanlog = 4.763, sdlog=0.471, min=0, max=520	29

Urine	urine production per day per person	L/day	Gamma	α (shape)=5.315, β (scale)=0.25, and a (positive) offset Δ of 0.5	29
HUMAN SHEDDING					
Sputum	gene copies of influenza in sputum	gc / mL	Empirical		28
Saliva	gene copies of influenza in saliva	gc / mL	Empirical		assume equivalent to sputum shedding, per findings by Crank <i>et al</i> for SARS-CoV-2 ²⁹
Stool	gene copies of influenza in stool	gc / g	Empirical		32–35
Urine	gene copies of influenza in urine	gc / mL	Point	0	assumption
HUMAN FRACTIONAL SHEDDING					
Sputum	fraction of infected people shedding influenza in sputum	unitless	Uniform	min = 0.73, max = 1	Calculated from data in Lowry, Wolfe, & Boehm ²⁸
Saliva	fraction of infected people shedding influenza in saliva	unitless	Uniform	min = 0.85, max = 1	Calculated from data in Lowry <i>et al.</i> ²⁸
Stool	fraction of infected people shedding influenza in stool	unitless	Truncated normal	mean = 0.40, sd = 0.21; min = 0, max = 1	Calculated from data in Lowry <i>et al.</i> ²⁸
Urine	fraction of infected people shedding influenza in urine	unitless	Uniform	min = 0.05, max = 1	Assumption based on Lowry <i>et al.</i> ²⁸

COW MILK					
milk	H5 concentration in commercial (pasteurized) milk	log10 EID50 / mL	Truncated lognormal	Mean = 5.93, sd = 2.63, min = 0, max = 2.5×10^5	Calculated from ^{17,18}
milk	conversion from EID50 to gc	gc / EID50	Uniform	Min = 10, max = 25	³⁰
milk	conversion from mL to gallons	mL/gallon	Point	3785.41253	constant
POULTRY AND WILD BIRDS					
poultry	H5 concentration , cloacal swabs	Log10 gc / swab	Log10 normal	mean = 4.6, sd = 1.6	Extracted from Fig 3 for chickens ²³
waterfowl	H5 concentration , cloacal swabs	Log10 gc / swab	Log10 normal	mean = 3.68, sd = 1.0	²²
both	mass feces per cloacal swab	g / swab	Uniform	min = 0.05, max = 0.2	assumption
both	conversion factor - swab to g	swab / g	Point	1 / mass_feces_cloacal_swab	Conversion factor
poultry	daily amount of bird poop / bird, g	g / day	Uniform	min = 130, max = 184	assumption from values in Tanczuk <i>et al</i> ³⁶

waterfowl	daily amount of bird poop / bird, g	g / day	Uniform	min = 5.7, max = 8.7	Calculated from ³⁷
both	fractional shedding	unitless	Point	1	assumption

276
 277 To estimate the total daily H5 RNA for the POTW, we calculated total solids and total
 278 liquids at the POTW per day using the flow rate and total suspended solids (TSS)
 279 reported by the POTW. We assumed homogeneity in both solids and liquids, meaning
 280 that the quantity of H5 RNA measured in the solids sample is the same throughout all
 281 solids passing through the system. The H5 RNA concentration in liquids was estimated
 282 from the solids using the partitioning coefficient of IAV RNA in wastewater and the
 283 adsorption intensity (**Table 2**).²⁷ We summed the total H5 RNA in solids and total H5
 284 RNA in liquids to calculate the total H5 RNA at the POTW per day.

285
 286 **Table 2.** Wastewater model input parameters

Category	Parameter	Unit	Distribution	Parameters	Reference
wastewater	solid-liquid partitioning coefficient	mL / g	Empirical		²⁷
wastewater	Adsorption intensity	unitless	Uniform	min = 0.7, max = 1.9	²⁷

287
 288 Raw data were fit to distributions using the *fitdistr* package in R. For each parameter,
 289 we first used the *descdist* function to create a Cullen and Fray graph, which plots the
 290 square of skewness against kurtosis. The value from the observed data is plotted, as
 291 are the locations of theoretical distributions. Whichever theoretical distribution the
 292 observation is plotted nearest is selected as the distribution type, with the beta
 293 distribution being the lowest priority (meaning if the observation is near normal, uniform,
 294 exponential, or logistic, while still being located within the beta region, the other non-
 295 beta distribution is selected). After selecting a distribution type, data were fitted to the
 296 distribution using the *fitdistr* package and distribution parameters were extracted.

