

**Supporting Information:**

**Flushing of stagnant premise water systems after the  
COVID-19 shutdown can reduce infection risk by  
*Legionella* and *Mycobacterium* spp.**

Raymond M. Hozalski,<sup>\*,†</sup> Timothy M. LaPara,<sup>†</sup> Xiaotian Zhao,<sup>†</sup> Taegyu Kim,<sup>†</sup>  
Michael B. Waak,<sup>‡,¶</sup> Tucker Burch,<sup>§</sup> and Michael McCarty<sup>||</sup>

<sup>†</sup>*Department of Civil, Environmental, and Geo-Engineering, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis,  
Minnesota, United States*

<sup>‡</sup>*Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway*

<sup>¶</sup>*Department of Infrastructure, SINTEF Community, Trondheim, Norway*

<sup>§</sup>*Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Marshfield, Wisconsin, United  
States*

<sup>||</sup>*School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States*

E-mail: [hozalski@umn.edu](mailto:hozalski@umn.edu)

Phone: +1 612-626-9650. Fax: +1 612-626-7750

# SI Experimental Materials and Methods

## Sample Collection and Processing

Sampling crew members were outfitted with personal protective equipment consisting of N95 masks to protect against inhalation exposure. In addition, shower water was directed into a bucket to minimize splashing and aerosolization of the water.

Temperature and pH were measured with a handheld meter, and total chlorine was measured using the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) DPD method (10070) and a DR900 colorimeter (Hach Company; Loveland, Colorado). Each hot water flush was initiated 20 min after starting the cold water flush. Flushes began by turning the valve to cold or fully hot, as appropriate. All valves were on/off type without flow-rate controls. Flow rates without shower heads ranged from 3.8 to 29.4 L/min (median 14.3 L/min), which would correspond to turbulent flow (Reynold's number  $>4000$ ) in common 1/2 inch copper piping and which theoretically would have produced wall shear stresses of 1 to 40 N/m<sup>2</sup> (median 11.1 N/m<sup>2</sup>; [Table S14](#)). In contrast, a water-efficient shower head might release 9 L/min, giving an estimated shear stress of 4.9 N/m<sup>2</sup>.

Microbiological samples were mixed by gentle inversion, and one to three aliquots (100 mL) were poured into individual graduated vessels with sodium thiosulfate (Na<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>) for the Legiolert assays. The remaining sample volume was used for DNA extraction via vacuum filtration. After filtration, filter membranes were placed in separate microcentrifuge tubes with lysis buffer (500 µL), subjected to three freeze-thaw cycles and 90 min incubation at 70 °C, and then purified using the FastDNA Spin Kit (MP Biomedicals; Santa Ana, California), as previously detailed.<sup>S1</sup>

## Real-time qPCR

For 16S rRNA genes, sample amplification was differentiated from background amplification using the mean and 99.9 % confidence interval of the negative controls ( $n = 7$ ). For the other gene targets, any amplification was considered a positive detect—no amplification was observed in negative controls—but the method quantification limit (MQL) was defined as the lowest calibration standard to amplify, normalized by sample volumes. All gene targets amplified at 10 copies/µL, with the exception of *ssrA* (100 copies/µL). Calibration curves are summarized in [Table S15](#).

## Data Analysis and Statistics

Neither culturable *Legionella pneumophila* nor *mip* and *wzm* genes were observed, so these were excluded from analysis. Furthermore, building E (St. Paul) was not statistically informative about *Mycobacterium avium* complex (MAC) 16S-23S internal transcribed spacer (ITS) regions (in context of flushing practices), as ITS were never observed in those samples, so the site was excluded from analyses pertaining to the ITS data.

The data contained left-censored observations, so appropriate statistical methods were selected to test experimental null hypotheses ( $H_0$ ).<sup>S2,S3</sup> Left-censoring was defined based on either non-significant amplification in contrast to negative controls (16S rRNA genes) or if no amplification was observed (*ssrA*, *atpE*, 16S-23S ITS).

## Paired Difference Tests

To determine whether flushing was effective at reducing bacterial biomass in showers, paired gene concentrations were contrasted for all combinations of four different time-points: pre-flush, after 30 min flush, and then during the two subsequent follow-up events (6 contrasts total per gene target). An example null hypothesis is given:

$H_0$ : At  $t = 0$  (pre-flush) and  $t = 30$  (after 30 min of flushing), the mean difference of all paired 16S rRNA gene concentrations is zero.\*

Paired difference tests were employed to control for any confounding effects of city, building, shower room, and water supply line type and test the isolated effects of flushing and/or post-flush stagnation. To control for type I errors (false positives) among the multiple comparisons within each gene target,  $p$  values were adjusted for the false discovery rate using the procedure of [Benjamini and Hochberg](#).<sup>S4</sup>

Two paired difference tests were used. First, paired maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) was used via the ‘survival’ package in R,<sup>S5,S6</sup> using procedures described by Helsel<sup>S2</sup> and with supplemental R code adapted from Huston and Juarez-Colunga<sup>S3</sup> to use the grammar and data structures of ‘tidyverse’ and ‘magrittr’ packages<sup>S7,S8</sup> (example provided in [Code S1](#)). Residuals were manually assessed for normality<sup>†</sup> using quantile-quantile plots. Occasionally, ‘survival’ did not converge to a solution, so Fong’s modified sign test was used instead<sup>S9</sup> (example provided in [Code S2](#)).

## Multivariate and Univariate Correlation

To account for censored values, ranked gene concentrations<sup>S2</sup> (ranked ascending, such that large values rank higher and with ties ranked equally) were assessed for correlation with water quality (total chlorine, temperature, and pH). An example null hypothesis is given:

$H_0$ : 16S rRNA gene concentration ranks do not co-vary with the ranks of total chlorine<sup>‡</sup>

Using a multivariate approach, ranked gene concentrations were subjected to principal components analysis (PCA) with the R ‘vegan’ package.<sup>S10</sup> Water quality data were fit to the biplot ordination using the *envfit* function, and  $p$  values were generated using 999 permutations.

As an alternative to the multivariate approach, all pairings of gene marker concentration were assessed for monotonic correlation with total chlorine, temperature, or pH using Spearman’s rank tests.

---

\*For differences of logs, 0 is equivalent to a ratio of geometric means that equals 1 (unity).<sup>S2</sup>

†Essentially log-normality due to prior  $\log_{10}$  transformation

‡Alternatively stated, the ranks of the parameter neither increase nor decrease as the ranks of marker gene increase.

## Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment

Inhaled doses were calculated with an adapted version of the equation of Hamilton et al.<sup>S11</sup> (Eq. 1).

$$\text{dose}|_{\text{inhaled}} = \frac{C_w B t}{H} \sum_{i=1}^{10} C_{a,i} V_{a,i} \sum_{i=1}^{10} F_i D_i \times 1000 \frac{L}{m^3} \quad (1)$$

where  $C_w$  is the pathogen concentration in water from the fixture (copies/L),  $H$  is a dose harmonization factor for conversion of colony-forming units (CFU) to concentration via quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) (CFU/copies),  $B$  is human breathing rate ( $m^3/\text{min}$ ),  $t$  is duration of human exposure while showering (min),  $C_{a,i}$  is the concentration of aerosols ( $1/m^3$ ) in the air at specified aerosol sizes,  $i$  (ranging from 1 to  $10 \mu\text{m}$  by increments of  $1 \mu\text{m}$ ),  $V_{a,i}$  is the volume of individual aerosols at the specified aerosol size,  $F_i$  is the proportion of bacterial cells partitioned at the specified size, and  $D_i$  is the alveolar deposition efficiency of aerosols at the specified size. Notably, this adapted version includes a dose harmonization factor,  $H$ , which was not needed by Hamilton et al.<sup>S11</sup> Values for  $H$  are based on those reported by Lee et al.<sup>S12</sup> and Ditommaso et al.<sup>S13</sup> for *Legionella*. For MAC,  $H$  was assumed to be 1 (conservatively) due to a lack of data.<sup>S14</sup> All other values were adopted from Ahmed et al.<sup>S15</sup> and Hamilton et al.<sup>S14</sup>

Ingestion dose estimates were quantified using Eq. 2.

$$\text{dose}|_{\text{ingested}} = \frac{C_w V_i}{H} \quad (2)$$

where  $V_i$  is the volume (L) of water accidentally ingested while showering. Values for  $V_i$  were obtained from Ahmed et al.<sup>S15</sup> and were assumed to be independent of shower head type (i.e., conventional versus efficient).

