

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

**Wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 on college campuses:
Initial efforts, lessons learned and research needs**

Authors:

Sasha Harris-Lovett, Berkeley Water Center, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, California, USA

Kara Nelson, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, California, USA

Paloma Beamer, Department of Community, Environment & Policy, Zuckerman College of Public Health, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, USA

Heather N. Bischel, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California Davis, Davis, California, USA

Aaron Bivins, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Earth Sciences, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana, USA

Andrea Bruder, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado, USA

Caitlyn Butler, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts, USA

Todd D. Camenisch, Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, St. John Fisher College, Rochester, New York, USA

Susan K. De Long, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA

Smruthi Karthikeyan, Department of Pediatrics, University of California San Diego, San Diego, California, USA

David A. Larsen, Department of Public Health, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, USA

Katherine Meierdiercks, Department of Environmental Studies and Sciences, Siena College, Loudonville, New York, USA

Paula Mouser, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of New Hampshire Durham, Durham, New Hampshire, USA

- 32 Sheree Pagsuyoin, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of
33 Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, Massachusetts, USA
- 34 Sarah Prasek, Water and Energy Sustainable Technology Center, University of Arizona, Tucson,
35 Arizona, USA
- 36 Tyler S. Radniecki, School of Chemical, Biological, and Environmental Engineering, Oregon
37 State University, Corvallis, Oregon, USA
- 38 Jeffrey L. Ram, Department of Physiology, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, USA
- 39 D. Keith Roper, Department of Biological Engineering, Utah State University, Logan, Utah,
40 USA
- 41 Hannah Safford, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California
42 Davis, Davis, California, USA
- 43 Samendra P. Sherchan, Department of Environmental Health Science, Tulane University, New
44 Orleans, Louisiana, USA
- 45 William Shuster, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Wayne State University,
46 Detroit, Michigan, USA
- 47 Thibault Stalder, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, USA
- 48 Robert T. Wheeler, Department of Molecular and Biomedical Sciences, University of Maine,
49 Orono, Maine, USA
- 50 Katrina Smith Korfmacher, Department of Environmental Medicine, University of Rochester,
51 Rochester, NY, USA
- 52 **Corresponding Author:**
- 53 Sasha Harris-Lovett, Ph.D.
54 sharrislovett@berkeley.edu
55 410 O'Brien Hall, University of California Berkeley
56 Berkeley, CA 94720

57 *The authors declare they have no actual or potential competing financial interests.*

58

59

60 **Abstract**

61 *Background*

62 Wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 is an emerging approach to help identify the risk of a
63 COVID-19 outbreak. This tool can contribute to public health surveillance at both community
64 (wastewater treatment system) and institutional (e.g., colleges, prisons, nursing homes) scales.

65 *Objectives*

66 This research aims to understand the successes, challenges, and lessons learned from initial
67 wastewater surveillance efforts at colleges and university systems to inform future research,
68 development and implementation.

69 *Methods*

70 This paper presents the experiences of 25 college and university systems in the United States that
71 monitored campus wastewater for SARS-CoV-2 during the fall 2020 academic period. We
72 describe the broad range of approaches, findings, resource needs, and lessons learned from these
73 initial efforts. These institutions range in size, social and political geographies, and include both
74 public and private institutions.

75 *Discussion*

76 Our analysis suggests that wastewater monitoring at colleges requires consideration of
77 information needs, local sewage infrastructure, resources for sampling and analysis, college and
78 community dynamics, approaches to interpretation and communication of results, and follow-up
79 actions. Most colleges reported that a learning process of experimentation, evaluation, and
80 adaptation was key to progress. This process requires ongoing collaboration among diverse
81 stakeholders including decision-makers, researchers, faculty, facilities staff, students, and
82 community members.

83

84 **Introduction**

85 Since the spring of 2020, many colleges have pursued wastewater monitoring for SARS-
86 CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19, as part of a multi-pronged approach to controlling
87 COVID-19 transmission on campus. In August 2020, the University of Arizona made headlines
88 by announcing that it had detected RNA from SARS-CoV-2 in the wastewater from a student
89 dormitory (Peiser 2020). Subsequent testing of dormitory residents identified two asymptomatic
90 infected students, who were transferred to an isolation facility, potentially preventing an outbreak
91 of COVID-19 on campus (Betancourt et al. 2020). As colleges across the country considered
92 their options for reducing transmission of COVID-19, the University of Arizona story piqued
93 interest in wastewater monitoring as a promising tool. By the authors' count, news media in the
94 United States published nearly 200 articles on wastewater monitoring on college campuses in
95 September 2020 alone (for this paper, we use the term "colleges" to describe institutions of
96 higher education, including colleges, universities, and university systems spanning multiple
97 campuses).

98 As of January 2021, more than 210 colleges around the world had begun monitoring
99 wastewater for SARS-CoV-2 (University of California Merced 2021), and many more are
100 considering launching similar efforts. Our synthetic, comparative study found that institutions'
101 approaches to wastewater monitoring vary by where, how, and how often they sample, their
102 analytical and reporting protocols, and the use of their findings in decision-making. The lessons

103 learned from these emerging experiences can inform other colleges, institutions (e.g. nursing
104 homes, prisons, private industries), and communities seeking to manage COVID-19.

105 This paper synthesizes the experiences of 25 colleges that monitored campus wastewater
106 for SARS-CoV-2 during fall 2020. It describes the broad range of approaches, resource needs,
107 and lessons learned from these initial efforts. These experiences provide early insights into
108 varied approaches, decision-support potential, and research needs related to wastewater
109 surveillance by colleges. Based on these reported experiences, we developed a process-oriented
110 framework for design of wastewater surveillance at colleges. This framework provides a
111 structure for the collaborative learning process needed to successfully implement, evaluate, and
112 adapt wastewater surveillance programs.

113 114 **Background**

115 Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) has long been used to inform public health
116 decisions about infectious disease, most prominently in the global effort to monitor elimination
117 of polioviruses (Asgar et al. 2014). Similar to polioviruses, SARS-CoV-2 RNA is shed by many
118 infected individuals in fecal matter (Wölfel et al. 2020) and is relatively stable in wastewater
119 (Ahmed, Bertsch, et al. 2020). Soon after the start of the pandemic, researchers around the world
120 began developing methodologies to detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA in sewage (Ahmed, Angel, et al.
121 2020; Medema, Heijnen, et al. 2020; Bivins et al. 2020; Gonzalez et al. 2020; Sherchan et al.
122 2020). Methods generally involve concentration of viral particles in wastewater, and molecular
123 biology assays that measure SARS-CoV-2 RNA (Philo et al. 2021).

124 Researchers continue to refine sample collection and data analysis with the goal of
125 providing a real-time quantitative indicator of prevalence, increase, and geographic reach of
126 COVID-19 within a population (Ahmed, Bivins, et al. 2020; Farkas et al. 2020; Graham et al.
127 2021; Peccia et al. 2020). Meanwhile, several U.S. cities have begun monitoring for SARS-CoV-
128 2 in sewage at municipal wastewater treatment plants (Stadler et al. 2020; Gonzalez et al. 2020;
129 Wu et al. 2020; Sherchan et al. 2020). In some cases, these data are made public on online
130 dashboards, and accompanied by guidance for public health messaging (e.g., Ohio Department of
131 Health 2021; Oregon Health Authority 2021). To support these efforts, the Centers for Disease
132 Control and Prevention (CDC) has established a National Wastewater Surveillance System
133 (CDC 2020).

134 Monitoring wastewater for SARS-CoV-2 is a useful complement to clinical surveillance
135 for COVID-19 (Bivins et al. 2020; Farkas et al. 2020; Larsen and Wigginton 2020). Wastewater
136 monitoring has particular value when clinical testing is limited (Peccia et al. 2020). In addition,
137 the SARS-CoV-2 wastewater signal may be a leading indicator that precedes trends in confirmed
138 cases (Wu et al. 2020; Larsen and Wigginton 2020; Randazzo, Truchado, et al. 2020). This early
139 warning from wastewater may occur because wastewater monitoring detects both pre-
140 symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections (Buitrago-Garcia et al. 2020; Wang et
141 al. 2020). Wastewater monitoring also provides cost-effective infection information about a large
142 population (Randazzo, Cuevas-Ferrando, et al. 2020; Hart and Halden 2020). If used to target
143 allocation of pandemic-response resources, this approach could help offset the inequitable
144 impacts of the pandemic.

