

Supporting Information Available

List of Supplementary Contents

1. Figure S1-5 Amplification curves of RT-qPCR from extraction controls, RNA standards, and bus samples.
2. Figure S6 Threshold cycles (CT) of RT-qPCR from extraction controls, RNA standards, and bus samples.
3. Table S1 PCR CTs.
4. Table S2 Bus CTs.
5. Figure S9 Fragment analysis of positive products using polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis
6. Table S3 Comparison to column-based RNA detection
7. Figure S11 Extracted RNA solution from swab samples after TriZOL and Qiagen extraction
8. Table S4 Cost analysis of procedure
9. Open source code availability

Supplementary Information

Testing in-house extraction protocol on contrived samples

In each RT-qPCR assay, we included a negative control of two replicates containing nuclease-free water (AAJ71786AE, Fisher Scientific) that underwent the TRIzol isolation steps in parallel to the samples. Each assay also included three positive controls containing 10, 100, or 1000 copies of purified RNA controls including the N gene regions of SARS-CoV-2 (102024, Twist Biosciences, San Francisco, CA). To test the efficiency of TRIzol isolation of RNA from viral envelopes, the TRIzol extraction and RT-qPCR method was performed on AccuPlex enveloped RNA reference material (0505-0126, Seracare, Milford, MA), and results are displayed in Figure S1 below.




Figure S1: Controls PCR curves for N1 gene.

Legend Key

For Figures S1-S5:

Color, Well Number (96-well plate): Unique ID, Sample Description (including bus vehicle ID number and sample location or control type), Gene Target.

Examples:

- A4 = Column A, Row 4 of a 96-well PCR plate
- BFN12 = Bus sample, Front bus air filter, (N) Mixed Cellulose Ester filter material, 1st sample from that bus, 2nd replicate from that sample
- 4552 = Bus vehicle ID 4552
- CP12 = Control, Positive, 1st control sample, 2nd replicate of that control

Key:

- G = Polypropylene Fabric
- F = Biopsy Foam
- P = Paper
- N = Mixed Cellulose Ester
- E = EnviroMax Swab
- S = Swab Rails
- BS = Swab filter
- B, F, FS, BF = Air filter sample

PCR curves from bus testing

The method was also validated on environmental samples collected from buses. The procedure detected RNA from SARS-CoV-2 using both the air filter and the swab method. The results can be seen below in Figures S2-S5.




Figure S2: Bus PCRs from first positive test result in Aug 2020.





Figure S3: Bus PCRs from collection dates Oct 2020.





Figure S4: Bus PCRs from collection dates Nov-Dec 2020.





Figure S5: Bus PCRs from collection dates in Jan-March 2021.

qPCR Standard Curve




Figure S6: Creating a standard curve from the controls samples and fitting the CT results from bus runs onto that standard curve reveals most of the bus results contained a small estimated copy number of below 10 viral cells per 8 uL of extracted sample.

Table of results from controls testing

Table S1: CT results for controls. All controls above 10 copies/sample amplified in our testing. For copy numbers below the LOD of the PCR reagents (10 copies/sample), amplification still occurred intermittently.

Solution	Sol Name	Copies	CT Ave	CT 1 Res	CT 2 Res	CT 3 Res
Direct RNA PCR (Twist)	RNA PCR	5	36.10	no amp	35.4	36.79
Direct RNA PCR (Twist)	RNA PCR	10	35.72	35.8	34.68	36.68
Direct RNA PCR (Twist)	RNA PCR	25	34.37	34.47	34.08	34.55
Direct RNA PCR (Twist)	RNA PCR	50	33.07	33.17	33.77	32.27
Direct RNA PCR (Twist)	RNA PCR	100	32.46	32.36	32.49	32.52
Direct RNA PCR (Twist)	RNA PCR	1000	29.14	28.83	29.32	29.28
RNA through Trizol Extraction (Twist)	RNA TZL	5	37.28	37.28	no amp	N/A
RNA through Trizol Extraction (Twist)	RNA TZL	10	36.00	36.44	35.55	N/A
RNA through Trizol Extraction (Twist)	RNA TZL	50	33.20	33.23	33.17	N/A
RNA through Trizol Extraction (Twist)	RNA TZL	100	32.85	32.37	33.33	N/A
RNA through Trizol Extraction (Twist)	RNA TZL	1000	29.52	29.37	29.66	N/A
Spike Control Virus Trizol Extraction (AccuPlex)	Accu TZL	10	34.71	33.32	35.6	35.22
Spike Control Virus Trizol Extraction (AccuPlex)	Accu TZL	25	33.88	34.04	32.72	34.87
Spike Control Virus Trizol Extraction (AccuPlex)	Accu TZL	50	33.00	32.4	33.38	33.21
Spike Control Virus Trizol Extraction (AccuPlex)	Accu TZL	100	32.23	33.32	31.56	31.82
Spike Control Virus Trizol Extraction (AccuPlex)	Accu TZL	1000	28.62	28.14	29	28.73