Example R code are provided in Code S3. Full code (or specific code for any simulation) may be provided upon request to the corresponding author.

## SI Results

### Relationships Between Water Quality and Microbiological Indicators

Initially, the potential confounding variables of city, building/site, and water supply type (i.e., cold versus hot water) were fit simultaneously (using the *envfit* function) with total chlorine, temperature, and pH. This initial analysis indicated that city and building site—but not water supply type—were significant confounding variables (Code S4). Subsequent data exploration, however, indicated temperature (and by extension, water supply type) had a non-monotonic relationship with all four marker genes (bell-shaped with a maximum of approximately 29 to 30 °C; data not shown), which can violate the method assumptions.

After segregating observations by water supply type (cold or hot), temperature was associated with the gene concentrations, particularly in the cold water supplies (Code S5 and S6). Because water temperature in the hot water systems was often observed below 30 °C, the non-monotonic relationship of temperature likely still existed for the hot water data set, consequently weakening the power of the multivariate analysis to determine an effect. During these analyses, PCA was performed with the effects of city and building site ‘partialled out’ using a conditioning matrix.<sup>S10</sup>

Spearman's rank tests were performed on subsets by municipal water system (Minneapolis or St. Paul) and water supply type (cold or hot), to account for either the confounding effect of city or non-monotonic structure of temperature via water supply type. Results for Minneapolis and St. Paul are summarized, respectively, in [Tables S8](#) and [S9](#). The effect of building site within municipal system was assumed to be minimal.

### Code S1. Example code for paired MLE.

```
> # A tibble of example data follows. Concentrations (Conc) for groups 1
  and 2 have been log10 transformed, and censored observations (Cen ==
  TRUE) are treated as -Inf.
> head(data)
# A tibble: 6 x 4
  Conc.1 Cen.1 Conc.2 Cen.2
  <dbl> <lgl> <dbl> <lgl>
1 -Inf TRUE -Inf TRUE
2 2.03 FALSE 2.93 FALSE
3 -Inf TRUE -Inf TRUE
4 2.99 FALSE 3.21 FALSE
5 3.83 FALSE 3.68 FALSE
6 2.63 FALSE 2.33 FALSE

> pairs <- data %>%
  mutate(diffL = case_when(Cen.1==FALSE & Cen.2==FALSE ~ Conc.2-Conc.1,
    Cen.1==TRUE & Cen.2==FALSE ~ Conc.2-Conc.1,
    Cen.1==FALSE & Cen.2==TRUE ~ 0-Conc.1,
    Cen.1==TRUE & Cen.2==TRUE ~ 0-Conc.1)) %>%
  mutate(diffU = case_when(Cen.1==FALSE & Cen.2==FALSE ~ Conc.2-Conc.1,
    Cen.1==TRUE & Cen.2==FALSE ~ Conc.2-0,
    Cen.1==FALSE & Cen.2==TRUE ~ Conc.2-Conc.1,
    Cen.1==TRUE & Cen.2==TRUE ~ Conc.2-0))

> paired.mle = survreg(Surv(time = pairs$diffU, time2 = pairs$diffL, type
  = "interval2") ~ 1, dist = "gaussian")
> summary(paired.mle)
Call:
survreg(formula = Surv(time = pairsMLE$diffU, time2 = pairsMLE$diffL,
  type = "interval2") ~ 1, dist = "gaussian")

              Value Std. Error      z      p
(Intercept)  1.019      0.714  1.43.  0.15
Log(scale)   0.585      0.345  1.69  0.09

Scale= 1.79

Gaussian distribution
Loglik(model)= -12.1 Loglik(intercept only)= -12.1
Number of Newton-Raphson Iterations: 5
n=7 (3 observations deleted due to missingness)

> signif(confint(paired.mle, level = 0.95), digits = 4)
              2.5 %    97.5 %
(Intercept) -0.3799    2.419

> # Interpretation: The mean difference between paired observations is
  1.019, with a 95% confidence interval [-0.380,2.419] that includes 0.
  The null hypothesis is not rejected (p = 0.15/2 = 0.08 for one-sided
  test).
```

## Code S2. Example code for Fong's modified sign test.

```
> # Occasionally, survival cannot converge to a solution:
> paired.mle = survreg(Surv(time = pairs$difffU, time2 = pairs$difffL, type
  = "interval2") ~ 1, dist = "gaussian")
Warning messages:
1: In survreg.fit(X, Y, weights, offset, init = init, controlvals =
  control, :
  Ran out of iterations and did not converge

> # In this case, Fong's modified sign test is an alternative method.
> pairs <- data %>%
  mutate(Conc.1 = case_when(Conc.1 == -Inf ~ 0, # Arbitrary substitution
    TRUE ~ Conc.1)) %>%
  mutate(Conc.2 = case_when(Conc.2 == -Inf ~ 0, # Arbitrary substitution
    TRUE ~ Conc.2)) %>%
  mutate(difffL = case_when(Cen.1==FALSE & Cen.2==FALSE ~ Conc.2-Conc.1,
    Cen.1==TRUE & Cen.2==FALSE ~ Conc.2-Conc.1,
    Cen.1==FALSE & Cen.2==TRUE ~ 0-Conc.1,
    Cen.1==TRUE & Cen.2==TRUE ~ 0-Conc.1)) %>%
  mutate(difffU = case_when(Cen.1==FALSE & Cen.2==FALSE ~ Conc.2-Conc.1,
    Cen.1==TRUE & Cen.2==FALSE ~ Conc.2-0,
    Cen.1==FALSE & Cen.2==TRUE ~ Conc.2-Conc.1,
    Cen.1==TRUE & Cen.2==TRUE ~ Conc.2-0)) %>%
  mutate(sign = case_when(difffL > 0 & difffU > 0 ~ 1,
    difffL < 0 & difffU < 0 ~ -1,
    (difffL<0 & difffU>0) | (difffL>0 & difffU<0) | (difffL
      ==0 & difffU==0) ~ 0))
> n.vals <- pairs %>% group_by(sign) %>% summarize(n = n())
> N = sum(n.vals$n)
> n.ties = as.numeric(n.vals$n[which(n.vals$sign == 0)])
> if(length(n.ties) == 0){n.ties = 0}
> n.plus = as.numeric(n.vals$n[which(n.vals$sign == 1)])
> if(length(n.plus) == 0){n.plus = 0}
> n.neg = as.numeric(n.vals$n[which(n.vals$sign == -1)])
> if(length(n.neg) == 0){n.neg = 0}
> value.1 = max(n.neg, n.plus)
> dfn = vector(mode = "numeric", length = N - value.1 + 1)
> for(i in c(value.1:N)){
  dfn[i - value.1 + 1] = dbinom(x = i, size = N, prob = 0.5)
}
> value.2 = floor((N - n.ties + 1) / 2)
> dfd = vector(mode = "numeric", length = N - value.2 + 1)
> for(i in c(value.2:N)){
  dfd[i - value.2 + 1] = dbinom(x = i, size = N, prob = 0.5)
}
> sum(dfn)/sum(dfd)/2 # One-sided p value for Fong's test
```