297
 298 *Model Approach*

299 In the models, we assumed that the measured H5 RNA in wastewater originated
 300 entirely from one of the four input types and then independently calculated (1) the
 301 number of infected humans in the sewershed, (2) the liters of milk input into the sewer,

302 (3) the number of poultry contributing feces to the sewer, and (4) the number of
303 waterfowl contributing feces to the sewer that would be required to result in the
304 measured H5 concentration. By looking at each source independently, we can estimate
305 an upper bound on the number of infected individuals or IAV-impacted liters of milk that
306 could be contributing to the system. To assess variability in our parameter estimates,
307 we conducted Monte Carlo simulations using $n=10,000$ iterations. For each iteration, we
308 randomly selected a value from each parameter's distribution and conducted the
309 calculations. Presented throughout are the median and interquartile range (25th - 75th
310 percentile) from these simulations. Due to the limited data available for our
311 assumptions, we are reporting order of magnitude results.

312

313 *Sensitivity Analysis*

314 We use a previously-published method to conduct a sensitivity analysis to determine
315 which parameters the model is most sensitive to.^{38,39} The model is run with the
316 parameter first set to its 25th percentile (p25) then set to the 75th percentile (p75) while
317 all other parameters are set to their median value. We calculate the ratio between the
318 model output for p75/p25. A p75:p25 ratio of 1 indicates that the model is not sensitive
319 to the parameter, while a ratio above or below indicates the model is sensitive to that
320 parameter. For ratios below 1, we calculated the inverse ($1/p75:p25$) so that all ratios
321 are presented on a comparable scale.

322

323 *Shiny Application*

324 We developed an application using the R Shiny package to make the model available
325 for public use. Users can input the H5 wastewater concentration in solids (gene
326 copies/dry g) and the flow rate (in millions of gallons [MGD] per day) and total
327 suspended solids (TSS; mg/L) at the treatment plant. The model will conduct $n=50,000$
328 iterations and provide estimates of the required inputs. The Shiny app is available at
329 https://abharv52.shinyapps.io/h5_input_estimates/.

330

331 *Identifying food and/or agricultural industries within the sewershed*

332 We used multiple online sources to search for potential industrial contributors of dairy
333 products to the sewershed wastewater. We searched google maps for dairy, cheese, or
334 butter processing facilities and cross-checked locations with the sewershed boundaries
335 to see if they fell within the sewershed. The boundary shapefile was provided by the
336 POTW. We also searched the Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO)
337 database for facilities with Clean Water Act permits with a Standardized Industry Code
338 (SIC) indicating dairy processing (**Table S5**).

339

340

341 **Results**

342 ***H1 and H3 assay performance and QA/QC***

343 Both *in silico* and *in vitro* testing indicated the H1 and H3 assays are 100% specific. *In*
344 *vitro* tests returned non-detects for all non-target pathogens, including other influenza
345 subtypes.


346
347 The Environmental Microbiology Minimal Information (EMMI)⁴⁰ and McClary-Gutierrez
348 et al. guidelines⁴¹ were used for reporting results (both checklists available at
349 <https://purl.stanford.edu/ks454rq5640>). Positive and negative controls performed as
350 expected. Nucleic acid extraction efficiency in samples exceeded the quality control
351 threshold of 0.1 for bovine coronavirus (median = 1.8, interquartile range (IQR) = 1.2 -
352 2.4); recoveries greater than one are likely a result of errors associated with the
353 measurement of bovine coronavirus seeded into the sample. PMMoV was detected at
354 high concentrations in all samples (median of 6.1×10^8 , IQR = 4.8×10^8 - 7.9×10^8 cp/g)
355 providing further support of efficient nucleic-acid extraction

356

357 ***H5 RNA detection in wastewater samples***

358 H5 RNA was first detected at the POTW on March 18, 2024 (**Fig 2**). Between March 18
359 and May 13 (the final sample of this study), 13 of 25 (52%) samples tested positive for
360 H5 RNA. The median concentration detected was 2410 gc/dry g, with the peak
361 concentration detected on May 3 (19,000 gc/dry g). H5 RNA detections were not related
362 to rainfall patterns in the region (**Fig S1**).

363



364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377

Figure 2. Concentrations of influenza A M gene (all IAV), H5, H1, and H3 RNA in wastewater solids. Concentrations measured are indicated by filled circles with the 68% confidence interval represented by bars. Samples with no detection are indicated by open circles. The lines represent the 5-adjacent sample trimmed average.

Both total IAV (M gene) and H1 RNA were regularly detected throughout the sampling period, and concentrations of both peaked in late December 2023 (**Fig 2**). H3 RNA was regularly detected from December 2023 onwards. H1 and H3 RNA concentrations remained low during H5 RNA detections from March through May. Of clinical influenza cases reported in CA during the 2023-2024 season, over 70% of cases were H1N1 (**Fig S2**)⁴².