Table of results from bus testing

Table S2: Full set of results from buses tested at King County Metro. All buses, replicates, and samples are recorded, alongside whether or not they amplified in PCR testing and also their CT values.

Date Collected	Bus Number	Filter Location	Filter Material	1 Result	2 Result	CT @ 50000
				N1	N1	All N1 gen
8/21/20	4552	Swab	Gram	No	No	
	4552	Front	Gram	Yes	No	39.67
	4552	Front	Foam	No	No	
	6072	Swab	Gram	No	No	
	6072	Back	Gram	No	No	
	6072	Front	Foam	No	No	
	8284	Back	Gram	No	No	
	8284	Back	Foam	No	No	
	6210	Swab	Gram	Yes	No	37.86
	6210	Front	Gram	No	No	
	6215	Swab	Gram	No	No	
	6228	Swab	Gram	No	Yes	39.39
pos % (all bus)	6	3	50.0%			
pos % (bus filters)	4	1	25.0%			
				N1	N2	N1 and N2
10/1/20	8284	Back	Paper	No	No	
	8284	Front	Paper	No	Yes	37.97
	8284	Swab	Paper	No	No	
	4354	Back	Paper	No	No	
	8263	Back	Paper	No	No	
	8263	Swab	Paper	Yes	No	35.91
	8266	Back	Paper	No	No	
	8266	Front	Paper	No	No	
	6210	Front	Paper	No	No	
	6236	Back	Paper	No	No	
	6236	Front	Paper	Yes	No	38.18
pos % (all bus)	6	3	50.0%			
pos % (bus filters)	6	2	33.3%			
				N1	N2	N1 and N2
10/14/20	6080	Front	Paper	No	No	
(1 day - AM)	6080	Swab	Paper	Yes	No	34.82
	6086	Front	Paper	No	No	
	6086	Swab	Paper	No	No	
	6245	Front	Paper	No	No	
	6245	Swab	Paper	No	Yes	
	6068	Front	Paper	No	No	
	6068	Swab	Paper	No	No	
	6251	Front	Paper	No	No	
	6251	Swab	Paper	No	No	
	6265	Front	Paper	No	No	
	6265	Swab	Paper	Yes	No	36.14
pos % (all bus)	6	3	50.0%			
pos % (bus filters)	6	0	0.0%			
				N1	N2	N1 and N2
11/24/20	8294	Front	Paper	No	No	
5 weeks	8294	Swab	Paper	Yes	No	32.31
	6215	Front (small)	Paper	No	No	
	6215	Swab	Paper	Yes	No	34.69
	6245	Front	Paper	No	No	
	6245	Swab	Paper	Yes	No	34.39
	8266	Front	Paper	No	No	
	8266	Swab	Paper	Yes	No	32.87
	8266	Back	Paper	No	No	
	8264	Front	Paper	No	No	
	8264	Front (small)	Paper	No	No	
	8264	Swab	Paper	Yes	N/A	37.66
pos % (all bus)	5	5	100.0%			
pos % (bus filters)	5	0	0.0%			

