Wastewater surveillance pilot at US military installations: a cost model analysis

3

Jaleal Sanjak,^{1,5} Erin M McAuley,^{1,5} Richard Pinkham,¹ Jacob Tarnowski,¹ Nicole Miko,¹ Bridgette
 Rasmussen,¹ Christian Manalo,¹ Michael Goodson,² Blake Stamps,² Bryan D Necciai,³ Shanmuga
 Sozhamannan,^{3,4} Ezekiel J Maier^{1,6}

7

8 ¹ Booz Allen Hamilton, Bethesda, MD 20814, USA

- 9 ² United States Air Force Research Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, USA
- ³ Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Defense (JPEO-CBRND), Joint
- 11 Project Lead for CBRND Enabling Biotechnologies (JPL CBRND EB), Frederick, MD 21702, USA
- 12 ⁴ Joint Research and Development, Inc, Stafford, VA 22556, USA
- 13 ⁵ These authors contributed equally to this work.
- 14 ⁶ Corresponding author: maier_ezekiel@bah.com
- 15
- 16 Abstract

17 Background:

- 18 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic highlighted the need for pathogen surveillance
- 19 systems to augment both early warning and outbreak monitoring/control efforts. Wastewater samples
- 20 provide a rapid and accurate source of environmental surveillance data to complement direct patient
- sampling. Due to its global presence and critical missions, the US military is a leader in global pandemic
- 22 preparedness efforts. Clinical testing for COVID-19 on US Air Force (USAF) bases (AFBs) was effective,
- but costly with respect to direct costs and indirect costs of lost time. To remain operating at peak
- 24 capacity such bases sought a more passive surveillance option and piloted wastewater surveillance
- 25 (WWS) at 17 AFBs to demonstrate feasibility, safety, and utility from May 2021 to January 2022.
- 26 Objective:
- 27 Here we model the costs of a wastewater program for pathogens of pandemic potential within the
- 28 specific context of US military installations using assumptions based on the results of the USAF and Joint
- 29 Program Executive Office for Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Defense (JPEO-CBRND) pilot
- program. The objective was to determine the cost of deploying WWS to all AFBs, relative to clinical
- 31 swab testing surveillance regimes.
- 32 Methods:
- 33 A simple WWS cost projection model was built based on subject matter expert input and actual costs
- 34 incurred during a WWS pilot program at USAF AFBs. Several SARS-CoV-2 circulation scenarios were
- considered and costs of both WWS and clinical swab testing were projected. Break even analysis was
- 36 conducted to determine how reduction in swab testing could open up space to enable WWS to occur in
- 37 complement.
- 38 Results:
- 39 Our model confirms that wastewater surveillance is complimentary and highly cost-effective when
- 40 compared to existing alternative forms of biosurveillance. We find that the cost of WWS was between
- 41 \$10.5 \$18.5 million less expensive annually in direct costs as compared to clinical swab testing
- 42 surveillance. When indirect cost of lost work is incorporated, including assumed lost work required to go
- 43 obtain a clinical swab test, we estimate that over two thirds of clinical swab testing could be maintained
- 44 with no additional costs upon implementation of WWS.

45 Conclusions:

46 Our results support adoption of wastewater surveillance across US military installations as part of a

- 47 more comprehensive and early warning system that will enable adaptive monitoring during disease
- 48 outbreaks.
- 49

50 Keywords

51 Wastewater Surveillance, Cost Analysis, Military Health, Public Health

52

53 Introduction

- 54 Many human pathogens are shed into bodily fluids during active infection and make their way into the 55 sewage system along several routes. Therefore, wastewater sample collection is a viable approach to
- 56 monitor for prevalence of pathogens [1], including those of pandemic potential and
- 57 biodefense/biosecurity relevance. Early in the COVID-19 pandemic researchers identified that severe
- 58 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) ribonucleic acid (RNA) was shed into fecal
- 59 matter at viral loads high enough to be detected in wastewater [2]. Therefore, the pre-existing field of
- 60 wastewater-based epidemiology rallied to transition pre-existing methods [3] from academic research
- 61 into scalable public health surveillance tools. Especially early in the COVID-19 pandemic, traditional
- 62 swab-based testing could not scale quickly enough to serve as a reliable source of population level
- disease transmission data [4]. Multiple studies explored the efficacy of WWS as a stream of
- 64 epidemiological data to complement case tracking for community transmission monitoring, finding that
- 65 WWS data tracks with trends in clinical case reporting data [5–7]. While the statistical correlation
- 66 between viral load in sewage and clinical indicators is strong, the exact quantitative relationship
- 67 between individual-level testing and WWS data is complex and depends on a variety of factors related
- to the epidemiology of the outbreak as well as data collection and processing timelines [8]. Despite
 these complexities, WWS has been shown to be correlated with community infection dynamics [7] in
- 70 addition to simply being an effective qualitative detection tool. Implementing WWS within institutional
- 71 building complexes, such as college campuses, has unique challenges but also enables building-level
- resolution monitoring and early warning capabilities [9–12]. WWS can be a leading qualitative indicator
- 73 of disease presence in a community when overall disease prevalence is low, making WWS a good
- candidate for broad scale baseline pathogen monitoring [13]. Because WWS is passive and independent
- of healthcare seeking behavior, it provides a data stream complementary to active tracking of infections
- or hospitalizations, which both have limitations. Additional benefits of WWS include the ability to
- 77 monitor multiple pathogens, emerging viral variants, and non-biological hazards [14].
- 78