### Code S3. Example code for a quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA).

```
library(mc2d)
library(truncnorm)
ndvar(1e4)
ndunc(1e4)

B <- mcstoc(runif, "U", min = 0.013, max = 0.017) # breathing rate, m3
  air/min
tsh <- mcstoc(rtruncnorm, "U", a = 0, mean = 7.8, sd = 0.02) # shower
  time, min

# Aerosol concentrations, no./m3 air (conventional shower fixtures)
Caer1 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 17.5, sdlog = 0.30)
Caer2 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 17.5, sdlog = 0.17)
Caer3 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 19.4, sdlog = 0.35)
Caer4 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 19.4, sdlog = 0.35)
Caer5 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 19.4, sdlog = 0.35)
Caer6 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 20.0, sdlog = 0.31)
Caer7 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 20.0, sdlog = 0.31)
Caer8 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 20.0, sdlog = 0.31)
Caer9 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 20.0, sdlog = 0.31)
Caer10 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 20.0, sdlog = 0.31)

# Aerosol volumes, m3 water (assumes spherical aerosols)
Vaer1 <- (4 / 3) * pi * (((1 / 2) * (10 ^ -6)) ^ 3)
Vaer2 <- (4 / 3) * pi * (((2 / 2) * (10 ^ -6)) ^ 3)
Vaer3 <- (4 / 3) * pi * (((3 / 2) * (10 ^ -6)) ^ 3)
Vaer4 <- (4 / 3) * pi * (((4 / 2) * (10 ^ -6)) ^ 3)
Vaer5 <- (4 / 3) * pi * (((5 / 2) * (10 ^ -6)) ^ 3)
Vaer6 <- (4 / 3) * pi * (((6 / 2) * (10 ^ -6)) ^ 3)
Vaer7 <- (4 / 3) * pi * (((7 / 2) * (10 ^ -6)) ^ 3)
Vaer8 <- (4 / 3) * pi * (((8 / 2) * (10 ^ -6)) ^ 3)
Vaer9 <- (4 / 3) * pi * (((9 / 2) * (10 ^ -6)) ^ 3)
Vaer10 <- (4 / 3) * pi * (((10 / 2) * (10 ^ -6)) ^ 3)

# Percentage of total Legionella per size fraction
F1 <- 17.5 / 100
F2 <- 16.39 / 100
F3 <- 15.56 / 100
F4 <- 6.67 / 100
F5 <- 3.89 / 100
F6 <- 2.5 / 100
F7 <- 2.78 / 100
F8 <- 5.00 / 100
F9 <- 5.28 / 100
F10 <- 3.89 / 100

# Deposition efficiency of aerosols by size category
D1 <- mcstoc(runif, "U", min = 0.23, max = 0.25)
D2 <- mcstoc(runif, "U", min = 0.40, max = 0.53)
D3 <- mcstoc(runif, "U", min = 0.36, max = 0.62)
D4 <- mcstoc(runif, "U", min = 0.29, max = 0.61)
D5 <- mcstoc(runif, "U", min = 0.19, max = 0.52)
```



```

D6 <- mcstoc(runif, "U", min = 0.10, max = 0.40)
D7 <- mcstoc(runif, "U", min = 0.06, max = 0.29)
D8 <- mcstoc(runif, "U", min = 0.03, max = 0.19)
D9 <- mcstoc(runif, "U", min = 0.01, max = 0.12)
D10 <- mcstoc(runif, "U", min = 0.01, max = 0.06)

# Total aerosol concentration, m^3 water/m^3 air (conventional)
CVAer_conv <- (Caer1 * Vaer1) + (Caer2 * Vaer2) + (Caer3 * Vaer3) +
  (Caer4 * Vaer4) + (Caer5 * Vaer5) + (Caer6 * Vaer6) + (Caer7 * Vaer7) +
  (Caer8 * Vaer8) + (Caer9 * Vaer9) + (Caer10 * Vaer10)

# Inhalable proportion of total Legionella (F extrapolated to MAC)
FD <- (F1 * D1) + (F2 * D2) + (F3 * D3) + (F4 * D4) + (F5 * D5) + (F6 * D6
) +
  (F7 * D7) + (F8 * D8) + (F9 * D9) + (F10 * D10)

# Equivalent inhaled aerosol volume, L (conventional)
wat_conv <- B * tsh * (CVAer_conv * 1e3) * FD

# Reality checks
sum(c(F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F7, F8, F9, F10)) # 20% of Legionella occur
  in non-inhalable aerosols
median(FD) # after accounting for deposition, ~75% of Legionella are
  assumed non-inhalable

# Aerosol concentrations, no./m^3 air (high efficiency shower fixtures)
Caer1 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 18.1, sdlog = 0.57)
Caer2 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 17.9, sdlog = 0.64)
Caer3 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 18.7, sdlog = 0.52)
Caer4 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 18.7, sdlog = 0.52)
Caer5 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 18.7, sdlog = 0.52)
Caer6 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 18.3, sdlog = 0.14)
Caer7 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 18.3, sdlog = 0.14)
Caer8 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 18.3, sdlog = 0.14)
Caer9 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 18.3, sdlog = 0.14)
Caer10 <- mcstoc(rlnorm, "U", meanlog = 18.3, sdlog = 0.14)

# Total aerosol concentration, m^3 water/m^3 air (high efficiency)
CVAer_he <- (Caer1 * Vaer1) + (Caer2 * Vaer2) + (Caer3 * Vaer3) +
  (Caer4 * Vaer4) + (Caer5 * Vaer5) + (Caer6 * Vaer6) + (Caer7 * Vaer7) +
  (Caer8 * Vaer8) + (Caer9 * Vaer9) + (Caer10 * Vaer10)

# Equivalent inhaled aerosol volume, L (high efficiency)
wat_he <- B * tsh * (CVAer_he * 1e3) * FD

# Reality checks
summary(wat_conv) # 2e-5 L per exposure (actual is greater, because of F)
summary(wat_he) # 4e-6 L per exposure (actual is greater, because of F)
median(wat_conv) / median(wat_he) # factor of 5 (water use and aerosol
  generation)

# L. pneumophila concentrations, Minneapolis (flushing period)
original <- c(10 ^ c(4.75, 4.94, 4.65, 4.68, 4.38, 5.5, 5.98, 4.52),
  rep(0, 35))

```

```

mean(original) # 3.6e4 copies/L
ClegMin <- matrix(nrow = ndvar(), ncol = ndunc())
for (i in 1:ndunc()) {
  resample <- sample(original, length(original), replace = TRUE)
  ClegMin[, i] <- rep_len(resample, ndvar())
}
ClegMin <- mcddata(ClegMin, type = "VU")
summary(ClegMin) # 3.3e4 [4.6e3, 8.9e4] copies/L

# L. pneumophila concentrations, St. Paul (flushing period)
original <- c(10 ^ c(6, 5.63, 5.2, 6.21, 4.34, 4.88, 4.78, 5.41, 5.1),
             rep(0, 5))
mean(original) # 2.7e5 copies/L
ClegSP <- matrix(nrow = ndvar(), ncol = ndunc())
for (i in 1:ndunc()) {
  resample <- sample(original, length(original), replace = TRUE)
  ClegSP[, i] <- rep_len(resample, ndvar())
}
ClegSP <- mcddata(ClegSP, type = "VU")
summary(ClegSP) # 2.6e5 [7.0e4, 5.4e5] copies/L

# Dose calculations
legDoseHarm <- mcstoc(runif, "U", min = 11, max = 28) # copies/CFU
dlegMin_conv <- ((wat_conv * ClegMin) / legDoseHarm) * 1 # CFU
  pneumophila
dlegMin_he <- ((wat_he * ClegMin) / legDoseHarm) * 1 # CFU pneumophila
dlegSP_conv <- ((wat_conv * ClegSP) / legDoseHarm) * 1 # CFU pneumophila
dlegSP_he <- ((wat_he * ClegSP) / legDoseHarm) * 1 # CFU pneumophila
summary(dlegMin_conv) # 3.9e-2 [5.1e-3, 1.4e-1]
summary(dlegMin_he) # 7.7e-3 [1.0e-3, 2.5e-2]
summary(dlegSP_conv) # 3.1e-1 [7.0e-2, 8.6e-1]
summary(dlegSP_he) # 5.9e-2 [1.4e-2, 1.6e-1]

# Risk calculations (Sub-clinical Infection)
rlegSubClin <- mcstoc(rlnorm, type = "U", meanlog = -2.93, sdlog = 0.49)
Pleg1 <- 1 - exp(-rlegSubClin * dlegMin_conv)
Pleg2 <- 1 - exp(-rlegSubClin * dlegMin_he)
Pleg3 <- 1 - exp(-rlegSubClin * dlegSP_conv)
Pleg4 <- 1 - exp(-rlegSubClin * dlegSP_he)
summary(Pleg1) # Minneapolis, conventional 2.0e-3 [2.2e-4, 9.8e-3]
summary(Pleg2) # Minneapolis, high efficiency 3.9e-4 [4.2e-5, 1.9e-3]
summary(Pleg3) # St. Paul, conventional 1.5e-2 [2.8e-3, 6.1e-2]
summary(Pleg4) # St. Paul, high efficiency 3.1e-3 [5.6e-4, 1.2e-2]

# Risk calculations (Clinical Severity Infection)
rlegCSI <- mcstoc(rlnorm, type = "U", meanlog = -9.69, sdlog = 0.30)
Pleg5 <- 1 - exp(-rlegCSI * dlegMin_conv)
Pleg6 <- 1 - exp(-rlegCSI * dlegMin_he)
Pleg7 <- 1 - exp(-rlegCSI * dlegSP_conv)
Pleg8 <- 1 - exp(-rlegCSI * dlegSP_he)
summary(Pleg5) # Minneapolis, conventional 2.4e-6 [3.0e-7, 9.8e-6]
summary(Pleg6) # Minneapolis, high efficiency 4.7e-7 [5.8e-8, 1.8e-6]
summary(Pleg7) # St. Paul, conventional 1.9e-5 [4.0e-6, 6.3e-5]
summary(Pleg8) # St. Paul, high efficiency 3.6e-6 [7.9e-7, 1.2e-5]