Date Collected	Bus Number	Filter Location	Filter Material	1 Result	2 Result	CT @ 50000
				N1	N2	
12/16/20	8211	Back	Nitro	No	No	
	6215	Back	Paper	No	No	
	6215	Swab	Nitro	No	No	
	6263	Back	Paper	No	No	
	6263	Swab	Nitro	No	No	
	8264	Back	Paper	No	No	
	8264	Swab	Nitro	No	No	
	6214	Back	Paper	No	No	
	6214	Swab	Nitro	No	No	
	8216	Back	Paper	No	No	
	8216	Swab	Nitro	No	No	
pos % (all bus)	6	0	0.0%			
pos % (bus filters)	6	0	0.0%			
pos % (bus-used)	2	0	0.0%			
				N1	N2	
1/29/21	6245	Back	Nitro	No	No	
	6245	Swab	EMax	No	No	
	6245	Back Swab	EMax	Yes	No	35.51
	8264	Back	Nitro	No	No	
	8264	Swab	EMax	No	No	
	8264	Back Swab	EMax	Yes	No	37.09
	8216	Back	Nitro	No	No	
	8216	Swab	EMax	No	No	
	6263	Back	Nitro	No	No	
	6263	Swab	EMax	No	No	
	6250	Back	Nitro	No	No	
	6250	Swab	EMax	Yes	No	32.42
pos % (all bus)	5	3	60.0%			
pos % (bus filters)	5	0	0.0%			
				N1	N2	
3/2/21	6250	Back	Nitro	Yes	No	37.22
	6250	Back Swab	EMax	No	No	
	8266	Back	Nitro	No	No	
	8266	Back Swab	EMax	No	No	
	6214	Back	Nitro	Yes	No	37.28
	6214	Swab	Paper	No	No	
	8216	Back	Nitro	No	No	
	8216	Back Swab	EMax	No	No	
	8216	Swab	Paper	No	No	
	8211	Back	Nitro	No	No	
	8211	Back Swab	EMax	No	No	
	8211	Swab	Paper	Yes	No	34.03
pos % (all bus)	5	3	60.0%			
pos % (bus filters)	5	2	40.0%			

Verification of Sample via native-PAGE




Figure S7: Randomly selected positive PCR samples were analyzed using a 12 percent polyacrylamide gel. The arrowhead indicates the expected size of the PCR product from both N1 and N2 probes. Labels differentiate between air filter and swab samples, as well as an RNA positive control. O'RangeRuler 10bp DNA Ladder (SM1313, ThermoFisher)

Method comparison to Qiagen column-based RNA extraction kit

Column-based extraction kits (52906, Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) were used to extract environmental samples collected on March 2nd, 2021. Each 5 μ L RNA product was assayed with TaqPath 1-step RT-qPCR N1 and N2 assays and compared to its counterpart replicates processed by TRIzol extraction (Figure S3).

Table S3: A comparison was performed on 3/2/21 to understand how the results of our method compared to the silica-based extraction method. Based on these limited results, it appears that the sediments introduced by swab samples may interfere with precipitation and/or amplification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA using this method; whereas samples with very high CT (and thus low copy numbers) were not detected using Qiagen kits, indicating that this method may be more sensitive to low copy numbers when the sample is relatively clean, as is the case with passive air filter sampling.

Date Collected	Bus ID	Filter Location	Filter Medium	Result 1	Result 2	CT @ 50000 ROX	Amplified?	N1-1	N1-2	N2-1	N2-2
3/2/2021	6250	Back	Nitro	Yes	No	37.22	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6250	Back Swab	EMax	No	No		Yes	36.7	36.6	38.27	35.44
	8266	Back	Nitro	No	No		No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	8266	Back Swab	EMax	No	No		Yes	N/A	37.76	N/A	39.42
	6214	Back	Nitro	Yes	No	37.28	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6214	Swab	Paper	No	No		No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	8216	Back	Nitro	No	No		No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	8216	Back Swab	EMax	No	No		Yes	N/A	36.96	N/A	N/A
	8216	Swab	Paper	No	No		No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	8211	Back	Nitro	No	No		No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	8211	Back Swab	Emax	No	No		Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	38.47
	8211	Swab	Paper	Yes	No	34.03	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Extraction Contaminants

The filter swab samples were the siltiest, returning from the bus depot with the darkest brown color. The differing ways that filter methods of TRIzol-based and column-based RNA extraction interacted with these dirt particles likely caused difference in results for the two methods. TRIzol-based extraction resulted in positive results that column-based method missed, while the column-based method resulted in more positives in especially dirty samples.