79 The US Government prioritized WWS to track the spread of COVID-19 and other diseases. For example, 80 environmental monitoring for viral threats via wastewater surveillance is a key component of pandemic

- threat early-warning systems prioritized in the Biden Administration's "American Pandemic
- Preparedness: Transforming our Capabilities" plan [15]. In addition, the Under Secretary of Defense for
- 83 Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)) directed the US Department of Defense (DoD) to leverage
- alternative technologies, including wastewater surveillance, to supplement existing surveillance
- 85 strategies in a memorandum titled "Consolidated Department of Defense Coronavirus Disease 2019
- 86 Force Health Protection Guidance" [16]. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)
- 87 established the National Waster Water Surveillance System [17] as a supplement to traditional
- diagnostic test surveillance systems by enabling efficient collection of community level samples. In
- addition, CDC is applying WWS within passenger airplanes as part of its Traveler Genomic Surveillance
- program [18]. Finally, in June 2021, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and the
- 91 Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Science and Technology Directorate convened a virtual
- 92 workshop, entitled "Standards to Support an Enduring Capability in Wastewater Surveillance for Public

Health" to identify challenges and solutions for maturing an ensuring WWS capability for detecting andmonitoring public health threats [19,20].

95

96 As a result of practical successes in early research and implementation studies, best practices emerged 97 for how to implement WWS at scale [4]. WWS can be an important tool for epidemiological monitoring 98 and outbreak response if implemented with consideration of various challenges [21,22]; one important 99 aspect to consider is avoiding redundancy with clinical testing by implementing a joint surveillance 100 strategy. The design of a WWS data collection scheme and methods for analysis can have significant 101 impacts on bias and interpretation of the data [23]. When implemented according to best practices 102 WWS can be a cost-effective part of a public health response system [24]. Pairing WWS with clinical 103 testing allows for both approaches to serve specific needs thereby enhancing the cost effectiveness of 104 both [25].

105

106 The DoD has installations around the globe with small compact living communities, some of which have 107 overlapping watersheds with nearby cities. Tens of thousands of military personnel and civilians live and

work in these installations. The DoD implements a four-tiered COVID-19 testing scheme. The first three

- tiers focus on staff at varying levels of critical service and deployment; Tier 4 sentinel surveillance is an
- asymptomatic testing program designed to cover all forces. Therefore, we focus on Tier 4 sentinel
- 111 surveillance as our point of comparison for WWS cost since WWS is also suited to broad population
- 112 monitoring.
- 113

Similarities exist between DoD installations and other institutional building complexes like college

- 115 campuses. Yet implementing a WWS system at DoD sites requires special planning considerations given
- unique operational constraints and global scale. To address these issues the DoD commissioned several
- 117 WWS pilot studies aimed at figuring out the logistical, operational, and financial aspects of
- 118 implementing a WWS program. One such study demonstrated the effectiveness of wastewater
- screening of blackwater from Coast Guard vessels [26]. Another study focused on WWS at AFBs; the
- 120 USAF and JPEO-CBRND WWS pilot study was larger than previous DoD pilots and more representative of
- 121 US military installations globally. Here we analyze the cost effectiveness of WWS within the DoD
- 122 context, based on the results from that Air Force and JPEO-CBRND WWS pilot study. We developed a
- simple cost model that includes upfront capital expenditures, operational expenditures, and indirect
- 124 costs of lost work time. Further, we perform break-even analysis to explore how traditional swab testing
- 125 and WWS could be carried out in tandem within the budget of existing swab testing schemes. We
- 126 conclude that WWS is cost-effective as a complimentary passive community level disease surveillance
- scheme, within the context of AFBs and therefore likely would be cost-effective as a DoD wide global
- 128 multi-pathogen monitoring system that could be operated in complement to swab-based testing in the 129 event of future disease outbreaks.
- 129 event of fut 130

131 Methods

132 WWS pilot study design

133 To assess feasibility of WWS for SARS-CoV-2 within the USAF context, a multidisciplinary working group

- 134 was assembled, and a pilot scale implementation was organized. The effort was also coordinated with
- 135 DoD partners through collaboration with the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health
- Affairs and JPEO-CBRND. A total of 26 AFBs were initially contacted for enrollment either via an
- 137 invitation from a Public Health Emergency Officer or a USAF Air Staff Logistics Directorate of Civil
- 138 Engineers memo and all 26 sites expressed initial interest. Wastewater surveillance was ultimately
- piloted at 17 AFBs to demonstrate feasibility, safety, and utility from May 2021 to January 2022. During
- 140 the initial phase, conducted June through August 2021, wastewater surveillance techniques were