145 Because of these advantages, many researchers, government agencies, and communities
146 have promoted wastewater monitoring as an important component of pandemic response (Bivins
147 et al. 2020; Farkas et al. 2020; Medema, Been, et al. 2020; Xagorarakis 2020). Wastewater results
148 could be used to alert communities to increased COVID-19 prevalence and track spread, guide

149 individual behavioral choices, target public health messaging, allocate testing resources, inform
150 infection control policies (e.g. limiting size of gatherings, building openings, and school
151 modalities), and evaluate the success of such interventions (Daughton 2020; Farkas et al. 2020;
152 Polo et al. 2020; Hassard et al. 2021). Although some have raised concerns about privacy,
153 stigma, and potential negative repercussions of sharing these data (Joh 2020), the community-
154 wide, non-individualized nature of the technology mitigates potential legal and ethical issues of
155 using wastewater monitoring for public health purposes (Gable, Ram, and Ram 2020).

156 As wastewater monitoring for public health surveillance has gained traction in the United
157 States, many colleges have initiated and implemented wastewater-monitoring programs to
158 address an urgent need to monitor for potential infections on campus. Several professional
159 networks have emerged to support co-learning, including a website (“CoSeS: Communicating
160 Sewage Surveillance for COVID-19” 2021), a Slack channel, and an NSF-funded Research
161 Coordination Network (Research Coordination Network: Wastewater Surveillance of SARS-
162 CoV-2 2020). The National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine undertook a
163 “rapid expert assessment” of COVID-19 surveillance efforts at colleges, many of which
164 integrated wastewater monitoring (National Academies 2020). However, there has not been a
165 systematic effort to review the experiences of colleges’ pioneering efforts and to synthesize
166 lessons learned. This paper represents a first step: to collect insights from colleges on wastewater
167 monitoring for SARS-CoV-2 in order to inform future research and action.

168

169 **Methods**

170 Case studies were solicited through email lists, Slack channels, and informal networks among
171 practitioners conducting wastewater monitoring at colleges. Respondents – largely faculty and
172 staff involved in these efforts – were asked to self-report descriptions of their institution’s
173 history, practice, and use of wastewater monitoring for SARS-CoV-2 on campus via a shared
174 database. All participants were given the opportunity to check the accuracy of their college’s
175 portrayal in the paper and to clarify any ambiguous responses.

176 Open-ended interviews were conducted with a subset of respondents from 10 colleges with
177 diverse experiences to elicit in-depth lessons learned about wastewater monitoring on their
178 campuses. Interview protocols were approved by the Institutional Review Boards at the
179 University of California Berkeley and the University of Rochester. Interview notes were
180 separately coded for common themes, observations, and recommendations by Harris-Lovett and
181 Korfmacher, drawing from both the ENTREQ and COREQ protocols for conducting and
182 reporting qualitative research (Tong et al. 2012; Tong, Sainsbury, and Craig 2007). Differences
183 in coding were reconciled through discussion or follow-up with interviewees. Each case study
184 contributor was invited to be a co-author or named contributor.

185 Details of monitoring programs at participating colleges were corroborated where possible
186 using publicly available websites and/or media reports. The size, residential nature, and location
187 of each institution was similarly confirmed. Distinction was made between private and state
188 institutions, as each is accountable to a different set of stakeholders, regulations, levels of
189 external decision-making, resource constraints, and ability to compel student behavior (e.g.
190 testing requirements). These multiple sources of information were integrated into the case study
191 analyses.

192

193 **Results**

194

195 Case study institutions

196 Twenty-five colleges and universities from 16 states in the U.S. provided information
197 about their wastewater monitoring programs (Table 1, Figure 1). Most respondents represented a
198 single campus, although respondents from three state university systems (Maine, Oregon State,
199 and Utah State) represented two or more campus locations (Table 1). The case study institutions
200 represent rural, suburban, and urban settings within socially and politically diverse geographies.
201 Approximately two-thirds of participating institutions are public; the remainder are private.
202 Student populations of the campuses/systems ranged from approximately 2,000 to 50,000.

203 Some of the larger campuses have a dedicated wastewater treatment plant, while other
204 campuses are served by the wastewater infrastructure of the surrounding community. Larger
205 universities in urban locations generally have a smaller proportion of residential (e.g., on-
206 campus) students and a correspondingly larger proportion of students living off-campus in the
207 surrounding community. The smaller colleges had close to their normal, pre-pandemic number of
208 students living on and around campus. The majority of participating colleges offered some mix
209 of virtual and in-person course options in the fall 2020 academic period. Even those that offered
210 entirely remote instruction had some students living in campus housing.

211 The colleges started the fall 2020 academic period with considerable variation in
212 COVID-19 case rates in the surrounding area, ranging from 1.5 (New Hampshire) to 20.4
213 (Georgia) daily new cases per 100,000 population (Figure 1). In many places with low COVID-
214 19 rates, local communities voiced concerns about students carrying the virus from other states
215 and countries. Thus, colleges designed their surveillance systems under very different
216 community conditions, with significant implications for local public health and
217 campus/community relationships.

218
219 Origins and organization of wastewater monitoring on campus

220 In many cases, campus researchers seeking to address urgent pandemic-related needs
221 initiated college wastewater monitoring efforts. More than half of the wastewater monitoring
222 programs were started by faculty from engineering disciplines, several in collaboration with
223 biological scientists. Other programs were initiated by faculty in other disciplines (including
224 math, environmental health and epidemiology), by facilities staff, college administrators, or
225 county officials. Regardless of who initiated the program, nearly all reported that a
226 multidisciplinary team of faculty, facilities staff, and student health professionals collaborated to
227 sustain the effort. Many of the faculty involved had longstanding research programs involving
228 pathogens in wastewater and several had engaged in broader wastewater monitoring efforts for
229 SARS-CoV-2 in their region before applying this approach to their colleges. Other respondents,
230 however, pivoted from their previous research to adapt their expertise to wastewater monitoring.
231 All of the respondents noted that their wastewater monitoring efforts interfaced with a range of
232 stakeholders, including college administrators, students, researchers, facilities staff, local public
233 health officials, and/or the surrounding community.

234 Around half of the colleges started sampling wastewater in August in preparation for the
235 arrival of students. A quarter began sampling earlier (as early as May) as part of methodology
236 development; the remainder did not initiate sampling until mid-fall. Thus, only a small number
237 of the colleges had experience with data from occupied dorms going into the fall semester, but
238 many were able to capture baseline data prior to student move-in.

239 At a time when most colleges experienced financial challenges, obtaining funding for
240 these efforts was a frequent challenge. Around half of respondents noted their university

241 administrations funded wastewater monitoring efforts. Several participants noted that their
242 administrations “basically wrote a blank check,” acknowledging that optimal surveillance was
243 essential to keeping the campus open, while others cited pressure to control costs. Other funding
244 mechanisms included support from local or state government, federal CARES Act relief funding
245 for coronavirus surveillance, research grant funds, and philanthropic gifts.

247 Description of wastewater monitoring approaches

248 The colleges’ approaches varied with respect to how wastewater samples were collected,
249 sampling locations, how often samples were taken, laboratory analysis, and how results were
250 reported and used (Table 2). These activities were carried out by different groups of faculty,
251 staff, contractors, students and administrators on different campuses. Many respondents reported
252 that their approaches evolved over time as they developed expertise, acquired additional
253 resources, and scaled up their efforts.

254 In theory, wastewater samples can be collected from any accessible point in a sewer
255 system, but some are logistically simpler than others. The majority of colleges in this study
256 collected samples from sewer manholes. Several collected wastewater from pipes or sewer
257 cleanouts in dormitories, which can involve significant plumbing alterations. Participants
258 expressed more problems with autosampler clogging (toilet paper, large proportion of solids
259 under low-flow conditions) at smaller-diameter pipes and building cleanouts relative to other
260 sample collection points in their system. Around one-quarter of the colleges took samples of the
261 influent to the municipal wastewater treatment plants serving their campuses. Many of the
262 colleges sampled at multiple locations with differently sized sewer drainages (e.g., dorm, main
263 sewer lines, and wastewater treatment plant). Decisions about sampling location often reflected
264 complex tradeoffs between costs, logistical constraints (e.g. physical access), and ability to
265 associate individual sampling locations with specific student residences.