```

**Code S4.** R output of function `envfit` for PCA of ranked gene marker concentrations, fitting of temperature, total chlorine, and pH parameters with confounding variables city, building/site, and water supply type.

```

> df.qPCR.rank <- df.qPCR %>%
  select(xl6S, ssrA, atpE) %>% # ITS excluded due to no detection
  mutate(xl6S = dense_rank(xl6S),
         ssrA = dense_rank(ssrA),
         atpE = dense_rank(atpE))
> ord.PCA <- rda(df.qPCR.rank) # Unconstrained rda() = PCA
> env.PCA <- envfit(ord.PCA ~ Type + Total.Chlorine + Temperature + pH,
  data=df.water.quality)
> print(env.PCA)
***VECTORS
          PC1      PC2      r2 Pr(>r)
Temperature -0.69174 -0.72215 0.0219 0.397
Total.Chlorine -0.99861 -0.05265 0.5697 0.001 ***
pH             -0.85688 -0.51552 0.3075 0.001 ***
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Permutation: free
Number of permutations: 999

***FACTORS:
Centroids:
          PC1      PC2
City:Minneapolis -0.3963 -0.5702
City:St.Paul      1.1543  1.6609
Site:A            -0.5466  0.5964
Site:B            -0.9348 -1.0904
Site:C            -0.0041 -0.5844
Site:D            -0.1940 -1.0011
Site:E            1.1543  1.6609
Type:Cold         0.0068  0.0597
Type:Hot         -0.0074 -0.0652

Goodness of fit:
          r2 Pr(>r)
City  0.2375 0.001 ***
Site  0.3061 0.001 ***
Type  0.0007 0.956
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Permutation: free
Number of permutations: 999

```

**Code S5.** R output of function `envfit` for PCA of ranked gene marker concentrations in cold water, with fitting of temperature, total chlorine, and pH. Effects of city and site have been ‘partialled out’ with a conditioning matrix.

```

> df.qPCR.Cold <- df.qPCR %>%
  filter(Type == "Cold") %>%
  select(x16S, ssrA, atpE, ITS) %>%
  mutate(x16S = dense_rank(x16S),
         ssrA = dense_rank(ssrA),
         atpE = dense_rank(atpE),
         ITS = dense_rank(ITS))
> df.conditioning.Cold <- df.qPCR %>% select(City, Site)
> ord.PCA.Cold <- rda(df.qPCR.Cold, Z = df.conditioning.Cold) #
  Unconstrained rda() = PCA
> env.PCA.Cold <- envfit(ord.PCA.Cold ~ Temperature +
  Total.Chlorine + pH, data=subset(df.water.quality, Type == "Cold"))
> print(env.PCA.Cold)
***VECTORS
              PC1          PC2          r2 Pr(>r)
Temperature  -0.998360  0.057228  0.5716  0.001 ***
Total.Chlorine  0.988390  0.151954  0.5688  0.001 ***
pH              0.999180  0.040439  0.1435  0.029 *
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Permutation: free
Number of permutations: 999


```

**Code S6.** R output of function `envfit` for PCA of ranked gene marker concentrations in hot water, with fitting of temperature, total chlorine, and pH. Effects of city and site have been ‘partialled out’ with a conditioning matrix.


```

> df.qPCR.Hot <- df.qPCR %>%
  filter(Type == "Hot") %>%
  select(x16S, ssrA, atpE, ITS) %>%
  mutate(x16S = dense_rank(x16S),
         ssrA = dense_rank(ssrA),
         atpE = dense_rank(atpE),
         ITS = dense_rank(ITS))
> df.conditioning.Hot <- df.qPCR %>% select(City, Site)
> ord.PCA.Hot <- rda(df.qPCR.Hot, Z = df.conditioning.Hot) # Unconstrained
  rda() = PCA
> env.PCA.Hot <- envfit(ord.PCA.Hot ~ Temperature +
  Total.Chlorine + pH, data=subset(df.water.quality, Type == "Hot"))
> print(env.PCA.Hot)
***VECTORS
          PC1      PC2      r2 Pr(>r)
Temperature  0.96698  0.25485 0.2096  0.008 **
Total.Chlorine 0.89809 -0.43982 0.5252  0.001 ***
pH            0.43254 -0.90162 0.0593  0.288
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Permutation: free
Number of permutations: 999


```



**Figure S1.** Water quality during flushing: (A) total chlorine, (B) water temperature, and (C) water pH.



**Figure S2.** Chloramine decay in Minneapolis cold and hot tap water (onsite observations from buildings A to D) and Minneapolis cold tap water in a laboratory glass bottle: **(A)** Exponential modelling of chloramine decay as a function of time after flushing ( $C_t$ , relative to initial concentration,  $C_0$ ), with 95% confidence intervals, and **(B)** the fitted decay rate constants ( $K$ ) with 95% confidence intervals.



**Figure S3.** PCA biplot of ranked marker gene concentrations (conditioned by city and building site), with supplemental fitting of water quality parameters (temperature,  $T$ ; total chlorine,  $Cl_2$ ; and pH) in **(A)** cold water supplies, including building inlets, and **(B)** hot water supplies. Angles between response lines and supplementary variables represent two-dimensional approximations of correlation.



**Table S1. University of Minnesota, Twin Cities (UMN) building site descriptions**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Build year</b>	<b>A/G,* 10<sup>3</sup> m<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Level<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>Water supply description</b>
<b>Minneapolis Campus</b>				
A	2014	15.0/23.5	3 (7)	Copper piping with hot water stored at 48.9 °C (120 °F) in three storage tanks (each about 7.6 m <sup>3</sup> or 2000 gal). Main mixing valve and shared circulation with building C.
B	1934	5.2/8.1	3 (6)	Copper piping likely not original, but replacement date(s) unknown. Hot water circulation system without storage tanks or mixing valves and operation at 46.1 °C (115 °F).
C	2014	13.9/17.9	3 (5)	Copper piping without hot water storage; circulation with main mixing valve and hot water received from building A (about 48.9 °C or 120 °F).
D	1993	18.8/28.7	1 (4)	Copper piping (likely all original) with hot water storage (about 11.4 m <sup>3</sup> or 3000 gal) and circulation with main mixing valves (about 57.2 °C or 135 °F)
<b>St. Paul Campus</b>				
E	1965	3.8/5.3	1 (3)	Copper piping replaced in 2016/2017. No storage tanks or mixing valves.