378 **Modeled sources of H5 RNA**


379 We calculated the total gene copies of H5 theoretically contributed to wastewater per
380 infected human, liter of milk, and in daily fecal production in poultry and wild birds
381 (**Table 3**). The estimated required inputs per source varied with measured H5 RNA
382 concentrations (**Figure 3**). Overall, the lower bound (25th percentile) of contributions
383 required to result in the median measured H5 RNA concentration were 10^4 liters of milk,
384 10^4 infected humans, 10^2 infected poultry, or 10^5 infected wild birds.
385

Table 3. Median gene copies of H5 RNA contributed to wastewater per day per infected individual (person, poultry, waterfowl) or per liter (IAV RNA containing milk).

Source	Percentile		
	25	50 (median)	75
Person	2×10^6	9×10^6	3×10^7
Liter of Milk	7×10^4	4×10^5	2×10^6
Poultry	5×10^6	6×10^7	6×10^8
Waterfowl	9×10^4	3×10^5	1×10^6

386

387



388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399


400

Figure 3. Median and IQR (25th - 75th quantile) of number of infected individuals required (humans, poultry, waterfowl) or liters of milk required to result in the lowest non-zero, median, and maximum H5 concentration measured at the POTW.

The peak H5 RNA concentration was detected on May 3, 2024; for this concentration (19,000 gc/dry g), the lower bound (25th percentile) required contributions were 10^4 liters of milk, 10^4 infected humans, 10^3 infected poultry, or 10^6 infected waterfowl.

Sensitivity Analysis

The H5 input model is very sensitive to the concentrations of IAV in poultry and waterfowl cloacal swabs, the concentration of influenza RNA in cow milk, and the concentration of influenza in human saliva (**Fig 4**).



401
 402 **Figure 4.** Sensitivity analysis results. Presented are the ratios of model output between
 403 the 75th and 25th percentiles for each parameter while all other parameters are set to
 404 their median value.

405
 406 **Possible sources of animal inputs into the wastewater system**

407 We identified two dairy processing facilities in the sewershed: a cheese making
 408 business and a butter creamery. We were not able to determine the volume of waste
 409 output from these businesses or whether their waste entered the sewer system.
 410 Given that an estimated 20% of milk is wasted in residential settings,¹⁹ an estimated
 411 daily milk consumption per capita of 118 mL,⁴³ and a sewershed population of 750,000,
 412 we estimate that approximately 22,000 liters of milk are wasted per day in households in
 413 the sewershed. This is a conservative estimate, not accounting for waste in
 414 pasteurization, dairy products, food service, or at retail stores (of which an estimated
 415 15% is wasted¹⁹).

416
 417 We also located one live bird market in the sewershed where poultry are kept alive and
 418 where poultry feces enter the sewershed via drains in the establishment. The market
 419 operates on select dates and birds are typically housed at the market for a maximum of
 420 24 hours before being sold; thousands of birds can be present at any one time.

421

422 **Discussion**

423 We first detected H5 RNA in San Francisco wastewater in mid-March 2024 after H5N1
424 outbreaks in cows had been identified in the United States but before any outbreaks
425 had been reported in California. Samples from September 2023 to mid-March 2024
426 were all non-detect for H5 RNA, despite regular detection of the influenza A M gene and
427 known outbreaks of H5N1 in domestic poultry and wild birds in the region.⁸ The timing of
428 the initial H5 RNA detections generally aligned with detections of H5 RNA in wastewater
429 from Amarillo, TX (with detections late February to late April in the South plant and
430 detections from mid-March to late April in the North plant) and Dallas, TX (detections
431 mid-March to mid-April).¹⁶ However, while dairy cow herds were identified with H5N1
432 illness in Texas during this time, none were identified in California until late August
433 2024.⁴⁴ High concentrations of H5 RNA were detected in wastewater from dairy
434 industries discharging to the wastewater system in Amarillo, TX,¹⁶ while no major dairy
435 operations of similar scale were identified in the San Francisco sewershed. H5N1
436 outbreaks in poultry flocks were reported in San Francisco (May 9, 2024) within the time
437 period of wastewater H5 RNA detections. As such, the source of H5 RNA in wastewater
438 in San Francisco is unclear based on circumstantial evidence and we implemented a
439 modeling approach to determine the feasibility of different H5 influenza sources to the
440 sewer system producing these results. We found the model helpful to estimate the order
441 of magnitude contributions that may be required from different pathways; however, data
442 on shedding and other assumptions means that the ability of the model to make precise
443 estimates is limited.

