

1 Wastewater surveillance pilot at US military installations: a cost 2 model analysis

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

10 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
21 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,
23 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
30 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
35 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 Keywords

50 Wastewater Surveillance, Cost Analysis, Military Health, Public Health
51
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
63 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
68 to the epidemiology of the outbreak as well as data collection and processing timelines [8]. Despite
69 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
72 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
74 candidate for broad scale baseline pathogen monitoring [13]. Because WWS is passive and independent
75 of healthcare seeking behavior, it provides a data stream complementary to active tracking of infections
76 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
81 threat early-warning systems prioritized in the Biden Administration’s “American Pandemic
82 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
84 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
88 diagnostic test surveillance systems by enabling efficient collection of community level samples. In
89 addition, CDC is applying WWS within passenger airplanes as part of its Traveler Genomic Surveillance
90 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

93 Health” to identify challenges and solutions for maturing an ensuring WWS capability for detecting and
94 monitoring 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
108 work in these installations. The DoD implements a four-tiered COVID-19 testing scheme. The first three
109 tiers focus on staff at varying levels of critical service and deployment; Tier 4 sentinel surveillance is an
110 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
114 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
116 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
119 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
123 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
127 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.

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
136 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
139 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
142 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
146 associated with expensive auto-sampler procurement.

147

148 Collection of tier 4 sentinel surveillance and WWS costs

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

155

156 Materials costs modeled for Tier 4 swab testing only include the total cost of the PCR swab test, which
157 was estimated based on input from DoD subject matter experts with visibility into budgeting and
158 therefore reflects actual cost incurred. The remaining direct Tier 4 costs were associated with labor
159 including the nurse and lab tech time for swab sampling and data management and reporting. We
160 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
163 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
168 and reporting, vendor management, and ongoing support to participating bases. The estimate of hourly
169 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
175 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
177 spreadsheet model in Microsoft Excel (Version 2302) to calculate and compare total costs for each
178 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
181 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
189 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
192 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

200 17 out of the 26 AFBs recorded WWS data during the period from September 2021 to January 2022
201 (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
203 samples once per week. Yet, in total, 52 data submissions were recorded and amounted to 45 unique
204 viable sample records. As illustrated in Figure 2, invalid submissions included duplicate records and
205 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,
208 the pilot study identified 25 positive (or presumptive positive) samples and 20 negative samples. The 25
209 positive samples came from 12 of the 14 sites that collected samples systematically. However, the sites
210 did not collect the same number of samples and two sites that detected no positives were also the sites
211 that submitted the fewest total samples. This procedure validated the feasibility of implementing WWS
212 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

216 The cost of SARS-CoV-2 WWS was estimated and compared to the estimated cost of Tier 4 COVID-19
217 sentinel surveillance (asymptomatic testing) across 82 selected AFBs. The four scenarios modeled are
218 described in Table 2. For each scenario we use the cost model parameters to estimate total direct and
219 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
221 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
223 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
226 high such that strict control measures are put in place, enhanced surveillance is needed to manage
227 response. Therefore, under COVID-19 outbreak monitoring scenarios 3 and 4 we estimate the direct
228 costs of Tier 4 sentinel surveillance to be \$24 million dollars. The cost of WWS may also go up,
229 depending on policy decision making; for example, sites could choose to test more frequently or utilize
230 alternative pathogen detection methods. In scenario 3, only Tier 4 sentinel surveillance is increased
231 during outbreak response and so the estimated WWS direct costs remain \$5.4 million. In contrast,
232 scenario 4 assumed that the usage of both Tier 4 sentinel surveillance and WWS go up during outbreak
233 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
236 tested and this leads to additional effective costs. We use our model to estimate the cost of lost work,
237 based on typical staff salary ranges and time required to get tested. In scenarios with baseline testing,
238 we estimate that there would be a \$5.6 million cost for the loss of work associated with Tier 4 sentinel
239 surveillance PCR testing. During a disease outbreak scenario leading to increased testing, we estimate
240 the cost of lost work to be \$7.5 million. In contrast, WWS does not place any burden on staff not
241 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

267 The DoD SARS-CoV-2 WWS surveillance pilot studies demonstrated the feasibility of implementing WWS
268 at military installations. The pilot studies revealed some important technical considerations. For
269 example, although dPCR was extremely sensitive, it required shipping of wastewater from remote sites
270 to a centralized location, potentially limiting its use in largescale deployment. Portable qPCR had a lower
271 throughput of samples than dPCR but was simple to use at the point of sampling. Our simple cost model
272 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
277 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
279 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
281 testing. Our break-even analysis indicates that without allocating additional funding to surveillance
282 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
284 provide the exact same information. Swab testing can enable individual level actions, such as
285 quarantining and contact tracing, and higher resolution data. Therefore, tradeoffs between the public
286 health benefits of WWS and swab testing will need to be determined on a case-by-case basis. These
287 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
300 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
302 knowledge of the actual costs incurred during the pilot studies. Therefore, our model could be framed as
303 an estimate of what the actual cost would have been if the pilot was carried out at all AFBs rather than a
304 forecast of the costs of a DoD wide program—although we believe our work is germane to that topic.
305 Furthermore, systematic uncertainty in labor and materials costs due to changes in supply chain issues
306 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
310 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**

323 We would like to thank Helen Phipps for helpful input. JDV and SS designed the study. EMM managed
324 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
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339

Disclaimer


The views expressed in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the 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. Included references to commercial products do not constitute endorsement by the Department of Defense.