\* A = assignable area, available for occupancy or designated use; G = gross area, sum of all area within the exterior walls of the building

† Level where shower rooms located and samples collected (and total number of levels)

**Table S2. Sample collection dates**

Site	Shower room	Type	Flushing date	Follow-up (1/2)		Follow-up (2/2)	
				Date	$\Delta$ days*	Date	$\Delta$ days*
A	1/1	Cold	2020-05-19	2020-05-22	3	2020-05-26	7
		Hot	2020-05-19	2020-05-22	3	2020-05-26	7
B	1/1	Cold	2020-05-20	2020-05-22	2	2020-05-26	6
		Hot	2020-05-20	2020-05-22	2	2020-05-26	6
C	1/1	Cold	2020-05-19	2020-05-22	3	2020-05-26	7
		Hot	2020-05-19	2020-05-22	3	2020-05-26	7
D	1/2	Cold	2020-05-20	2020-05-22	2	2020-05-26	6
		Hot	2020-05-20	2020-05-22	2	2020-05-26	6
	2/2	Cold	2020-05-20	2020-05-22	2	2020-05-26	6
		Hot	2020-05-20	2020-05-22	2	2020-05-26	6
E	1/2	Cold	2020-06-01	2020-06-05	4	2020-06-08	7
		Hot	2020-06-01	2020-06-05	4	2020-06-08	7
	2/2	Cold	2020-06-01	2020-06-05	4	2020-06-08	7
		Hot	2020-06-01	2020-06-05	4	2020-06-08	7

\* Relative to flushing at  $t = 0$  days

**Table S3. Pre- and post-flushing total chlorine measurements (mg/L as Cl<sub>2</sub>)**

Site	Shower room	Type	Inlet	Pre-flush	Post-flush	Follow-up 1/2	Follow-up 2/2
A	1/1	Cold	2.97	<0.02	3.06	0.19	0.12
		Hot		<0.02	2.35	0.02	0.05
B	1/1	Cold	2.99	0.97	3.10	0.97	0.45
		Hot		0.55	2.73	0.11	0.23
C	1/1	Cold	3.06	<0.02	2.82	0.04	<0.02
		Hot		<0.02	0.66	0.05	<0.02
D	1/2	Cold	2.99	0.33	3.03	0.22	0.07
		Hot		<0.02	1.28	0.66	0.16
	2/2	Cold	<0.02	2.91	0.07	0.07	
		Hot	<0.02	1.62	0.40	0.10	
E	1/2	Cold	1.76	0.02	1.32	<0.02	<0.02
		Hot		0.65	2.19	<0.02	0.02
	2/2	Cold	0.04	2.12	<0.02	<0.02	
		Hot	0.03	1.41	<0.02	<0.02	

**Table headers:** Building/site; shower room; water supply type; building inlet (near entry-point of municipal water supply); pre-flush ( $t = 0$  min); post-flush (immediately after flushing,  $t = 30+$  min); follow-up at either 2 to 4 days after flushing (1/2) or 6 or 7 days after flushing (2/2)

**Table S4. Pre- and post-flushing water temperature measurements (°C)**

Site	Shower room	Type	Inlet	Pre-flush	Post-flush	Follow-up 1/2	Follow-up 2/2
A	1/1	Cold	16.9	23.8	15.4	23.0	25.4
		Hot		21.2	22.6	23.8	25.3
B	1/1	Cold	16.8	26.3	17.4	25.3	27.6
		Hot		26.8	43.3	26.3	27.8
C	1/1	Cold	14.5	23.5	16.4	23.1	26.3
		Hot		19.7	42.1	22.7	25.0
D	1/2	Cold	13.1	30.4	16.4	24.0	23.9
		Hot		21.8	46.7	23.4	23.7
	2/2	Cold		25.1	17.1	23.0	24.0
		Hot		24.7	41.1	23.3	24.5
E	1/2	Cold	14.0	22.6	17.8	25.8	28.4
		Hot		23.2	15.8	25.9	29.1
	2/2	Cold		21.2	17.6	24.2	26.0
		Hot		20.6	38.1	26.1	25.6

**Table headers:** Building/site; shower room; water supply type; building inlet (near entry-point of municipal water supply); pre-flush ( $t = 0$  min); post-flush (immediately after flushing,  $t = 30+$  min); follow-up at either 2 to 4 days after flushing (1/2) or 6 or 7 days after flushing (2/2)

**Table S5. Pre- and post-flushing water pH measurements**

Site	Shower room	Type	Inlet	Pre-flush	Post-flush	Follow-up 1/2	Follow-up 2/2
A	1/1	Cold	9.5	9.3	9.4	9.3	9.0
		Hot		9.3	9.4	9.3	9.1
B	1/1	Cold	9.4	8.6	9.4	8.9	8.8
		Hot		8.6	8.9	8.9	8.8
C	1/1	Cold	9.5	9.4	9.4	9.3	9.0
		Hot		9.3	9.1	9.4	9.1
D	1/2	Cold	9.5	9.0	9.4	9.2	8.9
		Hot		9.2	8.8	9.4	9.1
	2/2	Cold		8.8	9.4	9.2	8.8
		Hot		9.1	8.9	9.2	9.0
E	1/2	Cold	9.2	8.8	8.9	8.5	8.2
		Hot		8.6	9.1	8.5	8.2
	2/2	Cold		8.5	8.8	8.4	8.1
		Hot		8.5	8.4	8.5	8.3

**Table headers:** Building/site; shower room; water supply type; building inlet (near entry-point of municipal water supply); pre-flush ( $t = 0$  min); post-flush (immediately after flushing,  $t = 30+$  min); follow-up at either 2 to 4 days after flushing (1/2) or 6 or 7 days after flushing (2/2)

**Table S6. Paired MLE contrasting sample time-points**

Group 1 <sup>†</sup>	Group 2 <sup>†</sup>	Est. Diff.	95 % LCL	95 % UCL	<i>p</i>	Sig.
<b>16S rRNA genes (<i>n</i> = 14)</b>						
Pre-flush	30 min flush	-2.56	-3.14	-1.98	<0.001	***
Pre-flush	Follow-up (1/2)	-1.26	-1.66	-0.86	<0.001	***
Pre-flush	Follow-up (2/2)	-0.46	-0.83	-0.09	0.007	**
30 min flush	Follow-up (1/2)	1.30	0.89	1.70	<0.001	***
30 min flush	Follow-up (2/2)	2.10	1.39	2.81	<0.001	***
Follow-up (1/2)	Follow-up (2/2)	0.80	0.36	1.24	<0.001	***
<b><i>ssrA</i> (<i>n</i> = 14)</b>						
Pre-flush	30 min flush	-11.80	-23.30	-0.23	0.041	*
Pre-flush	Follow-up (1/2)	-5.22	-10.40	-0.06	0.041	*
Pre-flush	Follow-up (2/2)	-2.75	-5.70	0.21	0.041	*
30 min flush	Follow-up (1/2)	6.88	0.43	13.30	0.041	*
30 min flush	Follow-up (2/2)	9.70	-0.66	20.10	0.041	*
Follow-up (1/2)	Follow-up (2/2)	1.71	-2.14	5.56	0.192	
<b><i>atpE</i> (<i>n</i> = 14)</b>						
Pre-flush	30 min flush	-11.50	-21.30	-1.63	0.017	*
Pre-flush	Follow-up (1/2)	-2.11	-3.59	-0.64	0.015	*
Pre-flush	Follow-up (2/2)	-0.93	-1.82	-0.03	0.023	*
30 min flush	Follow-up (1/2)	6.80	1.33	12.30	0.017	*
30 min flush	Follow-up (2/2)	9.04	1.45	16.60	0.017	*
Follow-up (1/2)	Follow-up (2/2)	1.12	0.02	2.23	0.023	*
<b>16S-23S ITS (<i>n</i> = 10)<sup>‡</sup></b>						
Pre-flush	30 min flush	-6.94	-∞	+∞	NA <sup>§</sup>	
Pre-flush	Follow-up (1/2)	-2.77	-4.37	-1.18	0.001	***
Pre-flush	Follow-up (2/2)	-1.76	-2.97	-0.55	0.003	**
30 min flush	Follow-up (1/2)	4.97	-∞	+∞	NA <sup>§</sup>	
30 min flush	Follow-up (2/2)	4.94	-∞	+∞	NA <sup>§</sup>	
Follow-up (1/2)	Follow-up (2/2)	1.02	-0.38	2.42	0.077	.