444

445 **Waterfowl.** Based on the model results, waterfowl are unlikely to be a major source of
446 H5 RNA to wastewater from the SF sewershed. Feces from at least ten thousand of
447 these infected birds would be required to result in the minimum H5 RNA concentration
448 measured, and there is unlikely to be a feasible way for the required mass of bird feces
449 to enter the system despite it being a combined system in which some contribution is
450 likely. This analysis was limited by a lack of data on wild bird fecal shedding of
451 influenza. In California in 2024, waterfowl such as geese as well as owls, gull, falcons,
452 and other types of wild birds have all tested positive for H5N1.⁴⁵ Our shedding data was
453 based on a study in blue-winged teals,²² which are considered representative of
454 waterfowl.³¹ Influenza shedding in other types of birds with confirmed H5N1 in California
455 are sparse.²³ It is possible that other species of wildfowl could shed greater quantities of
456 IAV in feces or produce much greater quantities of feces. However, the mechanisms
457 through which wild bird feces enter the wastewater system are limited, and the model
458 assumes all feces produced are entering the system. Stormwater or urban runoff
459 entering the combined system could wash bird feces into the system, yet there were no
460 precipitation events recorded in San Francisco during the period of H5 RNA detections.

461 Bird feces could enter the system through bodies of standing water that drain to the
462 system, yet none were identified within the sewershed.

463
464 **Poultry.** Poultry are a feasible contributor of H5 to the SF sewer system, especially
465 given the live bird market located within the sewershed where chicken feces can be
466 washed into the sanitary sewer system. Notably, poultry at the live bird market infected
467 with H5N1 were identified on May 9, 2024,⁸ during the study period and coinciding with
468 an H5 RNA wastewater detection. The USDA describes that the outbreak involved 700
469 birds;⁸ this number is within the IQR of the modeled number of poultry required for both
470 the minimum and median H5 RNA concentrations measured in wastewater. Based on
471 the author's observation, we estimate that the bird market may house as many as 3,000
472 birds at one time, which is within the lower IQR (25th percentile) for the number of
473 infected poultry required to result in the maximum H5 concentration measured.
474 However, there were additional H5 detections after the May 2024 outbreak and it is
475 unlikely that such a large number of H5N1-infected birds could go undetected.
476 Outbreaks of highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI), which includes H5N1, result in
477 severe morbidity and mortality in affected flocks. An early sign of HPAI is often
478 unexpected chicken deaths, and common symptoms in chickens are severe and would
479 be difficult to miss.⁴⁶ On Dutch poultry farms, the time between virus introduction and
480 final mortality within individual chicken flocks ranged from 5 - 12 days,⁴⁷ signifying rapid
481 spread through flocks. We saw sustained detection of H5 RNA in wastewater across 5
482 weeks in the POTW, which would require that chickens at the live bird market be
483 consistently infected with H5N1 during this time period if the market were the sole or
484 primary H5 RNA wastewater source.

485
486 The poultry model is very sensitive to poultry fecal shedding. Our model uses fecal
487 shedding estimates for HPAI from a meta-analysis that incorporates data from 71
488 studies, including 25 studies specific to H5N1.²³ The presentation of H5N1 in poultry in
489 the U.S. since the beginning of the outbreak in 2022 has been similar to H5N1
490 outbreaks in poultry in other regions;⁴⁶ as such, we feel that we are using the best
491 available estimates of poultry fecal shedding.

492
493 **Milk.** We find that milk is feasible as a primary or sole H5 RNA source to the POTW, but
494 only if the milk supply is widely contaminated. Pasteurization of milk inactivates IAV, but
495 does not reduce the IAV RNA concentration in milk which is still detectable by PCR.⁴⁸⁻⁵⁰
496 Residential milk waste could drive H5 RNA detections; even for the maximum H5 RNA
497 wastewater concentration, the lower bound model output (25th percentile) requires
498 10,000 liters of contaminated milk to enter the sewer system. This is within our
499 conservative estimate of the amount of milk wasted residentially each day in the
500 sewershed (22,000 liters) not including the contribution of small dairies, retailers, and

501 food service, and so it is possible that dumping of contaminated milk could result in the
502 detected H5 RNA if there was widespread contamination of milk at retailers within SF.

503

504 This analysis was limited by the availability of data on H5 and IAV concentrations in
505 milk. No H5 or IAV containing milk was reported in milk processed in California during
506 the time of this study,^{17,51} although testing was limited (Tarbuck *et al.*: n=3, Suarez *et al.*,
507 n=6), and no infected dairy cows were reported in California during the time period of
508 this study.⁴⁴ However, it is possible that contaminated milk may enter the supply chain in
509 San Francisco through either unidentified local cattle outbreaks or through milk
510 processed in other locations with H5N1 outbreaks in dairy cattle. The model is sensitive
511 to the H5 concentration in milk, and thus our input estimates would be affected by an
512 over- or underestimation of the H5 concentration in milk.