266 Wastewater samples can be collected as one-time “grab” samples, as passive samples
267 using absorbent swabs (Liu et al. 2020), or as composite samples. Automated composite
268 samplers collect wastewater aliquots periodically over a 24-hour period to provide a more
269 representative sample of the sewage (Ahmed et al. 2021). Grab samples are normally taken
270 during peak (morning and evening) sewer flows (Curtis et al. 2020). Composite samplers cost
271 between \$3,000 to \$5,000. Passive samplers are inexpensive, but less is known about their
272 sensitivity for detecting SARS-CoV-2 compared to composite samplers (Liu et al. 2020). Several
273 colleges that could not purchase composite samplers due to cost or supply shortages constructed
274 their own (Kilaru, Larsen, and Monk 2020).

275 Colleges used student workers, existing staff, or private contractors to collect samples
276 and deliver or ship them to laboratories for analysis. Retrieving samples from collection points
277 took from 15 minutes to 3 hours per sample (not including the 24 hours over which composite
278 samples are collected) depending on the physical layout of sampling locations and equipment.

279 The number of sampling locations varied from one to more than fifty per campus. Two-
280 thirds of the colleges with normal (i.e. non-pandemic) enrollment of over 10,000 had 10 or more
281 sampling locations. The population size represented by a single wastewater sample ranged from
282 a single dorm to the entire campus community. For campuses that used wastewater monitoring to
283 guide targeted individual testing of all residents in a building, the reported number of students
284 per sampling location ranged from 50 to 800. 28% reported sampling at three or fewer sites.
285 Several sampled only at a local wastewater treatment plant or identified a single manhole in a
286 sewer line collecting most of the flow from the campus. Several respondents noted they had

287 increased their number of sampling locations over time (or planned to do so in the future) to
288 reduce the number of students who would be individually tested as a result of a “hot” wastewater
289 sample.

290 Colleges reported a range of sampling frequencies, from daily to weekly. Of those that
291 reported sampling once per week, most noted that they are still in the process of developing their
292 surveillance system and planned to increase sampling frequency in the future. Nearly three-
293 quarters (72%) reported taking samples at most locations two or three times per week. 16%
294 responded that some or all of their sites are sampled daily (5-7 times/week). Several noted that
295 samples were taken with different frequencies at different locations, and that sample collection
296 frequency varied over time. For example, when the virus was detected in the wastewater of a
297 specific dorm, they might increase sampling frequency at that location.

298 The majority of colleges analyzed their samples in on-campus laboratories; 28% used an
299 off-campus commercial laboratory. Of those that analyzed their own samples, the vast majority
300 of them (88%) relied in part or wholly on students (both undergraduates and graduates),
301 postdoctoral fellows, and faculty for wastewater sample analysis. All of the respondents used
302 quantitative analysis methods, either real-time reverse transcriptase quantitative polymerase
303 chain reaction (RT-qPCR) (68%), reverse transcriptase digital droplet polymerase chain reaction
304 (RT-ddPCR) (20%), or both technologies (12%) to identify the number of copies of RNA per mL
305 of wastewater. Colleges employed a range of viral concentration and RNA extraction methods
306 depending on factors including expertise, availability, cost, and speed. A technical comparison of
307 the different laboratory methods each college has been reported elsewhere (Pecson et al. 2021).

308 Program costs varied based on the number of sampling sites, number of samples analyzed
309 per week, costs per sample, and setup costs. Initial capital investments in equipment and staffing
310 (e.g. to collect and process samples, etc.) ranged from \$1,000 (using only existing equipment and
311 facilities, with in-kind support from faculty and students to collect and analyze samples) to over
312 \$500,000 (purchases of equipment, hiring new staff, and renting facilities for laboratory space).
313 Costs per sample are not readily comparable across institutions with different models of
314 accounting for labor, overhead and supplies costs. However, those that contracted with private
315 off-campus labs reported analysis fees ranging from \$200 to \$450 per sample. For those that
316 conducted their own analyses, costs from \$20 to \$400 per sample were reported (exclusive of
317 labor). Laboratory processing times ranged from 5 hours (for an on-campus lab using ddPCR) to
318 15 hours (depending on sample turbidity, using qPCR). Those using off-site labs generally used
319 refrigerated shipping services, which added to the per-sample cost.

320

321 Reporting and use of wastewater monitoring results in campus decision-making

322 All of the respondents reported sharing wastewater monitoring results with campus
323 decision makers. A subset also shared their results with local government (e.g., wastewater
324 agency staff; local, regional, or state health department). Over a quarter of the colleges publicly
325 shared wastewater results via text message or email to residents of affected dorms, in whole-
326 campus email announcements, or by integrating wastewater results into their campus COVID-19
327 surveillance dashboard.

328 The colleges communicated using diverse approaches, included establishing categorical
329 thresholds for “Levels” of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater (e.g. “low,” “medium,” or “high”),
330 providing absolute data (e.g. concentrations of RNA detected), reporting trends for each
331 sampling site (e.g. increasing, decreasing, or stable), or simply noting presence/absence of
332 SARS-CoV-2. Most reports included a summary of the wastewater surveillance process,

333 uncertainties involved, and implications for local public health risks. Some of the colleges
334 included follow-up actions in these communications (e.g. testing of dorm residents,
335 recommending hand-washing and social distancing), whereas others simply reported the results.
336 Some colleges did not regularly report results, but rather integrated wastewater data into
337 messaging as relevant to changes in college policies, such as reducing allowed gathering sizes or
338 moving to remote instruction.

339 Regardless of how, when, and to whom wastewater results were communicated, nearly
340 all colleges integrated wastewater data into their college’s overall COVID-19 surveillance and
341 response system. Several noted this integration is still a work in progress. Two-thirds reported
342 that a key function of their wastewater monitoring was to target clinical testing (either pooled or
343 individual diagnostic testing, including saliva, nasal swab, or nasal-pharyngeal swab) to students
344 living in residences with elevated SARS-CoV-2 RNA in their wastewater. Several noted that
345 targeting individual testing in response to a wastewater signal was a less costly approach than
346 frequent surveillance testing of all students to identify asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic cases.
347 Even where regular clinical surveillance testing was taking place, wastewater results were
348 helpful in providing early warning of infected individuals in dorms and requiring students to
349 quarantine until tested (CNN (Cable News Network) 2020). In several cases, wastewater results
350 also helped detect risks from untested individuals, including visitors or staff. One college
351 reported using wastewater data to evaluate the effectiveness of university interventions such as
352 email alerts recommending individual testing or reducing gathering size limits. At several
353 colleges, wastewater results corroborated trends in individual test results and gave campus
354 decision makers “more confidence” as they weighed restrictive measures like pausing in-person
355 classes.

356 Respondents noted that the role of wastewater monitoring results at colleges may change
357 over time. For example, several colleges found that wastewater results were most straightforward
358 in the “maintenance phase” after students were tested post-arrival on campus and before case
359 rates rose significantly. Once a significant number of infected students return to their dorms after
360 isolation, they may continue to shed the virus (Wang et al. 2020), complicating interpretation of
361 wastewater results. Wastewater data is also expected to be highly useful for tracking possible
362 outbreaks after the colleges’ populations begin to get vaccinated and institutions reduce
363 individual testing (Smith, Cassell, and Bhatnagar 2021).

364 Respondents noted complexities of sharing data from the unfamiliar process of
365 wastewater monitoring for SARS-CoV-2. Many mentioned the benefits of transparency
366 (immediately and publicly sharing wastewater results), such as building trust and encouraging
367 protective behaviors. Alternately, several respondents expressed concerns that public access to
368 results could incite unnecessary panic or cause people to second-guess the college’s responses.
369 One respondent noted positive feedback from parents of students who observed with gratitude
370 that the institution was taking a proactive step to maintain students’ health by monitoring
371 wastewater. Another noted they refrained from publicizing dormitory wastewater results in order
372 to avoid creating a stigma against students from a particular demographic or interest group who
373 resided in “themed dorms.” Colleges made different tradeoffs between transparency, sensitivity,
374 and privacy depending on their campus culture, leadership, and confidence in wastewater results.

375

376 Key elements of success and ongoing challenges

377 Respondents offered several insights into the key elements that contributed to progress in
378 wastewater surveillance at their colleges as well as ongoing challenges. Common themes are
379 summarized below.

380
381 Respondents identified a wide range of elements of the wastewater monitoring process that
382 worked well (self-defined “successes”), ranging from technical to educational to social.