- 141 deployed for testing at three remote sites. Next, WWS was evaluated at a larger scale, with 14
- additional sites completing standardized procedures to collect and process wastewater samples once
- 143 per week. The project utilized a portable quantitative polymerase chain reaction (PCR) instrument
- 144 (qPCR, Biomeme[®]) [27] and digital PCR (dPCR). AFB site personnel were trained to identify detectable
- 145 SARS-CoV-2 using both systems. In addition, a passive sampling device was prototyped to decrease costs
- associated with expensive auto-sampler procurement.
- 147

148 Collection of tier 4 sentinel surveillance and WWS costs

We gathered known costs or made estimates of direct costs for all activities required to implement both
Tier 4 diagnostic testing and WWS protocols. Costs of WWS were based on actual material costs and
levels of effort from the WWS pilot study. Costs of Tier 4 diagnostic testing were based directly on USAF
experience. Costs included fixed and variable equipment and material costs, and the costs of USAF labor
(salaries and benefits) and estimated fully loaded contractor labor (billing) rates. Specific cost parameter
values and sources are shown in Table 1.

155

Materials costs modeled for Tier 4 swab testing only include the total cost of the PCR swab test, which was estimated based on input from DoD subject matter experts with visibility into budgeting and therefore reflects actual cost incurred. The remaining direct Tier 4 costs were associated with labor including the nurse and lab tech time for swab sampling and data management and reporting. We obtained average USAF Nurse base salary values from Salary, a leading industry source of compensation

161 data [28]. Lab tech and USAF general staff salary information were obtained from Indeed [29] and

- 162 Glassdoor [30] respectively, which are both crowdsourced databases of employers and employees. We
- assumed a flat benefits rate of 35% and this was added on top of base compensation values to estimate
- 164 the staff total compensation rates.
- 165

166 WWS labor included a variety of USAF staff and contractors for base and sampling site selection,

- 167 onboarding bases and training base personnel, obtaining samples, sample processing, data management
- and reporting, vendor management, and ongoing support to participating bases. The estimate of hourly
- rate for sample collectors was obtained from publicly available USAF pay tables[31] and contractor rates
- 170 were estimated based on technical and pricing subject matter expert input and informed by relevant,
- 171 historical experience.
- 172

173 Economic cost model

174 Our analysis addressed the cost of implementing WWS at 82 AFBs, which was the forecasted number of

- bases expected if a full scale WWS program were to reach maturity [32]. The cost of WWS was
- 176 evaluated relative to implementing Tier 4 diagnostic testing for the same AFBs. We developed a simple
- spreadsheet model in Microsoft Excel (Version 2302) to calculate and compare total costs for each
- surveillance protocol across different scenarios. We assume that there are negligible, if any, startup
- 179 costs to Tier 4 PCR Surveillance. We also assume that bases would be equipped with suitable resources
- 180 for Tier 4 surveillance since the pandemic spurred those initial investments. Expected time for staff to go
- an obtain a clinical PCR test is calculated as the major source of lost work time for Tier 4 surveillance.
- 182 We assume that there is minimal loss of work under WWS. WWS does not require time spent out of
- 183 operational environments for staff to get tested, like in Tier 4 diagnostic testing surveillance. Additional
- 184 staffing required to administer the WWS program and conduct tests is included. The spreadsheet
- 185 containing the model calculations is provided in **Supplemental Table 1**.
- 186

187 Cost-effectiveness analysis

188 We modeled several scenarios to explore the potential costs associated with a range of implementation

- plans and disease outbreak circumstances. Specifically, the study considered a baseline COVID-19
- 190 monitoring scenario (scenario 1), three additional scenarios that explore higher WWS frequency for
- 191 COVID-19 monitoring (scenario 2), and two scenarios that include increased testing during the 4-month
- simulated outbreaks (scenarios 3 and 4). For each scenario, the number of outbreak months and
- 193 number of monthly tests (per base) are described in Table 2. The Air Force Tier 4 sentinel surveillance in
- 194 practice carried out an average of 293 swab tests per base per month and we assumed that testing
- 195 would double during outbreaks. The WWS surveillance pilots operated on a once weekly basis, but some
- 196 evidence exists supporting the benefits of increased sampling frequency. Therefore, we considered
- 197 increases in baseline sampling and large increases in sampling during outbreaks.
- 198

199 Results

17 out of the 26 AFBs recorded WWS data during the period from September 2021 to January 2022
 (Figure 1); demonstrating that sewage can be safely sampled in a field environment and at a fixed lab.