513

514 **Humans.** Infected humans are unlikely to be a major contributor of H5 RNA to the San
515 Francisco wastewater. As of December 19, 2024, only 61 people in the United States
516 have been identified with H5N1 infections, and these cases were mostly in people who
517 worked closely with infected cows or poultry.¹² Human-to-human transmission of H5N1
518 is not suspected at this time. While it is possible that asymptomatic or undiagnosed
519 cases exist and the true number of infections is higher,⁵² there is no evidence to support
520 the likelihood of widespread infection in humans at this time - especially 10^3 cases as
521 the model estimates would be required to produce the minimum H5 concentration.¹³

522

523 Our estimates of the required H5 human cases are constrained by available human IAV
524 shedding data, and do not necessarily align with previous observations of influenza A in
525 wastewater during outbreaks in humans. The shedding data are based on human
526 shedding of influenza A overall (no subtyping conducted), H1N1, H3N2, or H7N9,²⁸ and
527 data on H5N1 shedding in humans are not available. No information is available on
528 human IAV shedding of any subtype in urine.²⁸ Recent H5N1 infections have presented
529 differently than seasonally influenza,^{13,53} and shedding profiles of H5N1 may differ from
530 those of other influenza types. We also noted that our estimate that 10^3 to 10^4 infected
531 humans would be required to result in the minimum H5 concentration observed is 3-4
532 orders of magnitude larger than the number of infected individuals that were empirically
533 observed to produce a similar concentration of total IAV in Ann Arbor, Michigan and at
534 Stanford University, as determined through case reporting and in depth outbreak
535 investigation.² Future work is needed to better quantify human shedding of influenza in
536 wastewater-relevant excretions.

537

538 Research is also needed into the possibility of human dietary shedding of H5 following
539 consumption of H5N1-containing dairy products. Other single-stranded RNA viruses,
540 such as PMMoV, brown rugose tomato virus, and porcine circoviruses, have been

541 detected in human stool following consumption of foods containing these viruses.^{54–57} If
542 H5 IAV present in milk or other dairy products is able to be shed in human stool,
543 uninfected humans who consume dairy products could contribute to H5 wastewater
544 detections.

545
546 **Limitations.** We note that a major limitation of the study is the uncertainty in the data
547 underlying many parameters, especially because the model was found to be sensitive to
548 several of these related to shedding. These shedding parameters are particularly
549 influential in the model, and in many cases are poorly understood. Concerns about this
550 limitation are exacerbated by the observation that modeled estimates for human
551 infections are substantially higher than would be expected based on observations from
552 previous influenza A outbreaks of other subtypes. Despite these limitations, we feel that
553 the model provides a helpful framework for discussing the order of magnitude estimated
554 contributions from different sources to wastewater. More data on shedding in animals
555 and humans will continue to improve estimates in the future.

556
557 Another limitation of this study is that inputs from humans, poultry, wild birds, and milk
558 were estimated separately. Multiple sources could contribute to H5 RNA wastewater
559 detections, yet there is no information available to constrain the fraction of input that
560 may come from each source, and thus each source was modeled separately. If multiple
561 sources contribute H5 to the wastewater system, the number of required infected
562 individuals or liters of milk could be lower than the lower bounds estimated by our
563 models. Our H5 assay will detect all IAV in the H5 subtype, and this could include
564 strains other than the currently circulating H5N1 (e.g., H5N8); however, no other H5
565 strains are currently expected to be circulating in wastewater-relevant species. It should
566 also be noted that the IAV genome, particularly the HA gene, has a high rate of
567 mutation. Although the H1, H3, and H5 assays used herein are highly sensitive and
568 specific for the dominate IAV H1, H3, and H5 subtypes circulating at the time of the
569 study, they may not be highly sensitive and specific in different time periods during
570 which different clades of each subtype are in circulation. For example, we have
571 confirmed that the H1 assay is no longer sensitive for the H1N1 clade circulating in the
572 2024-2025 flu season.

573
574 The model developed could be applied to other sites with H5 detections in wastewater
575 to help constrain potential sources, and we developed a Shiny app tool to allow the
576 model to be easily deployed at other sites. For other sites using the model, however, the
577 feasibility and appropriateness of each pathway included in the model would need to be
578 determined based on the specifics of the wastewater system.