- 383 • **Collaboration:** Nearly all respondents praised cooperation among faculty, facilities staff,
384 university administration, and, in several cases, the staff of wastewater treatment
385 facilities. One faculty member noted the wastewater monitoring effort had led to
386 “amazing collaborations and research opportunities that normally don’t fall in my scope
387 of work.” Respondents also reported new partnerships with other colleges, community
388 leaders, and government agencies (e.g., public works and public health). Several noted
389 that communicating with practitioners in other colleges helped them create successful
390 workflows. One respondent noted that “there has been an *incredibly* collegial attitude
391 about wastewater testing during the pandemic; it’s like nothing I’ve ever seen before!”
- 392 • **Student engagement:** Several of the colleges that engaged students in sampling and
393 analysis highlighted students’ enthusiasm and learning experiences as a benefit. One
394 student who was involved in her college’s wastewater surveillance noted an “immense
395 feeling of pride and satisfaction... The knowledge and skill set I have developed are so
396 valuable, and the work we did will make such a difference for our community and the
397 environment!” (Siena College 2020) Others noted that students contributed insights about
398 campus behaviors (e.g., location of parties) that informed wastewater sampling locations
399 and helped spread the word to others about the value of the wastewater monitoring
400 program.
- 401 • **Motivated staff:** Many respondents praised the involvement of “amazing” staff. One
402 respondent suggested that it was most productive to find the people on campus who were
403 “eager and willing” to help with wastewater monitoring, whatever their role, and work
404 with them to collect samples.
- 405 • **Support from college administration:** Administrators who supported college
406 wastewater monitoring efforts with resources – including financial support, staff time,
407 and release from teaching obligations – were vital. Several administrators adapted the
408 college’s policies to address urgent needs and streamline slow-moving bureaucratic
409 processes. As one respondent reflected, “universities are not flexible enough to handle the
410 rapid and nimble responses required to address a pandemic (e.g. hiring and purchasing
411 processes), so you need to have the president’s support to help bend rules and find work-
412 arounds to get things done.” Respondents also noted that high-level support was helpful
413 because the steep learning curve of wastewater surveillance often resulted in unexpected
414 challenges, delays, and costs. As one respondent said, “Be prepared to pay overtime.”
- 415 • **Problem-solving and adaptation:** Finding resourceful solutions to local challenges was
416 a hallmark of many of the college wastewater monitoring efforts. Respondents reported
417 adapting to changing student population sizes and living situations, creatively sampling
418 from less-accessible sewers, and developing inventive work-arounds to supply-chain
419 disruptions. In addition, many respondents noted they improved analytical methods in the
420 laboratory to gain greater sensitivity, reduce turn-around time for results, and reduce
421 costs. Many local solutions were made possible by support from collaborative networks
422 with practitioners from other colleges and wastewater agencies.

423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457

Respondents also cited many challenges, most of which related either to aspects of wastewater surveillance or complexities of interpreting results. Some of the most commonly cited technical challenges included:

- **Supply chain delays:** Respondents noted delays resulting from limited availability of autosampler pumps, centrifuge equipment, and RNA extraction kits.
- **Obtaining representative samples:** Even with composite sampling, obtaining representative samples at the dormitory scale is challenging due to issues with non-homogenous wastewater (variable fecal concentration), low-flow conditions, and autosampler intake clogging.
- **Collection system logistics:** The ease of wastewater sampling depends on the college's physical layout. For example, mapping sewer pipes and installing autosamplers in the plumbing of older campuses may be more logistically challenging due to the age and complexity of their sewer systems. Other colleges had to obtain special permits to lift manhole covers in city streets to obtain wastewater samples, figure out how to safely enter a confined sewer space, and protect autosamplers from theft or vandalism.
- **Developing laboratory methods:** Many college laboratories faced challenges developing appropriate techniques for concentration, extraction, and data analysis. As one respondent noted, "There are so many little lessons learned from making mistakes...there is going to be trial and error."
- **Safety protocols:** Researchers are still unsure how persistent infective SARS-CoV-2 is in wastewater (Amoah, Kumari, and Bux 2020), leading to uncertainty about the necessary levels of laboratory disinfection, equipment cleaning, and protective equipment required by personnel to collect and analyze samples. Biosafety protocols posed a hurdle for many college laboratories.
- **Timing:** In order to effectively inform decisions (e.g. follow-up testing of students), wastewater monitoring results need to be available quickly. Although sample processing time was typically under 12 hours, sample collection, lab workflows, shipping, and staffing limitations often delayed availability of results.
- **Scaling up from research to production:** Many colleges initiated wastewater surveillance through pilot-scale research projects. The complexity of expanding to campus-wide monitoring was frequently underestimated. Associated challenges included human resources, training, biosafety regulations, supplies, equipment, and space as they scaled up their efforts.

458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468

In addition to these technical challenges, many respondents noted the complexities involved in interpretation, communication, and use of wastewater results. There is currently no standard guidance for interpretation of wastewater results. In particular, several colleges noted difficulty "reconciling results from the wastewater with individual testing." One respondent found it difficult to explain to administrators why SARS-CoV-2 RNA was not detected in wastewater results from the "isolation dorm" that housed students known to be infected with COVID-19. Similarly, several colleges reported multiple instances of detecting the virus RNA in dorm wastewater, testing residents, and finding no positive individual test results. There are multiple possible explanations, including false negatives during clinical testing, low compliance with clinical testing directives, fecal contributions by non-residents, and convalescent students

469 back in residence. However, it was challenging to explain these possibilities to anxious students,
470 administrators, and members of the public. These examples highlight the complexities of
471 communicating uncertain but highly salient information in real time. As one respondent said,
472 “One must interpret the data the best that one can and not overstate.”

473 Participants gained experience interpreting trends in their particular setting over time.
474 One respondent noted, “After a while we learned that three points with a clear positive slope
475 meant there was an increase in cases in a dorm (an outbreak), but...did not accurately predict the
476 number of people we would find.” Many colleges struggled with effective messaging to diverse
477 audiences. For example, one noted that the “gross factor” associated with their initial choice of
478 terminology distracted students from their public health message. Another noted that emails
479 recommending testing following positive wastewater results were so frequent that students
480 became inured, resulting in reduced compliance with follow-up testing.

481 Despite such challenges, many respondents remained positive about the potential for
482 wastewater surveillance to enhance colleges’ pandemic responses. Several respondents shared
483 personal reflections about their ongoing support for wastewater monitoring.

- 484 • “There is a huge amount of value in getting negative results out of dorms, and that is
485 underestimated. Every time I get a zero [no detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from
486 wastewater] that is a comfort. There could be a case there that wasn’t caught, but there’s
487 a very low probability that an actual outbreak is occurring.”
- 488 • “The director of our regional health department said our college’s wastewater monitoring
489 has ‘protected our community from wider spread infections.’”
- 490 • “Wastewater testing allows use of limited testing resources to maximum benefit.”
- 491 • “We successfully stopped an outbreak based on this surveillance.”
- 492 • “Wastewater testing gave us a short, advanced warning of our outbreak, enough to
493 mobilize mass testing and request additional resources. It probably gained us a few days
494 in identifying and isolating students.”
- 495 • “The benefit to cost ratio is huge.”
- 496 • “Wastewater is a major piece of the puzzle in preventing outbreaks in the dorms...I truly
497 believe the tremendous efforts of the individuals who have worked on these projects
498 controlled outbreaks, kept campuses open, and most likely saved lives.”

499 One caveat was that wastewater surveillance adds more value for some colleges than
500 others, and that some “universities with extensive clinical testing are hesitant to utilize
501 wastewater” because they do not think it adds valuable information. Others see the two
502 approaches as complementary, with wastewater providing early warning and a check on untested
503 individuals.

504 Overall, respondents painted a picture of developing wastewater surveillance as a
505 collaborative learning process involving diverse on- and off-campus stakeholders. Particularly at
506 colleges where the surveillance efforts originated with research, these efforts often pulled faculty
507 into unfamiliar roles. Several faculty members who initiated wastewater monitoring provided
508 specific advice for others in similar positions (see Supplemental Material: Insights and advice to
509 fellow faculty engaging in wastewater monitoring).