Figures



340
341

Figure 1 Data collection procedure



342
343

Figure 2 Data preprocessing workflow

Tables

344
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 end of estimate)
Number of PCR Tests (Outbreak)	586	Tier 4 PCR Surveillance □ Plan (high end of estimate)
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 Minutes)	5	Estimate
Data Management and Reporting (Lab Tech Minutes)	2	Estimate
Benefits Adjustment to Salaries	35%	Common practice; consistent with BLS data
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 plus the cost of labor per PCR test.

WWS Parameters

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 per week)	\$105.53	Technical and pricing SME for pilot 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 Increased Tier 4 Testing	4	293 normally 586 in outbreaks	4.33 (1/week) in all months
4. Outbreak Scenario with Increased Tier 4 and WWS Testing	4	293 normally 586 in outbreaks	4.33 (1/week) normally 21.66 (5/week) in outbreaks

351
352
353
354

Table 3. Cost effectiveness analysis results Columns 2 and 3 represent direct costs to administer Tier 4 surveillance and WWS 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 Cost	WWS Direct Cost	Cost Difference	Cost of Lost Work
1. COVID-19 Monitoring	\$18.0 M	\$5.4 M	\$12.5 M	\$5.6 M
2. COVID-19 Monitoring with Higher WWS Frequency	\$18.0 M	\$7.5 M	\$10.5 M	\$5.6 M
3. Outbreak Scenario A with Increased Tier 4 Testing	\$24.0 M	\$5.4 M	\$18.5 M	\$7.5 M
4. Outbreak Scenario B with Increased Tier 4 and WWS Testing	\$24.0 M	\$8.2 M	\$15.8 M	\$7.5 M

355
356
357
358
359

Table 4. Breakeven analysis results.

Scenario	Breakeven Swab Tests	Breakeven Swab Tests
----------	----------------------	----------------------

	Based on Direct Cost Difference Only¹ (per AFB/month)	Including Cost of Lost Work¹ (per AFB/month)
1. COVID-19 Monitoring	204	225
2. COVID-19 Monitoring with Higher WWS Frequency	171	200
3. Outbreak Scenario with Increased Tier 4 Testing	302	323
4. Outbreak Scenario with Increased Tier 4 and WWS Testing	258	289

360 ¹Swab tests per base per month added to WWS at the breakeven point relative to Tier 4 costs; in outbreak scenarios,
361 these figures reflect a full year (4 outbreak months and 8 non-outbreak months).
362

363 References

- 364 1. Sinclair RG, Choi CY, Riley MR, Gerba CP. Pathogen surveillance through monitoring of sewer
365 systems. *Adv Appl Microbiol* 2008;65:249–269. PMID:19026868
- 366 2. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in
367 Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in
368 The Netherlands. *Environ Sci Technol Lett* 2020 May 20;acs.estlett.0c00357. PMID:null
- 369 3. Sims N, Kasprzyk-Hordern B. Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology: Monitoring
370 infectious disease spread and resistance to the community level. *Environment International* 2020
371 Jun 1;139:105689. doi: 10.1016/j.envint.2020.105689
- 372 4. Keshaviah A, Hu XC, Henry M. Developing a Flexible National Wastewater Surveillance System for
373 COVID-19 and Beyond. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2021 Apr 20;129(4):045002. doi:
374 10.1289/EHP8572
- 375 5. Ahmed W, Tschärke B, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Bivins A, Choi P, Clarke L, Dwyer J, Edson J, Nguyen
376 TMH, O’Brien JW, Simpson SL, Sherman P, Thomas KV, Verhagen R, Zaugg J, Mueller JF. SARS-CoV-2
377 RNA monitoring in wastewater as a potential early warning system for COVID-19 transmission in the
378 community: A temporal case study. *Sci Total Environ* 2021 Mar 20;761:144216. PMID:33360129
- 379 6. Feng S, Roguet A, McClary-Gutierrez JS, Newton RJ, Kloczko N, Meiman JG, McLellan SL. Evaluation
380 of Sampling, Analysis, and Normalization Methods for SARS-CoV-2 Concentrations in Wastewater to
381 Assess COVID-19 Burdens in Wisconsin Communities. *ACS EST Water* 2021 Aug 13;1(8):1955–1965.
382 doi: 10.1021/acsestwater.1c00160
- 383 7. Peccia J, Zulli A, Brackney DE, Grubaugh ND, Kaplan EH, Casanovas-Massana A, Ko AI, Malik AA,
384 Wang D, Wang M, Warren JL, Weinberger DM, Arnold W, Omer SB. Measurement of SARS-CoV-2
385 RNA in wastewater tracks community infection dynamics. *Nat Biotechnol* Nature Publishing Group;
386 2020 Oct;38(10):1164–1167. doi: 10.1038/s41587-020-0684-z
- 387 8. Olesen SW, Imakaev M, Duvall C. Making waves: Defining the lead time of wastewater-based
388 epidemiology for COVID-19. *Water Res* 2021 Sep 1;202:117433. PMID:34304074
- 389 9. Betancourt WQ, Schmitz BW, Innes GK, Prasek SM, Pogreba Brown KM, Stark ER, Foster AR, Sprissler
390 RS, Harris DT, Sherchan SP, Gerba CP, Pepper IL. COVID-19 containment on a college campus via