**Table headers:** Group 1, in contrast to Group 2; estimated difference in group means and 95 % lower and upper confidence limits (LCL and UCL); adjusted *p* values (after Benjamini and Hochberg<sup>S4</sup>) for one-sided tests; *p* significance codes: '\*\*\*' ≤0.001; '\*\*' ≤0.01; '\*' ≤0.05; '.' ≤0.1

<sup>†</sup> *Follow-up* is either 2 to 4 days after flushing (1/2) or 6 or 7 days after flushing (2/2)

<sup>‡</sup> Building E observations excluded due to their uniform absence

<sup>§</sup> Survival model failed to converge; no *p* value calculated

**Table S7. Fong's modified sign test contrasting sample time-points**

Group 1 <sup>†</sup>	Group 2 <sup>†</sup>	16S rRNA genes		<i>ssrA</i>		<i>atpE</i>		16S-23S ITS <sup>‡</sup>	
		<i>p</i>	Sig.	<i>p</i>	Sig.	<i>p</i>	Sig.	<i>p</i>	Sig.
Pre-flush	30 min flush	<0.001	***	0.025	*	0.036	*	0.026	*
Pre-flush	Follow-up (1/2)	0.001	**	0.148		0.036	*	0.026	*
Pre-flush	Follow-up (2/2)	0.175		0.148		0.074	.	0.207	
30 min flush	Follow-up (1/2)	0.001	**	0.487		0.059	.	0.395	
30 min flush	Follow-up (2/2)	0.001	**	0.487		0.036	*	0.207	
Follow-up (1/2)	Follow-up (2/2)	0.029	*	0.500		0.036	*	0.500	

**Table headers:** Group 1, in contrast to Group 2; adjusted *p* values (after Benjamini and Hochberg<sup>S4</sup>) for one-sided tests; *p* significance codes: '\*\*\*' ≤0.001; '\*\*' ≤0.01; '\*' ≤0.05; '.' ≤0.1

<sup>†</sup> *Follow-up* is either 2 to 4 days after flushing (1/2) or 6 or 7 days after flushing (2/2)

<sup>‡</sup> Building E observations excluded due to uniform absence (*n* = 10 versus *n* = 14 for other gene markers).

**Table S8. Spearman's rank correlation between gene markers and water quality parameters in Minneapolis, Minnesota**

Gene target	Parameter	S	$\rho$	p value	Sig.
<b>Cold Water (n = 42)</b>					
Total <i>Bacteria</i> (16S rRNA gene)	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	13 156.0	-0.843	<0.001	***
	Temperature	2007.9	0.719	<0.001	***
	pH	11 245.1	-0.575	<0.001	***
Total <i>Legionella</i> spp. ( <i>ssrA</i> )	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	11 056.3	-0.549	0.001	***
	Temperature	2649.0	0.629	<0.001	***
	pH	11 032.2	-0.545	0.001	***
Total <i>Mycobacterium</i> spp. ( <i>atpE</i> )	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	11 653.0	-0.632	<0.001	***
	Temperature	1855.8	0.740	<0.001	***
	pH	11 875.0	-0.663	<0.001	***
<i>M. avium</i> complex (16S-23S ITS)	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	10 664.3	-0.494	0.003	**
	Temperature	2708.9	0.621	<0.001	***
	pH	11 339.8	-0.588	<0.001	***
<b>Hot Water (n = 32)</b>					
Total <i>Bacteria</i> (16S rRNA gene)	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	10 048.3	-0.842	<0.001	***
	Temperature	8656.8	-0.587	<0.001	***
	pH	3867.0	0.291	0.106	
Total <i>Legionella</i> spp. ( <i>ssrA</i> )	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	8216.7	-0.506	0.003	**
	Temperature	6949.2	-0.274	0.130	
	pH	4782.9	0.123	0.501	
Total <i>Mycobacterium</i> spp. ( <i>atpE</i> )	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	9373.5	-0.718	<0.001	***
	Temperature	7748.5	-0.420	0.017	*
	pH	4899.6	0.102	0.579	
<i>M. avium</i> complex (16S-23S ITS)	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	9713.2	-0.780	<0.001	***
	Temperature	7822.1	-0.434	0.013	*
	pH	4509.0	0.174	0.342	

**Table headers:** Contrasted gene target and water quality parameter; Spearman's statistic (*S*); Spearman's rho ( $\rho$ ); Spearman's *p* value; *p* significance codes: '\*\*\*'  $\leq 0.001$ ; '\*\*'  $\leq 0.01$ ; '\*'  $\leq 0.05$ ; '.'  $\leq 0.1$



**Table S9. Spearman’s rank correlation between gene markers and water quality parameters in St. Paul, Minnesota**

Gene target	Parameter	S	$\rho$	p value	Sig.
<b>Cold Water (n = 12)</b>					
Total <i>Bacteria</i> (16S rRNA gene)	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	408.4	-0.428	0.165	
	Temperature	120.0	0.580	0.048	*
	pH	405.6	-0.418	0.176	
Total <i>Legionella</i> spp. ( <i>ssrA</i> )	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	273.5	0.044	0.893	
	Temperature	215.9	0.245	0.442	
	pH	251.8	0.120	0.711	
Total <i>Mycobacterium</i> spp. ( <i>atpE</i> )	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	329.6	-0.153	0.636	
	Temperature	130.7	0.543	0.068	.
	pH	345.4	-0.208	0.517	
<b>Hot Water (n = 11)<sup>†</sup></b>					
Total <i>Bacteria</i> (16S rRNA gene)	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	358.3	-0.629	0.038	*
	Temperature	92.0	0.582	0.060	.
	pH	333.6	-0.516	0.104	
Total <i>Legionella</i> spp. ( <i>ssrA</i> )	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	386.9	-0.759	0.007	**
	Temperature	88.8	0.596	0.053	.
	pH	334.6	-0.521	0.100	
Total <i>Mycobacterium</i> spp. ( <i>atpE</i> )	Total Cl <sub>2</sub>	372.9	-0.695	0.018	*
	Temperature	44.0	0.800	0.003	**
	pH	363.2	-0.651	0.030	*

**Table headers:** Contrasted gene target and water quality parameter; Spearman’s statistic (*S*); Spearman’s rho ( $\rho$ ); Spearman’s *p* value; *p* significance codes: ‘\*\*\*’  $\leq 0.001$ ; ‘\*\*’  $\leq 0.01$ ; ‘\*’  $\leq 0.05$ ; ‘.’  $\leq 0.1$

<sup>†</sup> The hot water system at building E had been turned off due to the campus closure, so hot water was effectively cold water for the first flush; hot water was turned on again for the flush in the second shower room.

Table S10. *Legionella* inhalation dose and subsequent infection risk in Minneapolis university shower rooms\*

Assumes <sup>†</sup>	Interval	Dose, CFU			Clinical risk, per exposure			Subclinical risk, per exposure		
		Median	L95 %	U95 %	Median	L95 %	U95 %	Median	L95 %	U95 %
<b>Fixture type: Conventional shower head</b>										
100 %	First-flush	$8.5 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-2}$	$2.9 \times 10^{-1}$	$5.1 \times 10^{-6}$	$6.7 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.3 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.1 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.1 \times 10^{-2}$
	≥ 15 min	$3.0 \times 10^{-6}$	0.0	$9.6 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.8 \times 10^{-10}$	0.0	$6.9 \times 10^{-10}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-7}$	0.0	$7.0 \times 10^{-7}$
10 %	First-flush	$8.5 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.9 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.1 \times 10^{-7}$	$6.3 \times 10^{-8}$	$2.1 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.2 \times 10^{-3}$
	≥ 15 min	$2.9 \times 10^{-7}$	0.0	$9.7 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.7 \times 10^{-11}$	0.0	$7.0 \times 10^{-11}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-8}$	0.0	$7.5 \times 10^{-8}$
1 %	First-flush	$8.5 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.0 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.2 \times 10^{-8}$	$6.2 \times 10^{-9}$	$2.1 \times 10^{-7}$	$4.4 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.8 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.2 \times 10^{-4}$
	≥ 15 min	$2.9 \times 10^{-8}$	0.0	$9.5 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.7 \times 10^{-12}$	0.0	$6.8 \times 10^{-12}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-9}$	0.0	$7.3 \times 10^{-9}$
0.1 %	First-flush	$8.6 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.0 \times 10^{-4}$	$5.1 \times 10^{-9}$	$6.5 \times 10^{-10}$	$2.1 \times 10^{-8}$	$4.4 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.9 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-5}$
	≥ 15 min	$2.9 \times 10^{-9}$	0.0	$9.5 \times 10^{-9}$	$1.7 \times 10^{-13}$	0.0	$7.0 \times 10^{-13}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-10}$	0.0	$7.4 \times 10^{-10}$
LOD	First-flush	$2.0 \times 10^{-6}$	0.0	$5.1 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-10}$	0.0	$4.0 \times 10^{-10}$	$9.4 \times 10^{-8}$	0.0	$4.5 \times 10^{-7}$
	≥ 15 min	$2.0 \times 10^{-6}$	0.0	$5.1 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-10}$	0.0	$4.0 \times 10^{-10}$	$9.4 \times 10^{-8}$	0.0	$4.5 \times 10^{-7}$
<b>Fixture type: Efficient shower head</b>										
100 %	First-flush	$1.6 \times 10^{-2}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-2}$	$9.8 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.3 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.8 \times 10^{-6}$	$8.5 \times 10^{-4}$	$9.6 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.0 \times 10^{-3}$
	≥ 15 min	$5.6 \times 10^{-7}$	0.0	$1.8 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.4 \times 10^{-11}$	0.0	$1.3 \times 10^{-10}$	$2.8 \times 10^{-8}$	0.0	$1.4 \times 10^{-7}$
10 %	First-flush	$1.7 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-4}$	$5.5 \times 10^{-3}$	$9.9 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.3 \times 10^{-8}$	$4.0 \times 10^{-7}$	$8.5 \times 10^{-5}$	$9.7 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.2 \times 10^{-4}$
	≥ 15 min	$5.6 \times 10^{-8}$	0.0	$1.8 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.4 \times 10^{-12}$	0.0	$1.3 \times 10^{-11}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-9}$	0.0	$1.4 \times 10^{-8}$
1 %	First-flush	$1.6 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-5}$	$5.6 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-9}$	$3.9 \times 10^{-8}$	$8.4 \times 10^{-6}$	$9.5 \times 10^{-7}$	$4.2 \times 10^{-5}$
	≥ 15 min	$5.5 \times 10^{-9}$	0.0	$1.8 \times 10^{-8}$	$3.3 \times 10^{-13}$	0.0	$1.3 \times 10^{-12}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-10}$	0.0	$1.4 \times 10^{-9}$
0.1 %	First-flush	$1.6 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.2 \times 10^{-6}$	$5.5 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-9}$	$1.3 \times 10^{-10}$	$4.0 \times 10^{-9}$	$8.5 \times 10^{-7}$	$9.8 \times 10^{-8}$	$4.2 \times 10^{-6}$
	≥ 15 min	$5.6 \times 10^{-10}$	0.0	$1.8 \times 10^{-9}$	$3.3 \times 10^{-14}$	0.0	$1.3 \times 10^{-13}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-11}$	0.0	$1.4 \times 10^{-10}$
LOD	First-flush	$3.8 \times 10^{-7}$	0.0	$9.0 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-11}$	0.0	$7.5 \times 10^{-11}$	$1.8 \times 10^{-8}$	0.0	$8.3 \times 10^{-8}$
	≥ 15 min	$3.8 \times 10^{-7}$	0.0	$9.0 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-11}$	0.0	$7.5 \times 10^{-11}$	$1.8 \times 10^{-8}$	0.0	$8.3 \times 10^{-8}$