202 The procedures implemented at sites during the pilot were designed to collect and process wastewater

- samples once per week. Yet, in total, 52 data submissions were recorded and amounted to 45 unique
- viable sample records. As illustrated in Figure 2, invalid submissions included duplicate records and
- samples with PCR reaction issues such incubation temperature and sample concentration. Three sites
- 206 were used strictly for an early feasibility pilot stage in which protocols were established. The remaining
- 207 14 sites submitted data collected over partially overlapping periods of 4.5 weeks on average. In total,
- the pilot study identified 25 positive (or presumptive positive) samples and 20 negative samples. The 25
- positive samples came from 12 of the 14 sites that collected samples systematically. However, the sites
- did not collect the same number of samples and two sites that detected no positives were also the sites
- that submitted the fewest total samples. This procedure validated the feasibility of implementing WWS
- at AFBs, but also highlighted considerable site-to-site variability in executing systematic sampling
- 213 procedures. These results provided a case study from which we derive assumptions for the economic 214 cost model.
- 215

The cost of SARS-CoV-2 WWS was estimated and compared to the estimated cost of Tier 4 COVID-19 sentinel surveillance (asymptomatic testing) across 82 selected AFBs. The four scenarios modeled are described in Table 2. For each scenario we use the cost model parameters to estimate total direct and indirect costs of both WWS and Tier 4 surveillance. Table 3 shows the total annual costs (in millions of

- 220 2021 dollars) for each scenario at 82 AFBs. Under baseline COVID-19 monitoring, scenarios 1 and 2, we
- estimate that the direct costs of the Tier 4 sentinel surveillance program would cost approximately \$18
- 222 million dollars. In the same scenarios, we estimate that WWS would directly cost between \$5.4 million
- with once weekly testing (scenario 1) to \$7.4 million with twice weekly testing (scenario 2).
- 224
- 225 During an outbreak, here defined broadly as either local or national level transmission that is sufficiently
- high such that strict control measures are put in place, enhanced surveillance is needed to manage
 response. Therefore, under COVID-19 outbreak monitoring scenarios 3 and 4 we estimate the direct
- costs of Tier 4 sentinel surveillance to be \$24 million dollars. The cost of WWS may also go up,
- depending on policy decision making; for example, sites could choose to test more frequently or utilize
- alternative pathogen detection methods. In scenario 3, only Tier 4 sentinel surveillance is increased
- during outbreak response and so the estimated WWS direct costs remain \$5.4 million. In contrast,
- scenario 4 assumed that the usage of both Tier 4 sentinel surveillance and WWS go up during outbreak
- response and so the estimated WWS direct costs increase to \$8.2 million.
- 234

235 Tier 4 sentinel surveillance PCR testing requires that Air Force staff take time out of their workday to get

- tested and this leads to additional effective costs. We use our model to estimate the cost of lost work,
- based on typical staff salary ranges and time required to get tested. In scenarios with baseline testing,
- we estimate that there would be a \$5.6 million cost for the loss of work associated with Tier 4 sentinel
- surveillance PCR testing. During a disease outbreak scenario leading to increased testing, we estimate
- the cost of lost work to be \$7.5 million. In contrast, WWS does not place any burden on staff not
- associated directly with implementation of the surveillance program.
- 242

243 We find that the cost of WWS was between \$10.5 - \$18.5 million less expensive annually in direct costs 244 as compared to Tier 4 sentinel surveillance, and that Tier 4 sentinel surveillance has an additional cost of 245 \$5.6-\$7.5 million annually in Air Force personnel lost work time for testing. If WWS were implemented 246 there would still be capacity to carry out a substantial amount of Tier 4 sentinel surveillance PCR testing. 247 We quantified the break-even point for combined WWS and PCR testing by calculating the number of 248 PCR swab tests that could be conducted per base per month under the WWS paradigm while breaking 249 even with the higher cost of the original Tier 4 testing scheme. The results of our break-even analysis are 250 shown in Table 4.

251

252 To estimate break-even point based on direct costs only, we simply take the direct cost differences and 253 divide by the direct cost per swab test (\$62.39/test for materials and labor), spread across 82 bases and 254 12 months. Under COVID-19 baseline monitoring with once weekly WWS (scenario 1) we estimate that 255 an additional 204 swab tests per AFB per month could be added to the WWS protocol for the same cost 256 as the original Tier 4 sentinel surveillance scheme. If WWS was increased to twice weekly (scenario 2) 257 then we estimate that 171 swab tests could still be performed at the break-even point. When cost of 258 lost work is incorporated, including assumed lost work for swabs used to reach break-even point, we 259 estimate that 225 and 200 additional swab tests could be performed in scenarios 1 and 2 respectively. 260 During an outbreak, the demands for all forms of surveillance increases and so more swab tests can be 261 performed at the break-even cost point. When the cost of lost work is included, we estimate that 323 262 and 289 additional swab tests could be performed for outbreak scenarios 3 and 4 respectively. Across all 263 scenarios, we estimate that more than half of the Tier 4 sentinel surveillance program could be 264 maintained while WWS is implemented in parallel with no additional cost, i.e., at the break-even point.