511 **A process-oriented framework for wastewater surveillance**

512 These findings suggest that there is no single ideal, universally applicable approach to
513 wastewater monitoring on college campuses. Rather, each campus experienced an iterative, user-
514 informed process that involved identification of unique information needs, sewage infrastructure,

515 opportunities for wastewater sampling and analysis, ways to interpret results for decision makers
516 and approaches to communication (Figure 2). The interplay between these different factors
517 informed development of each college’s wastewater surveillance strategy. Although the idea of a
518 “playbook” for wastewater monitoring is appealing, the diversity of these 25 colleges’
519 experiences suggests that it may be more appropriate to design wastewater surveillance as a
520 process of collaborative learning and adaptation. Based on these 25 colleges’ experiences, we
521 developed a framework for structuring such an iterative process. This process is delineated in
522 Table 3 through a series of questions for consideration at each step.

523

524 Information needs

525 Different institutions have different information needs, ranging from saving money by
526 minimizing the need for clinical testing, to identifying the presence of infected individuals who
527 were not tested, to reassuring the local community that students are not spreading COVID-19.
528 The potential for wastewater surveillance to meet these needs is shaped by many factors,
529 including the proportion of students who reside on campus and the current community-wide
530 infection rate. It is important to involve potential information users, including administrators,
531 student life, communications, and community stakeholders in designing the wastewater
532 surveillance system. Sources and implications of uncertainty, alternative approaches, and
533 resource requirements are a key part of this discussion. Clarifying the expected use of
534 wastewater results can guide subsequent decisions about the sampling plan and tradeoffs when
535 resources are limited.

536

537 Wastewater infrastructure

538 Understanding the local sewer system is essential, since physical layout and accessibility often
539 constrain the wastewater monitoring approaches. Many colleges lack an accurate map of their
540 wastewater infrastructure, particularly as it interfaces with the surrounding community. The next
541 step is to identify potential sampling locations (manholes, building cleanouts, wastewater
542 treatment plants). Sewer systems are designed for efficient wastewater conveyance, not for
543 public health surveillance – so collecting samples at the best locations for informing public
544 health decisions may not be possible. This can complicate colleges’ efforts to use wastewater
545 testing to identify specific groups of students for testing. For example, single dormitories may
546 have multiple sewer outlets, share outflows with adjacent dorms or public buildings (e.g. dining
547 halls), or be integrated with community systems. The physical layout of wastewater
548 infrastructure must be considered in the development of the sampling strategy, the interpretation
549 of results, and determination of follow-up actions.

550

551 Sampling plan

552 Once the flow of wastewater is understood, a sampling plan can be designed to meet identified
553 information needs. Choosing sampling sites requires input from decision makers, facilities staff,
554 and other stakeholders to assess the merits of various options. For example, certain sites may be
555 difficult to access (either physically or legally, as with manholes located in public streets), have
556 potential for clogging, have inadequate flow, pose a risk to security of autosamplers, or be
557 vulnerable to extreme weather conditions. The choice of autosamplers, passive samplers
558 (absorbent swabs), or grab samples should include consideration of equipment costs, staff time,
559 wastewater heterogeneity, and institutional characteristics. For example, since peak flows are not
560 as predictable when students do not have to leave their housing at a specific time to attend class,

561 composite sampling may be especially useful at schools with virtual instruction. However,
562 composite samples can also dilute SARS-CoV-2 signals, particularly in low prevalence areas.
563 Passive samples may be cost-effective, but there have not yet been robust studies comparing
564 results between composite samplers and passive swabs. Finally, sampling frequency must be
565 determined. This may involve tradeoffs between resources (costs, staff time, etc.) and ability to
566 rapidly identify trends in the data. Decisions about who will collect samples depend on multiple
567 factors including cost, safety regulations, and timing of analysis. Colleges may establish different
568 sampling schemes for different locations: for example, by using student labor in accessible on-
569 campus locations and employing contractors for off-campus sample collection, or by varying
570 frequency of sampling at different sites.

571 Wastewater analysis options

572 For colleges with on-campus laboratories capable of performing wastewater analysis, the choice
573 of analysis approach may be straightforward. However, on-campus labs will need to plan
574 carefully to scale up their capacity. For colleges relying on commercial analysis services,
575 considerations include cost, turnaround time, and reliability. The total time for shipping,
576 analysis, and return of results may vary significantly among commercial labs, and rapid return of
577 results is essential to end users. The recent proliferation of commercial laboratory services means
578 that it may be difficult for colleges to identify differences in limits of sensitivity, reliability,
579 reporting formats, and quality control.

581 Data interpretation and use

582 Despite the desire expressed by many colleges to have a predetermined “end use protocol” for
583 wastewater results, contextual information and expert human judgement in interpreting results
584 are critical. Wastewater monitoring results are most informative when integrated with individual
585 testing data and other contextual information about sample representativeness, the results of
586 laboratory positive and negative controls, the boundaries of sewershed catchment areas, and the
587 number of infected and recovering individuals in each catchment. Use of wastewater data
588 depends upon the college’s unique social and institutional dynamics. For example, the ability to
589 follow up on a positive wastewater signal with individual diagnostic testing may be determined
590 by whether the college is able to mandate student testing, whether students tend to comply with or
591 evade testing requirements, and whether students are willing and able to self-isolate. Different
592 institutions have varied potential public health interventions depending on their resources,
593 physical structure, student body size, and other constraints (e.g. public versus private). This
594 breadth of considerations suggests that a team of individuals with diverse experience is needed to
595 interpret results on an ongoing basis, ideally including expertise in environmental engineering,
596 epidemiology, biostatistics, facilities management, campus operations, student life, and
597 communications.

599 Communication plan

600 It is important to prepare a communication plan prior to detecting spikes in wastewater.
601 Communication plans should engage a wide range of stakeholders, including wastewater experts,
602 university communications, legal experts, and student life professionals. Students may also
603 inform effective messages and communication approaches. Each college should identify
604 appropriate visualization tools for its intended audiences. Examples include using color to
605 highlight data trends in particular locations; superimposing data on a map of campus residence
606

607 halls; or showing trends in wastewater data along with trends in clinical cases. Finally, the
608 communication plan should carefully consider the advantages and disadvantages of transparency
609 about wastewater data given inherent uncertainties, privacy considerations, and contextual
610 factors.

611 Evaluation and adaptation

613 As the cyclical design of Figure 2 indicates, experience and changing circumstances may require
614 adaptation of initial wastewater surveillance plans. Colleges should establish structures, metrics,
615 and collaborative processes for ongoing evaluation and adaptation. Most fundamentally, it is
616 important to revisit whether the initially identified information needs are being met, and if not,
617 whether the wastewater surveillance program can be adjusted to do so. Additional resource needs
618 may be identified. Alternately, expectations about how wastewater results can support the
619 college's COVID-19 management efforts may need to be altered.

620 **Discussion**

622 This analysis is limited by the information provided by the 25 colleges that chose to
623 participate in this study. This small pool may not be representative of the many institutions that
624 have implemented wastewater surveillance. In most cases, the information provided represents
625 the knowledge of one key informant at each college. Future in-depth case studies could shed
626 light on varied perspectives by multiple stakeholders at each institution. Nonetheless, the wide
627 range of approaches taken by these cases provides key insights to better understand the potential
628 for wastewater monitoring to inform colleges public health decision making.

629 This study highlighted some of the research needs related to wastewater monitoring for
630 SARS-CoV-2 on college campuses. While several respondents stated unequivocally that their
631 wastewater monitoring programs were worth the effort, others voiced the need for a more
632 systematic assessment of the costs and public health benefits of wastewater monitoring at
633 colleges. More research is needed to determine how wastewater surveillance and individual
634 clinical testing for SARS-CoV-2 can be most effectively paired to reduce COVID-19
635 transmission. There is also an urgent need for better understanding of how colleges' varied social
636 and decision-making contexts (i.e., privacy concerns, consent, communication, baseline health of
637 the populations, and degree of administrative controls over the social environment) affect their
638 wastewater surveillance efforts. For example, wastewater monitoring may be particularly useful
639 in the setting of public universities, which may be less able to compel students' compliance with
640 clinical testing.

641 Research to assess the sensitivity of low-cost sampling methods is needed. Comparisons
642 of results from grab, passive swab, and composite samples at the building scale could help
643 resource-limited institutions make appropriate choices. Ultimately, a clear understanding of the
644 sensitivity of each of these approaches for detecting infected individuals in a building would be
645 very helpful. Additional research to understand better the variability associated with wastewater
646 data is critical to its effective use.