579

580 In this study, we show that H5 was detected in an urban California watershed months
581 before H5N1 cases in California dairy cattle were reported. Given a lack of dairy
582 industry in the watershed or surrounding area, the source of H5 RNA in the wastewater
583 system was unclear. Here, we employ modeling to estimate the theoretical H5
584 contributions from infected humans, poultry, and wildfowl, and from H5-contaminated
585 milk. We demonstrate that humans and waterfowl are unlikely to be major contributors
586 of H5 to the system, while poultry and milk are both feasible sources in this system.

587

588 **Acknowledgements**

589 We thank the Southeast San Francisco POTW staff for providing us with samples and
590 the flow and total suspended solids data. We gratefully acknowledge all data
591 contributors, i.e., the authors and their originating laboratories responsible for obtaining
592 the specimens and their submitting laboratories for generating the genetic sequence
593 and metadata and sharing via the GISAID Initiative, on which this research is based.
594 This work was supported by a gift from the Sergey Brin Family Foundation to ABB. The
595 graphical abstract and Figure 1 were created using [Biorender.com](#).

596

597

598

599 **References**

- 600 1. Tokars, J. I., Olsen, S. J. & Reed, C. Seasonal Incidence of Symptomatic Influenza in the
601 United States. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **66**, 1511–1518 (2018).
- 602 2. Wolfe, M. K. *et al.* Wastewater-Based Detection of Two Influenza Outbreaks. *Environ. Sci.*
603 *Technol. Lett.* **9**, 687–692 (2022).
- 604 3. Toribio-Avedillo, D. *et al.* Monitoring influenza and respiratory syncytial virus in wastewater.
605 Beyond COVID-19. *Sci. Total Environ.* **892**, 164495 (2023).
- 606 4. Lehto, K.-M. *et al.* Wastewater-based surveillance is an efficient monitoring tool for tracking
607 influenza A in the community. *Water Res.* **257**, 121650 (2024).
- 608 5. Maida, C. M. *et al.* Detection of influenza virus in urban wastewater during the season
609 2022/2023 in Sicily, Italy. *Front. Public Health* **12**, (2024).
- 610 6. Nypaver, C., Dehlinger, C. & Carter, C. Influenza and Influenza Vaccine: A Review. *J.*
611 *Midwifery Womens Health* **66**, 45–53 (2021).
- 612 7. CDC. Avian Influenza Type A Viruses. *Avian Influenza (Bird Flu)* [https://www.cdc.gov/bird-](https://www.cdc.gov/bird-flu/about/index.html)
613 [flu/about/index.html](https://www.cdc.gov/bird-flu/about/index.html) (2024).
- 614 8. Confirmations of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza in Commercial and Backyard Flocks |
615 Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/commercial-backyard-flocks)
616 [disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/commercial-backyard-flocks](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/commercial-backyard-flocks).
- 617 9. Lai, S. *et al.* Global epidemiology of avian influenza A H5N1 virus infection in humans,
618 1997–2015: a systematic review of individual case data. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **16**, e108–e118
619 (2016).
- 620 10. Monto, A. S. & Fukuda, K. Lessons From Influenza Pandemics of the Last 100 Years. *Clin.*
621 *Infect. Dis.* **70**, 951–957 (2020).
- 622 11. Peiris, J. S. M., de Jong, M. D. & Guan, Y. Avian Influenza Virus (H5N1): a Threat to Human
623 Health. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* **20**, 243–267 (2007).
- 624 12. CDC. H5 Bird Flu: Current Situation. *Avian Influenza (Bird Flu)* <https://www.cdc.gov/bird->

- 625 flu/situation-summary/index.html (2024).
- 626 13. Garg, S. Outbreak of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza A(H5N1) Viruses in U.S. Dairy
627 Cattle and Detection of Two Human Cases — United States, 2024. *MMWR Morb. Mortal.*
628 *Wkly. Rep.* **73**, (2024).
- 629 14. CDC Newsroom. CDC [https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2024/p-0703-4th-human-case-](https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2024/p-0703-4th-human-case-h5.html)
630 [h5.html](https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2024/p-0703-4th-human-case-h5.html) (2016).
- 631 15. CDC Newsroom. CDC <https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2024/p-0715-confirm-h5.html>
632 (2016).
- 633 16. Wolfe, M. K. *et al.* Detection of Hemagglutinin H5 Influenza A Virus Sequence in Municipal
634 Wastewater Solids at Wastewater Treatment Plants with Increases in Influenza A in Spring,
635 2024. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **11**, 526–532 (2024).
- 636 17. Tarbuck, N. *et al.* Detection of A(H5N1) influenza virus nucleic acid in retail pasteurized
637 milk. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4572362/v1> (2024).
- 638 18. Spackman, E. *et al.* Characterization of highly pathogenic avian influenza virus in retail dairy
639 products in the US. *J. Virol.* **98**, e00881-24 (2024).
- 640 19. Thoma, G. *et al.* Greenhouse gas emissions from milk production and consumption in the
641 United States: A cradle-to-grave life cycle assessment circa 2008. *Int. Dairy J.* **31**, S3–S14
642 (2013).
- 643 20. Byker, C. J., Farris, A. R., Marcenelle, M., Davis, G. C. & Serrano, E. L. Food Waste in a
644 School Nutrition Program After Implementation of New Lunch Program Guidelines. *J. Nutr.*
645 *Educ. Behav.* **46**, 406–411 (2014).
- 646 21. Shanks, C. B., Bark, K., Stenberg, M., Gamble, J. & Parks, C. Milk Consumption and Waste
647 Across 5 Montana High School Lunch Programs. *J. Sch. Health* **90**, 718–723 (2020).
- 648 22. Dolinski, A. C., Jankowski, M. D., Fair, J. M. & Owen, J. C. The association between
649 SAα2,3Gal occurrence frequency and avian influenza viral load in mallards (*Anas*
650 *platyrhynchos*) and blue-winged teals (*Spatula discors*). *BMC Vet. Res.* **16**, 430 (2020).