265

266 Discussion

The DoD SARS-CoV-2 WWS surveillance pilot studies demonstrated the feasibility of implementing WWS
at military installations. The pilot studies revealed some important technical considerations. For
example, although dPCR was extremely sensitive, it required shipping of wastewater from remote sites
to a centralized location, potentially limiting its use in largescale deployment. Portable qPCR had a lower
throughput of samples than dPCR but was simple to use at the point of sampling. Our simple cost model

- took these lessons into account.
- 273

274 The pilot studies also provide real world data on the costs associated with WWS in comparison to

- 275 standard swab-based testing, including materials costs and labor requirements. In general, WWS for
- 276 SARS-CoV-2 may offer several benefits, including 1) earlier detection of outbreaks, 2) lower cost and
- burden for community-wide coverage compared to diagnostic testing, and 3) detection of viral
- 278 presence, regardless of symptoms. Coupling our analysis with the overall results of the DoD pilot studies
- suggests that those benefits are likely to transfer to the DoD. Specifically, our model suggests
- 280 deployment of WWS to AFBs would be substantially more cost effective than broad asymptomatic swab
- testing. Our break-even analysis indicates that without allocating additional funding to surveillance
- efforts that WWS could be implemented for AFB level monitoring and swab testing could be used for

283 more targeted purposes or simply in parallel. It is important to note that swab testing and WWS do not

provide the exact same information. Swab testing can enable individual level actions, such as

285 quarantining and contract tracing, and higher resolution data. Therefore, tradeoffs between the public

health benefits of WWS and swab testing will need to be determined on a case-by-case basis. These

findings apply do both baseline COVID-19 monitoring and in scenarios where outbreaks are occurring on

288 bases throughout the year.

289

290 Our cost model was intentionally simplistic to enhance transparency for decisionmakers. That simplicity 291 is also a limitation in that there may be unforeseen complexities and costs associated with scaling the 292 WWS program beyond the pilot sites. In addition, our cost data is primarily derived from the Air Force 293 WWS pilot program, and it is possible that facilities associated with other branches of the DoD may 294 require different considerations. Many of our parameter estimates were obtained from subject matter 295 experts, i.e., individual DoD staff and contractors associated with the pilot studies, as opposed to an 296 independent review of pilot study budgets. Therefore, our cost estimates should not be interpreted as 297 formal financial forecasts.

298

299 Another limitation of our analysis is the lack of uncertainty estimation. Any formal program level

financial forecast would require uncertainty ranges to be estimated along with point cost estimates.

301 However, in our present work many of the materials costs were obtained directly from individuals with

knowledge of the actual costs incurred during the pilot studies. Therefore, our model could be framed as

an estimate of what the actual cost would have been if the pilot was carried out at all AFBs rather than a

forecast of the costs of a DoD wide program—although we believe our work is germane to that topic.
 Furthermore, systematic uncertainty in labor and materials costs due to changes in supply chain issues

and inflation are likely correlated such that a proper uncertainty propagation would require estimating

307 the joint distribution of costs, which is beyond the scope of our efforts. Given the magnitude of the

308 point difference and the consensus in the literature that WWS is less expensive for population level

309 monitoring—albeit not necessarily cost-effective if implemented poorly [22]--we believe that our results

are qualitatively robust to underlying uncertainty in the data and model specification.

311

312 In conclusion, we find that the Air Force WWS pilot was a cost-effective complement to standard swab-313 based testing as implemented in the Tier 4 sentinel surveillance program. We believe that WWS and 314 swab-based testing have differing strengths and weaknesses; implementing both approaches in tandem 315 offers the opportunity to specialize. Looking ahead beyond the COVID-19 pandemic the DoD can be an 316 important partner in global pandemic and all-hazard preparedness efforts. WWS is uniquely well suited 317 to multi-threat biological surveillance and our results suggest that adoption of WWS across US military 318 installations would help deliver a more comprehensive early warning system. A DoD wide WWS would 319 complement civilian efforts like the National Wastewater Surveillance System and enable rapidly

- 320 scalable outbreak monitoring in the event of future disease outbreaks.
- 321

322 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Helen Phipps for helpful input. JDV and SS designed the study. EMM managed the study and carried out the analysis. RP, JT, and EJM carried out the analysis. JS wrote the manuscript.

325

326 Conflicts of Interest

327 This study was funded/supported by the United States Air Force and the Joint Program Executive Office

328 for Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Defense (JPEO-CBRND). Contract Support was

329 provided by Booz Allen Hamilton.

330

331 Disclaimer

- 332 The views expressed in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the
- 333 official policy or position of the Air Force, the Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical, Biological,
- Radiological and Nuclear Defense (JPEO-CBRND), the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.
- 1335 Included references to commercial products do not constitute endorsement by the Department of
- 336 Defense.
- 337

338 Figures

339

340 341





344 Tables

- 345
- 346
- 347 Table 1. Cost analysis model parameters, with the values used and the sources of the values.