647 Many respondents expressed a need for protocols for communication and use of
648 wastewater results. To help inform such guidelines, social science research is needed to help
649 identify effective ways to communicate uncertain results from wastewater surveillance, to
650 motivate behavior, and to support decisions using multiple sources of information. An in-depth
651 analysis of the ways in which different colleges (and other residential facilities) have interpreted

652 and communicated results of wastewater monitoring, along with corresponding changes in
653 behavior and case rates could elucidate some of these key information needs.

654 The diversity in approaches across the colleges included in this study was largely driven
655 by differences in physical infrastructure layout, research expertise, financial resources,
656 institutional characteristics, and leadership support. Research that informs cost-effective
657 implementation of wastewater monitoring at institutions with limited technical, financial, and
658 human resources is essential to promote equity in both health and educational outcomes.

659

660 **Conclusions**

661 This initial overview of wastewater monitoring at colleges across the U.S. reflects a wide
662 variety of experiences. These efforts were started by different stakeholders (faculty, staff,
663 administration, public health officials) for different reasons. Their diverse goals, combined with
664 varied funding, physical conditions, research expertise, and technical capacity, resulted in
665 approaches that vary in nearly every dimension (e.g. number and types of sites sampled,
666 frequency and methodology of sampling, analysis methodology, and use of data in decision-
667 making).

668 Despite differences in their approaches, common themes emerged from these colleges'
669 experiences. Most colleges encountered unexpected challenges in the design and implementation
670 of wastewater surveillance, resulting in rapid learning and frequent recalibration of expectations.
671 The vast majority faced challenges in how to interpret, communicate and use wastewater results
672 to inform their pandemic response. Collaboration – both within and outside of the institution –
673 was reported as essential to success in nearly every case.

674 These initial experiences provide many lessons, both for other colleges contemplating
675 implementing wastewater monitoring as part of their broader COVID-19 surveillance systems, as
676 well as for other types of institutions and community-level monitoring efforts. These lessons
677 include the need for a systematic assessment of wastewater infrastructure, sampling options, and
678 consideration of data use when designing the system. In addition, these experiences indicate that
679 developing and implementing effective wastewater surveillance programs at colleges requires a
680 collaborative multidisciplinary process, in which diverse campus and community stakeholders
681 iteratively evaluate and adapt their strategy to best inform public health action.

682

683 **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to thank these individuals for their important
684 contributions to this research and information about their colleges' wastewater surveillance
685 systems: Aaron Best, Walter Betancourt, Cindi K. Brinkman, Lifang Chiang, Erik R. Coats,
686 David Freedman, Elmer Johnson, Rob Knight, Karl Korfmacher, Erin K. Lipp, Erin A. Mack,
687 Christopher Maroney, Simona Matsoyan, Ian Pepper, Shalina Shahin, Lachlan Squair, Eva M.
688 Top, and Rogelio Zuniga-Montanez. Dr. Korfmacher's work on this project was supported in
689 part by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences grant P30 ES001247. Dr. Harris-
690 Lovett's work on this project was supported in part by the Catena Foundation. The content of
691 this manuscript is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the
692 views of contributors, interviewees, or institutions included in the study.

693

694 **References**

- 695 Ahmed, Warish, Nicola Angel, Janette Edson, Kyle Bibby, Aaron Bivins, Jake W. O'Brien, Phil
696 M. Choi, et al. 2020. "First Confirmed Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Untreated
697 Wastewater in Australia: A Proof of Concept for the Wastewater Surveillance of COVID-
698 19 in the Community." *Science of The Total Environment* 728 (August): 138764.
699 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764>.
- 700 Ahmed, Warish, Paul M. Bertsch, Kyle Bibby, Eiji Haramoto, Joanne Hewitt, Flavia Huygens,
701 Pradip Gyawali, Asja Korajkic, Shane Riddell, and Samendra P. Sherchan. 2020. "Decay
702 of SARS-CoV-2 and Surrogate Murine Hepatitis Virus RNA in Untreated Wastewater to
703 Inform Application in Wastewater-Based Epidemiology." *Environmental Research* 191:
704 110092.
- 705 Ahmed, Warish, Aaron Bivins, Paul M. Bertsch, Kyle Bibby, Phil M. Choi, Kata Farkas, Pradip
706 Gyawali, et al. 2020. "Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater: Methods
707 Optimization and Quality Control Are Crucial for Generating Reliable Public Health
708 Information." *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health*, Environmental
709 Health: COVID-19, 17 (October): 82–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.003>.
- 710 Ahmed, Warish, Aaron Bivins, Paul M. Bertsch, Kyle Bibby, Pradip Gyawali, Samendra P.
711 Sherchan, Stuart L. Simpson, et al. 2021. "Intraday Variability of Indicator and
712 Pathogenic Viruses in 1-h and 24-h Composite Wastewater Samples: Implications for
713 Wastewater-Based Epidemiology." *Environmental Research* 193 (February): 110531.
714 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.110531>.
- 715 Amoah, Isaac Dennis, Sheena Kumari, and Faizal Bux. 2020. "Coronaviruses in Wastewater
716 Processes: Source, Fate and Potential Risks." *Environment International* 143 (October):
717 105962. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105962>.
- 718 Asghar, Humayun, Ousmane M. Diop, Goitom Weldegebriel, Farzana Malik, Sushmitha Shetty,
719 Laila El Bassioni, Adefunke O. Akande, Eman Al Maamoun, Sohail Zaidi, and Adekunle
720 J. Adeniji. 2014. "Environmental Surveillance for Polioviruses in the Global Polio
721 Eradication Initiative." *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* 210 (suppl_1): S294–303.
- 722 Betancourt, Walter W., Bradley W. Schmitz, Gabriel K. Innes, Kristen M. Pogreba Brown, Sarah
723 M. Prasek, Erika R. Stark, Aidan R. Foster, et al. 2020. "Wastewater-Based
724 Epidemiology for Averting COVID-19 Outbreaks on The University of Arizona
725 Campus." *MedRxiv*, November, 2020.11.13.20231340.
726 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.13.20231340>.
- 727 Bivins, Aaron, Devin North, Arslan Ahmad, Warish Ahmed, Eric Alm, Frederic Been, Prosun
728 Bhattacharya, et al. 2020. "Wastewater-Based Epidemiology: Global Collaborative to
729 Maximize Contributions in the Fight Against COVID-19." *Environmental Science &
730 Technology* 54 (13): 7754–57. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c02388>.
- 731 Buitrago-Garcia, Diana, Dianne Egli-Gany, Michel J. Counotte, Stefanie Hossmann, Hira Imeri,
732 Aziz Mert Ipekci, Georgia Salanti, and Nicola Low. 2020. "Occurrence and Transmission
733 Potential of Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections: A Living
734 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *PLoS Medicine* 17 (9): e1003346.
- 735 CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). 2020a. "COVID-19 Cases, Deaths, and
736 Trends in the US | CDC COVID Data Tracker." Centers for Disease Control and
737 Prevention. March 28, 2020. <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker>.