- 391 wastewater-based epidemiology, targeted clinical testing and an intervention. *Sci Total Environ*
392 2021 Jul 20;779:146408. PMID:33743467
- 393 10. Karthikeyan S, Nguyen A, McDonald D, Zong Y, Ronquillo N, Ren J, Zou J, Farmer S, Humphrey G,
394 Henderson D, Javidi T, Messer K, Anderson C, Schooley R, Martin NK, Knight R. Rapid, Large-Scale
395 Wastewater Surveillance and Automated Reporting System Enable Early Detection of Nearly 85% of
396 COVID-19 Cases on a University Campus. *mSystems American Society for Microbiology*; 2021 Aug
397 10;6(4):e00793-21. doi: 10.1128/mSystems.00793-21
- 398 11. Landstrom M, Braun E, Larson E, Miller M, Holm GH. Efficacy of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance
399 for detection of COVID-19 at a residential private college. *FEMS Microbes* 2022 Jan 1;3:xtac008. doi:
400 10.1093/femsmc/xtac008
- 401 12. Scott LC, Aubee A, Babahaji L, Vigil K, Tims S, Aw TG. Targeted wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-
402 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 14. Li L, Mazurowski L, Dewan A, Carine M, Haak L, Guarin TC, Dastjerdi NG, Gerrity D, Mentzer C,
407 Pagilla KR. Longitudinal monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater using viral genetic markers and the
408 estimation of unconfirmed COVID-19 cases. *Sci Total Environ* 2022 Apr 15;817:152958.
409 PMID:35016937
- 410 15. Lander ES, Sullivan JJ. American Pandemic Preparedness: Transforming Our Capabilities. Available
411 from: [whitehouse.gov](https://www.whitehouse.gov)
- 412 16. CONSOLIDATED-DEPARTMENT-OF-DEFENSE-CORONAVIRUS-DISEASE-2019-FORCE-HEALTH-
413 PROTECTION-GUIDANCE-REVISION-5.pdf. Available from:
414 [https://media.defense.gov/2023/Mar/28/2003187831/-1/-1/1/CONSOLIDATED-DEPARTMENT-OF-
415 DEFENSE-CORONAVIRUS-DISEASE-2019-FORCE-HEALTH-PROTECTION-GUIDANCE-REVISION-5.PDF](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)
416 [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]
- 419 18. Traveler-Based Genomic Surveillance for Early Detection of New SARS-CoV-2 Variants | Travelers'
420 Health | CDC. Available from: <https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/travel/page/travel-genomic-surveillance>
421 [accessed Sep 25, 2023]
- 422 19. Lin N, Servetas S, Jackson S, Lippa K, Parratt K, Mattson P, Beahn C, Mattioli M, Gutierrez S, Focazio
423 M, Smith T, Storella P, Wright S. Report on the DHS/NIST Workshop on Standards for an Enduring
424 Capability in Wastewater Surveillance for Public Health (SWWS Workshop). NIST Nancy Lin,
425 Stephanie Servetas, Scott Jackson, Katrice Lippa, Kirsten Parratt, Philip Mattson, Clare Beahn, Mia
426 Mattioli, Sally Gutierrez, Michael Focazio, Ted Smith, Paul Storella, Sarah Wright; 2022 Aug 16;
427 Available from: [https://www.nist.gov/publications/report-dhsnist-workshop-standards-enduring-
428 capability-wastewater-surveillance-public](https://www.nist.gov/publications/report-dhsnist-workshop-standards-enduring-capability-wastewater-surveillance-public) [accessed May 24, 2023]

- 429 20. Servetas SL, Parratt KH, Brinkman NE, Shanks OC, Smith T, Mattson PJ, Lin NJ. Standards to support
430 an enduring capability in wastewater surveillance for public health: Where are we? *Case Studies in*
431 *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 wastewater-
442 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 SARS-
445 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-](https://www.airforce.com/pay-and-benefits/air-force-benefits)
462 [benefits/air-force-benefits](https://www.airforce.com/pay-and-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]