Parameter	Value	Source	

Tier 4 Parameters

Number of PCR Tests (Non-Outbreak)	293	Tier 4 PCR Surveillance Plan (low
Number of PCR Tests (Outbreak)	586	Tier 4 PCR Surveillance \Box Plan (high
Testing Time (Minutes per Patient)	30	Estimate
Sample Time (Lab Tech Minutes)	10	Estimate
Sample Time (Nurse Minutes)	5	Estimate
Data Management and Reporting (Nurse	5	Estimate
Data Management and Reporting (Lab Tech	2	Estimate
Minutes) Benefits Adjustment to Salaries	35%	Common practice; consistent with BLS
Nurse - Average Salary Including Benefits	\$87,750.00	[28]
Lab Tech - Average Salary Including Benefits	\$55,687.50	[29]
Average AF Salary Including Benefits	\$81,000.00	[30]
Material Cost per PCR Test	\$50.00	DoD SME
Total Cost Per PCR Test (Including Labor)	\$62.39	Estimate - Material cost of a PCR test
WWS Parameters		plus the cost of labor per PCR test.
Wastewater Tests Per Month (Non-Outbreak)	4.33 (1/week)	Phase 2 testing cadence
Wastewater Tests Per Month (Outbreak)	21.66 (5/week)	Estimate
Android Device Cost	\$600.00	DoD SME / Vendor
Thermocycler Cost	\$9,950.00	DoD SME / Vendor
Cooker and Cooking Container	\$271.88	DoD SME / Vendor
Biomeme Sample Preparation Tray	\$200.00	DoD SME / Vendor
DynaMag-50 Magnet	\$960.00	DoD SME / Vendor
M1 Sample Prep Cartridge Kit (Per Test)	\$45.00	DoD SME / Vendor
Go-Strips (Per Test)	\$300	DoD SME / Vendor
Materials Cost Per Wastewater Test	\$54.41	Vendor
Supply Shipping (Boxes)	\$22.66	DoD SME
Supply Shipping (FedEx)	\$34.66	DoD SME
Labor Hours Per Test	6	Air Force & Booz Allen Estimate
Hourly Wage of Sampler	\$13.10	Airforce.com
Base Selection (Per Base)	\$2,050.40	Technical and pricing SME for pilot study activities

Base Onboarding and Training (Per Base)	\$2,184.93	Technical and pricing SME for pilot study activities
Surveillance, Data Management and Reporting (per base per week)	\$265.35	Technical and pricing SME for pilot study activities
Ongoing Support (per base per week)	\$87.95	Technical and pricing SME for pilot study activities
Vendor Management (per base per week)	\$90.29	Technical and pricing SME for pilot study activities
Program Coordination and Oversight (per base	\$105.53	Technical and pricing SME for pilot
per week)		study activities
SME: subject matter expert		

348

349

350 Table 2. Cost analysis model scenarios.

Scenario	Outbreak Months/Year	Tier 4 Swab Tests per Base per Month	WWS Tests per Base per Month
1. COVID-19 Monitoring	None	293	4.33 (1/week)
2. COVID-19 Monitoring with Higher WWS Frequency	None	293	8.66 (2/week)
3. Outbreak Scenario with	4	293 normally	4.33 (1/week)
Increased Tier 4 Testing		586 in outbreaks	in all months
4. Outbreak Scenario with	4	293 normally	4.33 (1/week) normally
Increased Tier 4 and WWS		586 in outbreaks	21.66 (5/week) in outbreaks

351

352 Table 3. Cost effectiveness analysis results Columns 2 and 3 represent direct costs to administer Tier 4 surveillance and WWS

353 354 respectively. Column 4 shows the annual cost difference between Tier 4 surveillance and WWS. Column 5 is the indirect cost of staff taking time away from work for Tier 4 surveillance.

	Scenario	Tier 4 Direct	WWS Direct	Cost	Cost of Lost
		Cost	Cost	Difference	Work
	1. COVID-19 Monitoring	\$18.0 M	\$5.4 M	\$12.5 M	\$5.6 M
	2. COVID-19 Monitoring with Higher WWS	\$18.0 M	\$7.5 M	\$10.5 M	\$5.6 M
	Frequency 3. Outbreak Scenario A with Increased Tier 4	\$24.0 M	\$5.4 M	\$18.5 M	\$7.5 M
	Testing 4. Outbreak Scenario B with Increased Tier 4 and	\$24.0 M	\$8.2 M	\$15.8 M	\$7.5 M
255	WWS Testing				
355 356					
357					
358					
359	Table 4. Breakeven analysis res	ults.			