\* Median and lower/upper 95 % confidence limits are based on Monte Carlo simulations

† Percent of total observed *Legionella* spp. assumed to exhibit *pneumophila*-like infection characteristics (0.1 %, 1 %, 10 %, and 100 %), or if *L. pneumophila* are assumed present at the Legiolert assay detection limit, accounting for volume sampled (“LOD”).

Table S11. *Legionella* inhalation dose and subsequent infection risk in St. Paul university shower rooms\*

Assumes <sup>†</sup>	Interval	Dose, CFU			Clinical risk, per exposure			Subclinical risk, per exposure		
		Median	L95 %	U95 %	Median	L95 %	U95 %	Median	L95 %	U95 %
<b>Fixture type: Conventional shower head</b>										
100 %	First-flush	$4.6 \times 10^{-1}$	$4.0 \times 10^{-2}$	1.4	$2.8 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.8 \times 10^{-3}$	$9.8 \times 10^{-2}$
	≥ 15 min	$7.0 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.6 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.9 \times 10^{-1}$	$4.2 \times 10^{-6}$	$8.5 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.7 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-2}$
10 %	First-flush	$4.6 \times 10^{-2}$	$3.9 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-1}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.2 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.9 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-2}$
	≥ 15 min	$7.0 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.6 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.9 \times 10^{-2}$	$4.2 \times 10^{-7}$	$9.1 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.7 \times 10^{-4}$	$6.6 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-3}$
1 %	First-flush	$4.6 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.7 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-2}$	$2.8 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.1 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.6 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-3}$
	≥ 15 min	$7.0 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.9 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.2 \times 10^{-8}$	$8.9 \times 10^{-9}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.7 \times 10^{-5}$	$6.5 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-4}$
0.1 %	First-flush	$4.6 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.8 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.8 \times 10^{-8}$	$2.2 \times 10^{-9}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.4 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.8 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-4}$
	≥ 15 min	$7.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.9 \times 10^{-4}$	$4.3 \times 10^{-9}$	$8.8 \times 10^{-10}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-8}$	$3.7 \times 10^{-6}$	$6.3 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-5}$
LOD	First-flush	$5.5 \times 10^{-6}$	0.0	$1.4 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.3 \times 10^{-10}$	0.0	$1.1 \times 10^{-9}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-7}$	0.0	$1.3 \times 10^{-6}$
	≥ 15 min	$5.5 \times 10^{-6}$	0.0	$1.4 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.3 \times 10^{-10}$	0.0	$1.1 \times 10^{-9}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-7}$	0.0	$1.3 \times 10^{-6}$
<b>Fixture type: Efficient shower head</b>										
100 %	First-flush	$8.9 \times 10^{-2}$	$7.8 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-1}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.6 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.7 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.5 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.1 \times 10^{-2}$
	≥ 15 min	$1.3 \times 10^{-2}$	$3.1 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.5 \times 10^{-2}$	$8.2 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.7 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.6 \times 10^{-6}$	$7.1 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.3 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.8 \times 10^{-3}$
10 %	First-flush	$8.8 \times 10^{-3}$	$7.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.6 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.3 \times 10^{-7}$	$4.5 \times 10^{-8}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.6 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.7 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-3}$
	≥ 15 min	$1.3 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.1 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.5 \times 10^{-3}$	$8.1 \times 10^{-8}$	$1.8 \times 10^{-8}$	$2.5 \times 10^{-7}$	$7.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.3 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-4}$
1 %	First-flush	$8.9 \times 10^{-4}$	$7.2 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-8}$	$4.1 \times 10^{-9}$	$1.9 \times 10^{-7}$	$4.6 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.1 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-4}$
	≥ 15 min	$1.3 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.5 \times 10^{-4}$	$8.2 \times 10^{-9}$	$1.7 \times 10^{-9}$	$2.6 \times 10^{-8}$	$7.1 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.3 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.8 \times 10^{-5}$
0.1 %	First-flush	$9.0 \times 10^{-5}$	$7.3 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-4}$	$5.4 \times 10^{-9}$	$4.3 \times 10^{-10}$	$1.9 \times 10^{-8}$	$4.7 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.7 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.1 \times 10^{-5}$
	≥ 15 min	$1.3 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.9 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.5 \times 10^{-5}$	$8.2 \times 10^{-10}$	$1.7 \times 10^{-10}$	$2.6 \times 10^{-9}$	$7.1 \times 10^{-7}$	$1.3 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.9 \times 10^{-6}$
LOD	First-flush	$1.1 \times 10^{-6}$	0.0	$2.5 \times 10^{-6}$	$6.5 \times 10^{-11}$	0.0	$2.1 \times 10^{-10}$	$5.2 \times 10^{-8}$	0.0	$2.4 \times 10^{-7}$
	≥ 15 min	$1.1 \times 10^{-6}$	0.0	$2.5 \times 10^{-6}$	$6.5 \times 10^{-11}$	0.0	$2.1 \times 10^{-10}$	$5.2 \times 10^{-8}$	0.0	$2.4 \times 10^{-7}$

\* Medians and lower/upper 95 % confidence limits are based on Monte Carlo simulations

† Percent of total observed *Legionella* spp. assumed to exhibit *pneumophila*-like infection characteristics (0.1 %, 1 %, 10 %, and 100 %), or if *L. pneumophila* are assumed present at the Legiolert assay detection limit, accounting for volume sampled (“LOD”).