- 651 23. Germeraad, E. A. *et al.* Virus Shedding of Avian Influenza in Poultry: A Systematic Review
652 and Meta-Analysis. *Viruses* **11**, 812 (2019).
- 653 24. Boehm, A. B. *et al.* Human viral nucleic acids concentrations in wastewater solids from
654 Central and Coastal California USA. *Sci. Data* **10**, 396 (2023).
- 655 25. Topol, A. *High Throughput RNA Extraction and PCR Inhibitor Removal of Settled Solids for*
656 *Wastewater Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 RNA V2*. [https://www.protocols.click/view/high-](https://www.protocols.click/view/high-throughput-rna-extraction-and-pcr-inhibitor-r-b2mkqc4w)
657 [throughput-rna-extraction-and-pcr-inhibitor-r-b2mkqc4w](https://www.protocols.click/view/high-throughput-rna-extraction-and-pcr-inhibitor-r-b2mkqc4w) (2021)
658 doi:10.17504/protocols.io.b2mkqc4w.
- 659 26. Boehm, A. B. *et al.* Human pathogen nucleic acids in wastewater solids from 191
660 wastewater treatment plants in the United States. *Sci. Data* **11**, 1141 (2024).
- 661 27. Roldan-Hernandez, L., Oost, C. V. & B. Boehm, A. Solid–liquid partitioning of dengue, West
662 Nile, Zika, hepatitis A, influenza A, and SARS-CoV-2 viruses in wastewater from across the
663 USA. *Environ. Sci. Water Res. Technol.* (2024) doi:10.1039/D4EW00225C.
- 664 28. Lowry, S. A., Wolfe, M. K. & Boehm, A. B. Respiratory virus concentrations in human
665 excretions that contribute to wastewater: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Water*
666 *Health* **21**, 831–848 (2023).
- 667 29. Crank, K., Chen, W., Bivins, A., Lowry, S. & Bibby, K. Contribution of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
668 shedding routes to RNA loads in wastewater. *Sci. Total Environ.* **806**, 150376 (2022).
- 669 30. Dovas, C. I. *et al.* Detection and Quantification of Infectious Avian Influenza A (H5N1) Virus
670 in Environmental Water by Using Real-Time Reverse Transcription-PCR. *Appl. Environ.*
671 *Microbiol.* **76**, 2165–2174 (2010).
- 672 31. Humphreys, J. M. *et al.* Waterfowl occurrence and residence time as indicators of H5 and
673 H7 avian influenza in North American Poultry. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 2592 (2020).
- 674 32. Arena, C. *et al.* Simultaneous investigation of influenza and enteric viruses in the stools of
675 adult patients consulting in general practice for acute diarrhea. *Viol. J.* **9**, 116 (2012).
- 676 33. Hirose, R. *et al.* Long-term detection of seasonal influenza RNA in faeces and intestine.