a	•
Ncen	arin
Buun	ai iv

Breakeven Swab Tests

Breakeven Swab Tests

			Based on Direct Cost Difference Only ¹ (per AFB/month)	Including Cost of Lost Work ¹ (per AFB/month)	
	1. 0	COVID-19 Monitoring	204	225	
	2. 0	COVID-19 Monitoring with Higher	171	200	
	3. (Tio	Outbreak Scenario with Increased	302	323	
	4. (Tie	Outbreak Scenario with Increased	258	289	
360 361 362	¹ Sv the	wab tests per base per month added to V se figures reflect a full year (4 outbreak	WWS at the breakeven point relative months and 8 non-outbreak month	e to Tier 4 costs; in outbreak scenarios, ns).	
363	Re	eferences			
364 365	1.	Sinclair RG, Choi CY, Riley MR, Gei systems. Adv Appl Microbiol 2008	rba CP. Pathogen surveillance t ;65:249–269. PMID:19026868	hrough monitoring of sewer	
366 367 368	2.	Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands. Environ Sci Technol Lett 2020 May 20;acs.estlett.0c00357. PMID:null			
369 370 371	3.	Sims N, Kasprzyk-Hordern B. Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology: Monitoring infectious disease spread and resistance to the community level. Environment International 2020 Jun 1;139:105689. doi: 10.1016/j.envint.2020.105689			
372 373 374	4.	Keshaviah A, Hu XC, Henry M. Developing a Flexible National Wastewater Surveillance System for COVID-19 and Beyond. Environmental Health Perspectives 2021 Apr 20;129(4):045002. doi: 10.1289/EHP8572			
375 376 377 378	5.	Ahmed W, Tscharke B, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Bivins A, Choi P, Clarke L, Dwyer J, Edson J, Nguyen TMH, O'Brien JW, Simpson SL, Sherman P, Thomas KV, Verhagen R, Zaugg J, Mueller JF. SARS-Co RNA monitoring in wastewater as a potential early warning system for COVID-19 transmission in community: A temporal case study. Sci Total Environ 2021 Mar 20;761:144216. PMID:33360129			
379 380 381 382	6.	Feng S, Roguet A, McClary-Gutien of Sampling, Analysis, and Normal Assess COVID-19 Burdens in Wisc doi: 10.1021/acsestwater.1c0016	rez JS, Newton RJ, Kloczko N, M lization Methods for SARS-CoV- onsin Communities. ACS EST W 0	eiman JG, McLellan SL. Evaluation 2 Concentrations in Wastewater to ater 2021 Aug 13;1(8):1955–1965.	
383 384 385 386	7.	Peccia J, Zulli A, Brackney DE, Grul Wang D, Wang M, Warren JL, Wei RNA in wastewater tracks commu 2020 Oct;38(10):1164–1167. doi:	baugh ND, Kaplan EH, Casanova inberger DM, Arnold W, Omer S inity infection dynamics. Nat Bio 10.1038/s41587-020-0684-z	as-Massana A, Ko Al, Malik AA, 5B. Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 otechnol Nature Publishing Group;	
387 388	8.	Olesen SW, Imakaev M, Duvallet (epidemiology for COVID-19. Wate	C. Making waves: Defining the ler Pr Res 2021 Sep 1;202:117433. I	ead time of wastewater-based PMID:34304074	
389 390	9.	Betancourt WQ, Schmitz BW, Inne RS, Harris DT, Sherchan SP, Gerba	es GK, Prasek SM, Pogreba Brov CP, Pepper IL. COVID-19 conta	vn KM, Stark ER, Foster AR, Sprissler inment on a college campus via	

- wastewater-based epidemiology, targeted clinical testing and an intervention. Sci Total Environ
 2021 Jul 20;779:146408. PMID:33743467
- 10. Karthikeyan S, Nguyen A, McDonald D, Zong Y, Ronquillo N, Ren J, Zou J, Farmer S, Humphrey G,
 Henderson D, Javidi T, Messer K, Anderson C, Schooley R, Martin NK, Knight R. Rapid, Large-Scale
 Wastewater Surveillance and Automated Reporting System Enable Early Detection of Nearly 85% of
 COVID-19 Cases on a University Campus. mSystems American Society for Microbiology; 2021 Aug
 10;6(4):e00793-21. doi: 10.1128/mSystems.00793-21
- 11. Landstrom M, Braun E, Larson E, Miller M, Holm GH. Efficacy of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance
 for detection of COVID-19 at a residential private college. FEMS Microbes 2022 Jan 1;3:xtac008. doi:
 10.1093/femsmc/xtac008
- 401 12. Scott LC, Aubee A, Babahaji L, Vigil K, Tims S, Aw TG. Targeted wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV402 2 on a university campus for COVID-19 outbreak detection and mitigation. Environ Res 2021
 403 Sep;200:111374. PMID:34058182
- 404 13. Kirby AE. Using Wastewater Surveillance Data to Support the COVID-19 Response United States,
 405 2020–2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2021;70. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7036a2
- 406
 414. Li L, Mazurowski L, Dewan A, Carine M, Haak L, Guarin TC, Dastjerdi NG, Gerrity D, Mentzer C,
 407
 408
 408
 409
 409
 409
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400
 400</
- 410 15. Lander ES, Sullivan JJ. American Pandemic Preparedness: Transforming Our Capabilities. Available
 411 from: whitehouse.gov
- 412 16. CONSOLIDATED-DEPARTMENT-OF-DEFENSE-CORONAVIRUS-DISEASE-2019-FORCE-HEALTH-
- 413 PROTECTION-GUIDANCE-REVISION-5.pdf. Available from:
- https://media.defense.gov/2023/Mar/28/2003187831/-1/-1/1/CONSOLIDATED-DEPARTMENT-OF DEFENSE-CORONAVIRUS-DISEASE-2019-FORCE-HEALTH-PROTECTION-GUIDANCE-REVISION-5.PDF
 [accessed May 24, 2023]
- 417 17. National Wastewater Surveillance System. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2023.
 418 Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/nwss/wastewater-surveillance.html [accessed May 4, 2023]
- 18. Traveler-Based Genomic Surveillance for Early Detection of New SARS-CoV-2 Variants | Travelers'
 Health | CDC. Available from: https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/travel/page/travel-genomic-surveillance
 [accessed Sep 25, 2023]
- Lin N, Servetas S, Jackson S, Lippa K, Parratt K, Mattson P, Beahn C, Mattioli M, Gutierrez S, Focazio
 M, Smith T, Storella P, Wright S. Report on the DHS/NIST Workshop on Standards for an Enduring
 Capability in Wastewater Surveillance for Public Health (SWWS Workshop). NIST Nancy Lin,
 Stephanie Servetas, Scott Jackson, Katrice Lippa, Kirsten Parratt, Philip Mattson, Clare Beahn, Mia
 Mattioli, Sally Gutierrez, Michael Focazio, Ted Smith, Paul Storella, Sarah Wright; 2022 Aug 16;
 Available from: https://www.nist.gov/publications/report-dhsnist-workshop-standards-enduringcapability-wastewater-surveillance-public [accessed May 24, 2023]