- 738 ———. 2020b. “National Wastewater Surveillance System.” Centers for Disease Control and
739 Prevention. December 28, 2020. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/wastewater-surveillance.html)
740 [updates/wastewater-surveillance.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/wastewater-surveillance.html).
- 741 CNN (Cable News Network). 2020. “Utah State University: 287 Students Quarantined after
742 Covid-19 Found in Wastewater from Four Dorms.” September 1, 2020.
743 <https://www.cnn.com/2020/09/01/health/us-coronavirus-tuesday/index.html>.
- 744 “CoSeS: Communicating Sewage Surveillance for COVID-19.” 2021. 2021.
745 <https://sites.uwm.edu/coses/>.
- 746 Curtis, Kyle, David Keeling, Kathleen Yetka, Allison Larson, and Raul Gonzalez. 2020.
747 “Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Concentration and Loading Variability from Grab and 24-
748 Hour Composite Samples.” *MedRxiv*, July, 2020.07.10.20150607.
749 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.10.20150607>.
- 750 Daughton, Christian G. 2020. “Wastewater Surveillance for Population-Wide Covid-19: The
751 Present and Future.” *Science of the Total Environment*, 139631.
- 752 Farkas, Kata, Luke S. Hillary, Shelagh K. Malham, James E. McDonald, and David L. Jones.
753 2020. “Wastewater and Public Health: The Potential of Wastewater Surveillance for
754 Monitoring COVID-19.” *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health* 17
755 (October): 14–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.06.001>.
- 756 Gable, Lance, Natalie Ram, and Jeffrey L. Ram. 2020. “Legal and Ethical Implications of
757 Wastewater Sars-CoV-2 Monitoring for COVID-19 Surveillance.” *Journal of Law and*
758 *the Biosciences*.
- 759 Gonzalez, Raul, Kyle Curtis, Aaron Bivins, Kyle Bibby, Mark H. Weir, Kathleen Yetka, Hannah
760 Thompson, David Keeling, Jamie Mitchell, and Dana Gonzalez. 2020. “COVID-19
761 Surveillance in Southeastern Virginia Using Wastewater-Based Epidemiology.” *Water*
762 *Research* 186 (November): 116296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116296>.
- 763 Graham, Katherine E., Stephanie K. Loeb, Marlene K. Wolfe, David Catoe, Nasa Sinnott-
764 Armstrong, Sooyeol Kim, Kevan M. Yamahara, et al. 2021. “SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
765 Wastewater Settled Solids Is Associated with COVID-19 Cases in a Large Urban
766 Sewershed.” *Environmental Science & Technology* 55 (1): 488–98.
767 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c06191>.
- 768 Hart, Olga E., and Rolf U. Halden. 2020. “Computational Analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19
769 Surveillance by Wastewater-Based Epidemiology Locally and Globally: Feasibility,
770 Economy, Opportunities and Challenges.” *Science of the Total Environment* 730:
771 138875.
- 772 Hassard, Francis, Lian Lundy, Andrew C. Singer, Jasmine Grimsley, and Mariachiara Di Cesare.
773 2021. “Innovation in Wastewater Near-Source Tracking for Rapid Identification of
774 COVID-19 in Schools.” *The Lancet Microbe* 2 (1): e4–5. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30193-2)
775 [5247\(20\)30193-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30193-2).
- 776 Joh, Elizabeth E. 2020. “COVID-19 Sewage Testing as a Police Surveillance Infrastructure.”
777 SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 3742320. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network.
778 <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3742320>.
- 779 Kilaru, Pruthvi, David Larsen, and David Monk. 2020. “Design and Utilization of Homemade
780 Wastewater Samplers during the COVID-19 Pandemic.” *enrXiv*.
781 <https://doi.org/10.31224/osf.io/frbuk>.
- 782 Larsen, David A., and Krista R. Wigginton. 2020. “Tracking COVID-19 with Wastewater.”
783 *Nature Biotechnology* 38 (10): 1151–53. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0690-1>.

- 784 Liu, Pengbo, Makoto Ibaraki, Jamie VanTassell, Kelly Geith, Matthew Cavallo, Rebecca Kann,
785 and Christine Moe. 2020. “A Novel COVID-19 Early Warning Tool: Moore Swab
786 Method for Wastewater Surveillance at an Institutional Level.” *MedRxiv*.
- 787 Medema, Gertjan, Frederic Been, Leo Heijnen, and Susan Petterson. 2020. “Implementation of
788 Environmental Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 Virus to Support Public Health Decisions:
789 Opportunities and Challenges.” *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health*,
790 *Environmental Health: COVID-19*, 17 (October): 49–71.
791 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.006>.
- 792 Medema, Gertjan, Leo Heijnen, Goffe Elsinga, Ronald Italiaander, and Anke Brouwer. 2020.
793 “Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported
794 COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands.”
795 *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* 7 (7): 511–16.
796 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357>.
- 797 National Academies. 2020. “College COVID-19 Testing Strategies Webinar Series.” 2020.
798 [https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/college-covid-19-testing-strategies-](https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/college-covid-19-testing-strategies-webinar-series)
799 [webinar-series](https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/college-covid-19-testing-strategies-webinar-series).
- 800 Ohio Department of Health. 2021. “Ohio Coronavirus Wastewater Monitoring Network.”
801 January 26, 2021. [https://coronavirus.ohio.gov/wps/portal/gov/covid-](https://coronavirus.ohio.gov/wps/portal/gov/covid-19/dashboards/other-resources/wastewater)
802 [19/dashboards/other-resources/wastewater](https://coronavirus.ohio.gov/wps/portal/gov/covid-19/dashboards/other-resources/wastewater).
- 803 Oregon Health Authority. 2021. “Oregon’s SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater Monitoring.” 2021.
804 [https://public.tableau.com/profile/oregon.health.authority.covid.19#!/vizhome/OregonsS](https://public.tableau.com/profile/oregon.health.authority.covid.19#!/vizhome/OregonsSARS-CoV-2WastewaterMonitoring/WastewaterDashboard)
805 [ARS-CoV-2WastewaterMonitoring/WastewaterDashboard](https://public.tableau.com/profile/oregon.health.authority.covid.19#!/vizhome/OregonsSARS-CoV-2WastewaterMonitoring/WastewaterDashboard).
- 806 Peccia, Jordan, Alessandro Zulli, Doug E. Brackney, Nathan D. Grubaugh, Edward H. Kaplan,
807 Arnau Casanovas-Massana, Albert I. Ko, et al. 2020. “Measurement of SARS-CoV-2
808 RNA in Wastewater Tracks Community Infection Dynamics.” *Nature Biotechnology* 38
809 (10): 1164–67. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0684-z>.
- 810 Pecson, Brian M., Emily Darby, Charles N. Haas, Yamrot M. Amha, Mitchel Bartolo, Richard
811 Danielson, Yeggie Dearborn, et al. 2021. “Reproducibility and Sensitivity of 36 Methods
812 to Quantify the SARS-CoV-2 Genetic Signal in Raw Wastewater: Findings from an
813 Interlaboratory Methods Evaluation in the U.S.” *Environmental Science: Water Research*
814 *& Technology*, January. <https://doi.org/10.1039/D0EW00946F>.
- 815 Peiser, Jaclyn. 2020. “The University of Arizona Says It Caught a Dorm’s Covid-19 Outbreak
816 before It Started. Its Secret Weapon: Poop.” *Washington Post*, August 28, 2020.
817 [https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2020/08/28/arizona-coronavirus-wastewater-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2020/08/28/arizona-coronavirus-wastewater-testing/)
818 [testing/](https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2020/08/28/arizona-coronavirus-wastewater-testing/).
- 819 Philo, Sarah E., Erika K. Keim, Rachael Swanstrom, Angelo Q. W. Ong, Elisabeth A. Burnor,
820 Alexandra L. Kossik, Joanna C. Harrison, et al. 2021. “A Comparison of SARS-CoV-2
821 Wastewater Concentration Methods for Environmental Surveillance.” *Science of The*
822 *Total Environment* 760 (March): 144215.
823 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144215>.
- 824 Polo, David, Marcos Quintela-Baluja, Alexander Corbishley, Davey L. Jones, Andrew C. Singer,
825 David W. Graham, and Jesús L. Romalde. 2020. “Making Waves: Wastewater-Based
826 Epidemiology for COVID-19—Approaches and Challenges for Surveillance and
827 Prediction.” *Water Research* 186: 116404.
- 828 Randazzo, Walter, Enric Cuevas-Ferrando, Rafael Sanjuán, Pilar Domingo-Calap, and Gloria
829 Sánchez. 2020. “Metropolitan Wastewater Analysis for COVID-19 Epidemiological