- 677 *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **22**, 813.e1-813.e7 (2016).
- 678 34. Chan, M. C. W., Lee, N., Chan, P. K. S., Leung, T. F. & Sung, J. J. Y. Fecal detection of
679 influenza A virus in patients with concurrent respiratory and gastrointestinal symptoms. *J.*
680 *Clin. Virol.* **45**, 208–211 (2009).
- 681 35. Chan, M. C. W. *et al.* Seasonal Influenza A Virus in Feces of Hospitalized Adults. *Emerg.*
682 *Infect. Dis.* **17**, 2038–2042 (2011).
- 683 36. Tańczuk, M., Junga, R., Kolasa-Wiecek, A. & Niemiec, P. Assessment of the Energy
684 Potential of Chicken Manure in Poland. *Energies* **12**, 1244 (2019).
- 685 37. Owen, R. B., Jr. The Bioenergetics of Captive Blue-Winged Teal under Controlled and
686 Outdoor Conditions. *The Condor* **72**, 153–163 (1970).
- 687 38. Julian, T. R., Canales, R. A., Leckie, J. O. & Boehm, A. B. A model of exposure to rotavirus
688 from nondietary ingestion iterated by simulated intermittent contacts. *Risk Anal. Off. Publ.*
689 *Soc. Risk Anal.* **29**, 617–632 (2009).
- 690 39. Xue, J. *et al.* A Probabilistic Arsenic Exposure Assessment for Children Who Contact
691 Chromated Copper Arsenate (CCA)-Treated Playsets and Decks, Part 2: Sensitivity and
692 Uncertainty Analyses. *Risk Anal.* **26**, 533–541 (2006).
- 693 40. Borchardt, M. A. *et al.* The Environmental Microbiology Minimum Information (EMMI)
694 Guidelines: qPCR and dPCR Quality and Reporting for Environmental Microbiology.
695 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **55**, 10210–10223 (2021).
- 696 41. McClary-Gutierrez, J. S. *et al.* Standardizing data reporting in the research community to
697 enhance the utility of open data for SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance. *Environ. Sci.*
698 *Water Res. Technol.* **7**, 1545–1551 (2021).
- 699 42. Health, D. of P. California Department of Public Health.
700 <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC>.
- 701 43. Stewart, H., Kuchler, F. & Hahn, W. Is competition among soft drinks, juices, and other
702 major beverage categories responsible for reducing Americans' milk consumption?

- 703 *Agribusiness* **37**, 731–748 (2021).
- 704 44. HPAI Confirmed Cases in Livestock | Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.
705 [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/hpai-confirmed-cases-livestock)
706 [detections/hpai-confirmed-cases-livestock](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/wild-birds).
- 707 45. HPAI Detections in Wild Birds. [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/wild-birds)
708 [disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/wild-birds](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/wild-birds).
- 709 46. Bordes, L. *et al.* Experimental infection of chickens, Pekin ducks, Eurasian wigeons and
710 Barnacle geese with two recent highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b
711 viruses. *Emerg. Microbes Infect.* **13**, 2399970 (2024).
- 712 47. Hobbelen, P. H. F. *et al.* Estimating the introduction time of highly pathogenic avian
713 influenza into poultry flocks. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 12388 (2020).
- 714 48. Cui, P. *et al.* Does pasteurization inactivate bird flu virus in milk? *Emerg. Microbes Infect.*
715 **13**, 2364732 (2024).
- 716 49. Schafers, J. *et al.* Pasteurisation temperatures effectively inactivate influenza A viruses in
717 milk. 2024.05.30.24308212 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.30.24308212> (2024).
- 718 50. Nooruzzaman, M. *et al.* Thermal inactivation spectrum of influenza A H5N1 virus in raw milk.
719 2024.09.21.614205 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.21.614205> (2024).
- 720 51. Suarez, D. L. *et al.* Testing of retail cheese, butter, ice cream and other dairy products for
721 highly pathogenic avian influenza in the US. 2024.08.11.24311811 Preprint at
722 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.11.24311811> (2024).
- 723 52. Mellis, A. M. Serologic Evidence of Recent Infection with Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza
724 A(H5) Virus Among Dairy Workers — Michigan and Colorado, June–August 2024. *MMWR*
725 *Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **73**, (2024).
- 726 53. Uyeki, T. M. *et al.* Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza A(H5N1) Virus Infection in a Dairy
727 Farm Worker. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **390**, 2028–2029 (2024).
- 728 54. Zhang, T. *et al.* RNA Viral Community in Human Feces: Prevalence of Plant Pathogenic

- 729 Viruses. *PLOS Biol.* **4**, e3 (2005).
- 730 55. Colson, P. *et al.* Pepper Mild Mottle Virus, a Plant Virus Associated with Specific Immune
731 Responses, Fever, Abdominal Pains, and Pruritus in Humans. *PLOS ONE* **5**, e10041
732 (2010).
- 733 56. Li, L. *et al.* Multiple Diverse Circoviruses Infect Farm Animals and Are Commonly Found in
734 Human and Chimpanzee Feces. *J. Virol.* **84**, 1674–1682 (2010).
- 735 57. Natarajan, A. *et al.* The Tomato Brown Rugose Fruit Virus Movement Protein Gene Is a
736 Novel Microbial Source Tracking Marker. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **89**, e00583-23 (2023).