Servetas SL, Parratt KH, Brinkman NE, Shanks OC, Smith T, Mattson PJ, Lin NJ. Standards to support
an enduring capability in wastewater surveillance for public health: Where are we? Case Studies in
Chemical and Environmental Engineering 2022 Dec;6:100247. PMID:null

- 432 21. O'Keeffe J. Wastewater-based epidemiology: current uses and future opportunities as a public
 433 health surveillance tool. Environ Health Rev 2021 Nov;64(3):44–52. doi: 10.5864/d2021-015
- 434 22. Safford HR, Shapiro K, Bischel HN. Wastewater analysis can be a powerful public health tool—if it's
 435 done sensibly. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 2022 Feb 8;119(6):e2119600119.
 436 doi: 10.1073/pnas.2119600119
- 437 23. Safford H, Zuniga-Montanez RE, Kim M, Wu X, Wei L, Sharpnack J, Shapiro K, Bischel HN.
 438 Wastewater-Based Epidemiology for COVID-19: Handling qPCR Nondetects and Comparing Spatially
 439 Granular Wastewater and Clinical Data Trends. ACS EST Water 2022 Nov 11;2(11):2114–2124. doi:
 440 10.1021/acsestwater.2c00053
- 441 24. Hart OE, Halden RU. Computational analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 surveillance by wastewater442 based epidemiology locally and globally: Feasibility, economy, opportunities and challenges. Science
 443 of The Total Environment 2020 Aug 15;730:138875. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138875
- 444 25. Wright J, Driver EM, Bowes DA, Johnston B, Halden RU. Comparison of high-frequency in-pipe SARS445 CoV-2 wastewater-based surveillance to concurrent COVID-19 random clinical testing on a public
 446 U.S. university campus. Sci Total Environ 2022 May 10;820:152877. PMID:34998780
- 447 26. Hall GJ, Page EJ, Rhee M, Hay C, Krause A, Langenbacher E, Ruth A, Grenier S, Duran AP, Kamara I,
 448 Iskander JK, Thomas DL, Bock E, Porta N, Pharo J, Osterink BA, Zelmanowitz S, Fleischmann CM,
 449 Liyanage D, Gray JP. Wastewater Surveillance of U.S. Coast Guard Installations and Seagoing Military
 450 Vessels to Mitigate the Risk of COVID-19 Outbreaks. medRxiv; 2022. p. 2022.02.05.22269021. doi:
 451 10.1101/2022.02.05.22269021
- 452 27. Biomeme SARS-CoV-2 Real-Time RT-PCR Test Letter of Authorization | FDA. Available from:
 453 https://www.fda.gov/media/141049 [accessed May 24, 2023]
- 454 28. Salary.com S built by: U.S. Air Force (USAF) Nurse Salary. Salary.com. Available from:
 455 https://www.salary.com/research/salary/employer/u-s-air-force-usaf/nurse-salary [accessed Oct
 456 19, 2023]
- 457 29. Laboratory technician salary in United States. Available from:
- 458 https://www.indeed.com/career/laboratory-technician/salaries [accessed Oct 19, 2023]
- 459 30. How Much Does US Air Force Pay in 2023? (41,869 Salaries). Glassdoor. Available from:
 460 https://www.glassdoor.com/Salary/US-Air-Force-Salaries-E41283.htm [accessed Oct 19, 2023]
- 461 31. Air Force Active Duty Benefits U.S. Air Force. Available from: https://www.airforce.com/pay-and 462 benefits/air-force-benefits [accessed Oct 19, 2023]
- 463 32. Locations U.S. Air Force. Available from: https://www.airforce.com/ways-to-serve/locations
 464 [accessed May 24, 2023]

465