- 830 Surveillance.” *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health* 230
831 (September): 113621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2020.113621>.
- 832 Randazzo, Walter, Pilar Truchado, Enric Cuevas-Ferrando, Pedro Simón, Ana Allende, and
833 Gloria Sánchez. 2020. “SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Anticipated COVID-19
834 Occurrence in a Low Prevalence Area.” *Water Research* 181: 115942.
835 *Research Coordination Network: Wastewater Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2*. 2020.
836 [https://www.nsf.gov/awardsearch/showAward?AWD_ID=2038087&HistoricalAwards=f](https://www.nsf.gov/awardsearch/showAward?AWD_ID=2038087&HistoricalAwards=false)
837 [alse](https://www.nsf.gov/awardsearch/showAward?AWD_ID=2038087&HistoricalAwards=false).
- 838 Sherchan, Samendra P., Shalina Shahin, Lauren M. Ward, Sarmila Tandukar, Tiong G. Aw,
839 Bradley Schmitz, Warish Ahmed, and Masaaki Kitajima. 2020. “First Detection of
840 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater in North America: A Study in Louisiana, USA.” *The*
841 *Science of the Total Environment* 743 (November): 140621.
842 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140621>.
- 843 Siena College. 2020. “Looking for Clues in the Toilet.” Siena College. September 4, 2020.
844 <https://www.siena.edu/news/story/looking-for-clues-in-the-toilet/>.
- 845 Smith, Ted, Gail Cassell, and Aruni Bhatnagar. 2021. “Wastewater Surveillance Can Have a
846 Second Act in COVID-19 Vaccine Distribution.” *JAMA Health Forum* 2 (1): e201616.
847 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamahealthforum.2020.1616>.
- 848 Stadler, Lauren B., Katherine Ensor, Justin R. Clark, Prashant Kalvapalle, Zachary W. LaTurner,
849 Lilian Mojica, Austen L. Terwilliger, Yue Zhuo, Priyanka Ali, and Vasanthi Avadhanula.
850 2020. “Wastewater Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 as a Predictive Metric of Positivity Rate for
851 a Major Metropolis.” *MedRxiv*.
- 852 Tong, Allison, Kate Flemming, Elizabeth McInnes, Sandy Oliver, and Jonathan Craig. 2012.
853 “Enhancing Transparency in Reporting the Synthesis of Qualitative Research:
854 ENTREQ.” *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 12 (1): 181.
855 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-12-181>.
- 856 Tong, Allison, Peter Sainsbury, and Jonathan Craig. 2007. “Consolidated Criteria for Reporting
857 Qualitative Research (COREQ): A 32-Item Checklist for Interviews and Focus Groups.”
858 *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 19 (6): 349–57.
859 <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>.
- 860 University of California Merced. 2021. “COVID19Poops Dashboard.” Covid19wbec.Org.
861 January 26, 2021. <https://www.covid19wbec.org/covidpoops19>.
- 862 Wang, Xiaoming, Jingwei Zheng, Lei Guo, Hao Yao, Lingya Wang, XiaoDong Xia, and Weixi
863 Zhang. 2020. “Fecal Viral Shedding in COVID-19 Patients: Clinical Significance, Viral
864 Load Dynamics and Survival Analysis.” *Virus Research* 289: 198147.
- 865 Wölfel, Roman, Victor M. Corman, Wolfgang Guggemos, Michael Seilmaier, Sabine Zange,
866 Marcel A. Müller, Daniela Niemeyer, Terry C. Jones, Patrick Vollmar, and Camilla
867 Rothe. 2020. “Virological Assessment of Hospitalized Patients with COVID-2019.”
868 *Nature* 581 (7809): 465–69.
- 869 Wu, Fuqing, Amy Xiao, Jianbo Zhang, Katya Moniz, Noriko Endo, Federica Armas, Richard
870 Bonneau, et al. 2020. “SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Foreshadow Dynamics and
871 Clinical Presentation of New COVID-19 Cases.” *MedRxiv*, July.
872 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20117747>.
- 873 Xagorarakis, Irene. 2020. “Can We Predict Viral Outbreaks Using Wastewater Surveillance?”
874 *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 146 (11): 01820003.
875 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)EE.1943-7870.0001831](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)EE.1943-7870.0001831).
- 876

877 **Tables**

878

879 Table 1: Characteristics of case study colleges

880

College Name	Location City	State	Total 2019 Enrollment	Public/private
Clemson University	Clemson	SC	25,822	public
Colorado College	Colorado Springs	CO	2,270	private
Colorado State University	Fort Collins	CO	33,996	public
Hope College	Holland	MI	3,060	private
Oregon State University (system)	Multiple	OR	28,886	public
St. John Fisher College	Rochester	NY	3,647	private
Siena College	Loudonville	NY	3,226	private
SUNY Morrisville	Morrisville	NY	3,000	public
SUNY Oneonta	Oneonta	NY	6,733	public
Syracuse University	Syracuse	NY	22,850	private
Tulane University	New Orleans	LA	14,602	private
University of Arizona	Tucson	AZ	45,918	public
University of California Berkeley	Berkeley	CA	42,347	public
University of California Davis	Davis	CA	39,629	public
University California San Diego	San Diego	CA	38,396	public
University of Connecticut	Mansfield	CT	32,333	public
University of Georgia	Athens	GA	38,920	public
University of Idaho	Moscow	ID	10,791	public
University of Maine (system)	Multiple	ME	35,337	public
University of Massachusetts Amherst	Amherst	MA	49,617	public
University of Massachusetts Lowell	Lowell	MA	18,338	public
University of New Hampshire	Durham	NH	14,509	public
University of Notre Dame	Notre Dame	IN	11,836	private
Utah State University	Multiple	UT	27,691	public
Wayne State University	Detroit	MI	26,251	public

881

882

883

884

885 Table 2. Characteristics of college wastewater monitoring programs
886

College name	Laboratory Analysis (on or off-campus)	Number of sites sampled	Frequency of sampling (#/ week)	Sample collection (grab or composite)	Data sharing
Clemson University	off	17 ^{△△}	2 [△]	both	public
Colorado College	off	2	2	grab*	college
Colorado State University	on	17	3	composite	college
Hope College	on	11	5 [△]	composite	college
Oregon State University System	on	27	2	composite	college
St. John Fisher College	off	8	2	composite	public
Siena College	off	9	1	composite	college
SUNY Morrisville	off	9	2 [△]	composite	public
SUNY Oneonta	off	3	2	composite	public
Syracuse University	off	16	2	composite	public
Tulane University	on	12 ^{△△}	1 [△]	grab	college
University of Arizona	on	18	3	grab	college
University of California Berkeley	on	3	3 [△]	composite	public
University of California Davis	on	21	2 [△]	composite	college
University of California San Diego	on	68	7	composite	college
University of Connecticut	on	16	5	composite	college
University of Georgia	on	3	2	composite	public
University of Idaho	on	10	2	both	college
University of Maine System	on	3	1	composite	public
University of Massachusetts Amherst	on	10	2 [△]	composite	public
University of Massachusetts Lowell	on	2	2	grab*	college
University of New Hampshire	on	10	3	grab	college

University of Notre Dame	on	1	7	composite	college
Utah State University System	on	32	2	composite	public
Wayne State University	on	9	2	grab**	public

887

888 Notes:

889 *Planning to transition to composite samplers in Spring 2021

890 **Combine multiple grab samples (3/day) taken at each sample site

891 ^Δ Different sites sampled at different frequencies, number in table denotes most common

892 frequency across sites

893 ^{ΔΔ}Number of sampling sites varies

894

895

896 Table 3: A framework for designing a campus wastewater monitoring system

Framework element	Key question	Factors for consideration
Information needs	Who will use the information? What information do those users need from wastewater?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target individual testing and contact-tracing resources • Identify SARS-CoV-2 trends over time • Compare on- and off-campus trends • Limitations/uncertainties of results • Resources available (expected value of sample information)
Wastewater infrastructure	How can the sewage infrastructure be accessed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and create maps of sewer system • Assess accessibility of sampling sites • Coordinate with municipal wastewater agency and/or campus facilities staff
Sampling plan	How can we sample wastewater?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select sampling locations • Consider tradeoffs between composite samples, passive samples, or grab samples • Determine sampling frequency (samples/week) • Identify who will collect samples
Wastewater analysis	Who can analyze and interpret wastewater samples?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess wastewater testing options (on-campus or private lab, cost, turnaround time, capacity, safety regulations, etc.)
Data Interpretation and use	How can findings inform decisions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine who will interpret data and assess trends • Access public health information needed to contextualize data (e.g. number of people in quarantine or recently recovered) • Consider range of decision outcomes (e.g. testing, messaging, limiting gatherings, remote instruction)
Communication plan	What is the most effective way to share findings with appropriate audiences?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who should be involved in messaging? • Who are the key target audiences? • How can messages best be communicated to intended audiences (e.g. signs, email, social media, website, etc.)?

897

898 **Figure captions**

899 Figure 1. Map showing location of case study colleges and average daily number of COVID-19
900 cases per 100,000 population during the last week of August 2020, by state. Data from Centers
901 for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020 (CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention)
902 2020a). Note: A single dot in Utah, Oregon, and Maine represents a system of more than one
903 university in each state that work together on wastewater surveillance.

904

905 Figure 2. An iterative, process-oriented framework for wastewater surveillance at colleges.

906

907

908