Figure S8: Swab samples' appearance after our extraction method suggests that dirt and debris could interfere with PCR results, increasing number of false negatives for especially dirty samples. **Top** Resulting tubes after extraction by TRIzol-based extraction (our method) for 2 samples from air filters (two on left) and two samples from filter swabs (two on right). The filter swab samples were especially dirty before extraction, and some of that dirt ended up in the post-extracted material. **Bottom** Resulting tubes after extraction by column-based method (Qiagen). In column-based extraction, even the dirty bus swab samples remained clear after extraction, suggesting that they filtered different content than the TRIzol-based method.

Cost Analysis of Method

We have shown that passive filters with minimal installation requirements are capable of capturing extremely low quantities of viral particles. However, the concentration step with TRIzol-extraction makes our procedure more time-consuming and costly per-sample than other methods, such as column-purification and amplification of nucleic acids.⁴⁷ This paper details the results of 82 individual samples separately tested across 45 buses. In theory, by combining samples from the same bus in the concentration step, or by limiting the number of locations to install filters in each bus, the effort to assay multiple buses may be reduced in. Ultimately, while our method does not include cost-prohibitive or difficult-to-obtain materials, the cost of scalability must be considered alongside the increased sensitivity when comparing to alternative detection methods (Figure S4).

Table S4: Cost breakdown of lab materials. Note that these reagent and supplies costs were based on the small scaled purchased and did not include the labor cost.

Total Cost

	Total	Sampling Materials	Lab Materials
Total cost (for one test run):	\$341.66	\$58.21	\$283.45
Cost / bus:	\$56.94	\$9.70	\$47.24

Lab Materials

Category	Item	Qty / sample	Qty	Unit	Bulk qty	Price / bulk	Cost / Unit	Total cost / experiment
Consumable	Pipette tips	N/A	562	tips	960	\$130	\$0.14	\$76.10
Consumable	Tubes	N/A	148	tubes	250	\$55	\$0.22	\$32.56
Consumable	PCR plate	N/A	1	plate	25	\$157	\$6.28	\$6.28
Consumable	PCR plate film	N/A	1	film	100	\$43	\$0.43	\$0.43
Consumable	Gloves	N/A	10	gloves	1000	\$268	\$0.27	\$2.68
Reagent	Lysis buffer	0.2	6.4	mL	500	\$111.84	\$0.22	\$1.43
Reagent	Trizol	0.8	25.6	mL	200	\$374	\$1.87	\$47.87
Reagent	Chloroform	0.12	3.84	mL	500	22.14	\$0.04	\$0.17
Reagent	Glycogen (RNA grade)	1	42	uL	200	\$81.25	\$0.41	\$17.06
Reagent	200-proof Ethanol	2	84	mL	2000	\$109	\$0.05	\$4.58
Reagent	Water (Mol Bio Grade)	N/A	10	mL	1000	\$28.34	\$0.03	\$0.28
Reagent (PCR)	PCR mastermix	5	210	uL	500	\$204	\$0.41	\$85.68
Reagent (PCR)	Primers	1	42	uL	500	\$99	\$0.20	\$8.32
Total								\$283.45


Sampling Materials

Category	Item	Qty	Unit	Bulk qty	Price for bulk	Cost / Unit	Total cost
Sample Material	Filters max	10	Filter	100	\$114	\$1.14	\$11.40
Sample Material	Swabs	15	Swab	100	\$190.72	\$1.91	\$28.61
Sample Material	Cleaning wipes	30	wipes	225	\$11.97	\$0.05	\$1.60
Sample Material	Gloves	40	gloves	100	\$18	\$0.18	\$7.20
Sample Material	Baggies	30	bags	300	\$7.12	\$0.02	\$0.71
Sample Material	Secondary containers	1	Container	6	\$52.19	\$8.70	\$8.70
Total							\$58.21

Code Availability

Code for processing PCR results will be made public on Github at: (url to be shared upon publication).

Graphical TOC Entry



This journal requires a graphical entry for the Table of Contents. This should be laid out “print ready” so that the sizing of the text is correct.

Inside the tocentry environment, the font used is Helvetica 8 pt, as required by *Journal of the American Chemical Society*.

The surrounding frame is 9 cm by 3.5 cm, which is the maximum permitted for *Journal of the American Chemical Society* graphical table of content entries.

The box will not resize if the content is too big: instead it will overflow the edge of the box.

This box and the associated title will always be printed on a separate page at the end of the document.

See here for more information:

http://pubsapp.acs.org.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/paragonplus/submission/toc_abstract_graphics_guidelines.pdf