**Table S12. MAC inhalation dose and subsequent pulmonary infection risk in university shower rooms**

Fixture type	Interval	Dose, CFU			Risk, per exposure		
		Median	L95 %	U95 %	Median	L95 %	U95 %
<b>City: Minneapolis</b>							
Conventional	First-flush	$3.4 \times 10^{-1}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-2}$	1.1	$7.6 \times 10^{-10}$	$5.8 \times 10^{-11}$	$2.4 \times 10^{-9}$
	≥ 15 min	$9.8 \times 10^{-4}$	0.0	$3.6 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.2 \times 10^{-12}$	0.0	$8.0 \times 10^{-12}$
Efficient	First-flush	$6.8 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.2 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.1 \times 10^{-1}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-10}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-11}$	$4.5 \times 10^{-10}$
	≥ 15 min	$1.9 \times 10^{-4}$	0.0	$6.8 \times 10^{-4}$	$4.2 \times 10^{-13}$	0.0	$1.5 \times 10^{-12}$
<b>City: St. Paul</b>							
Conventional	First-flush	$9.4 \times 10^{-5}$	0.0	$2.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.1 \times 10^{-13}$	0.0	$5.4 \times 10^{-13}$
	≥ 15 min	$9.4 \times 10^{-5}$	0.0	$2.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.1 \times 10^{-13}$	0.0	$5.4 \times 10^{-13}$
Efficient	First-flush	$1.8 \times 10^{-5}$	0.0	$4.3 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.0 \times 10^{-14}$	0.0	$9.5 \times 10^{-14}$
	≥ 15 min	$1.8 \times 10^{-5}$	0.0	$4.3 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.0 \times 10^{-14}$	0.0	$9.5 \times 10^{-14}$

\* Medians and lower/upper 95 % confidence limits are based on Monte Carlo simulations

Table S13. MAC ingestion dose and subsequent per-exposure risk in university shower rooms

Interval	Dose, CFU			Systemic infection risk			Cervical lymphadenitis risk		
	Median	L95 %	U95 %	Median	L95 %	U95 %	Median	L95 %	U95 %
<b>City: Minneapolis</b>									
First-flush	8.9	$4.8 \times 10^{-1}$	$5.7 \times 10^1$	$1.5 \times 10^{-6}$	$8.3 \times 10^{-8}$	$9.9 \times 10^{-6}$	$8.2 \times 10^{-8}$	$4.4 \times 10^{-9}$	$5.3 \times 10^{-7}$
≥15 min	$3.0 \times 10^{-2}$	0.0	$1.9 \times 10^{-1}$	$5.2 \times 10^{-9}$	0.0	$3.3 \times 10^{-8}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-10}$	0.0	$1.7 \times 10^{-9}$
<b>City: St. Paul</b>									
First-flush	$2.9 \times 10^{-3}$	0.0	$1.4 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-10}$	0.0	$2.5 \times 10^{-9}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-11}$	0.0	$1.3 \times 10^{-10}$
≥15 min	$2.9 \times 10^{-3}$	0.0	$1.4 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-10}$	0.0	$2.5 \times 10^{-9}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-11}$	0.0	$1.3 \times 10^{-10}$

\* Medians and lower/upper 95 % confidence limits are based on Monte Carlo simulations

**Table S14. Measured and predicted hydraulic characteristics during flushing experiments**

Site	Shower room	Type	<i>Measured</i>		<i>Predicted</i> (½ in. copper pipe, 20 °C) <sup>†</sup>		
			<i>Q</i> (L/min)	<i>Q</i> (L/s)	<i>v</i> (m/s)	<i>Re</i>	$\tau_0$ (N/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>‡</sup>
A	1/1	Cold	8.53	0.14	1.12	14 220	4.46
		Hot	15.73	0.26	2.07	26 229	13.12
B	1/1	Cold	20.23	0.34	2.66	33 733	20.51
		Hot	29.40	0.49	3.87	49 012	39.95
C	1/1	Cold	7.93	0.13	1.04	13 225	3.93
		Hot	12.83	0.21	1.69	21 394	9.15
D	1/2	Cold	22.89	0.38	3.01	38 159	25.54
		Hot	29.25	0.49	3.85	48 762	39.59
	2/2	Cold	21.60	0.36	2.84	36 009	23.03
		Hot	22.00	0.37	2.89	36 676	23.80
E	1/2	Cold	11.06	0.18	1.46	18 442	7.04
		Hot	3.76	0.06	0.49	6 268	1.08
	2/2	Cold	11.18	0.19	1.47	18 630	7.17
		Hot	7.86	0.13	1.03	13 103	3.87

**Table headers:** Building/site; shower room; water supply type; measured flow rate (*Q*); flow velocity (*v*); Reynold's number (*Re*, unitless); shear stress ( $\tau_0$ )

<sup>†</sup> Assuming absolute roughness coefficient ( $\epsilon$ ) = 0.0015 mm for copper pipe<sup>S16</sup>

<sup>‡</sup> Calculated per Liu et al.<sup>S17</sup> after iterative estimation of the friction factor as in Colebrook and White<sup>S18</sup>

**Table S15. Real-time qPCR summary**

<b>Target</b>	<b>% Efficiency</b>	<b><math>R^2</math></b>	<b>Slope</b>	<b>Intercept</b>
16S rRNA genes	119.4	0.996	-2.931	34.716
	117.3	0.995	-2.968	35.264
<i>ssrA</i>	107.6	0.997	-3.153	47.948
	122.8	0.966	-2.875	46.339
<i>mip</i>	124.5	0.997	-2.847	33.224
<i>wzm</i>	111.0	0.994	-3.085	37.777
<i>atpE</i>	102.2	0.993	-3.270	39.934
	101.2	0.991	-3.294	42.089
16S-23S ITS	108.8	0.997	-3.129	36.022
	104.9	0.999	-3.210	35.347

## References

- (S1) Waak, M. B.; LaPara, T. M.; Hallé, C.; Hozalski, R. M. Occurrence of *Legionella* spp. in water-main biofilms from two drinking water distribution systems. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2018**, *52*, 7630–7639.
- (S2) Helsel, D. R. In *Statistics for Censored Environmental Data Using Minitab and R*, 2nd ed.; Scott, M., Barnett, V., Eds.; Statistics in Practice; John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: Hoboken, New Jersey, 2012; p 344.
- (S3) Huston, C.; Juarez-Colunga, E. Guidelines for Computing Summary Statistics for Data-Sets Containing Non-Detects. 2009; <http://bvcentre.ca>.
- (S4) Benjamini, Y.; Hochberg, Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *J. Roy. Stat. Soc. B Met.* **1995**, *57*, 289–300.
- (S5) Therneau, T. M. A package for survival analysis in R. 2020.
- (S6) R Core Team, R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing: Vienna, Austria, 2019.
- (S7) Wickham, H.; Averick, M.; Bryan, J.; Chang, W.; McGowan, L. D.; François, R.; Golemund, G.; Hayes, A.; Henry, L.; Hester, J.; Kuhn, M.; Pedersen, T. L.; Miller, E.; Bache, S. M.; Müller, K.; Ooms, J.; Robinson, D.; Seidel, D. P.; Spinu, V.; Takahashi, K.; Vaughan, D.; Wilke, C.; Woo, K.; Yutani, H. Welcome to the tidyverse. *J. Open Source Softw.* **2019**, *4*, 1686.
- (S8) Bache, S. M.; Wickham, H. magrittr: A Forward-Pipe Operator for R. 2014.
- (S9) Fong, D. Y. T.; Kwan, C. W.; Lam, K. F.; Lam, K. S. L. Use of the sign test for the median in the presence of ties. *Am. Stat.* **2003**, *57*, 237–240.
- (S10) Oksanen, J.; Blanchet, F. G.; Friendly, M.; Kindt, R.; Legendre, P.; McGlinn, D.; Minchin, P. R.; O’Hara, R. B.; Simpson, G. L.; Solymos, P.; Stevens, M. H. H.; Szoecs, E.; Wagner, H. vegan: Community Ecology Package. 2018.
- (S11) Hamilton, K. A.; Hamilton, M. T.; Johnson, W.; Jjemba, P.; Bukhari, Z.; LeChevallier, M.; Haas, C. N.; Gurian, P. L. Risk-based critical concentrations of *Legionella pneumophila* for indoor residential water uses. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2019**, *53*, 4528–4541.
- (S12) Lee, J. V.; Lai, S.; Exner, M.; Lenz, J.; Gaia, V.; Casati, S.; Hartemann, P.; Lück, C.; Pangon, B.; Ricci, M. L.; Scaturro, M.; Fontana, S.; Sabria, M.; Sánchez, I.; Assaf, S.; Surman-Lee, S. An international trial of quantitative PCR for monitoring *Legionella* in artificial water systems. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **2011**, *110*, 1032–1044.
- (S13) Ditommaso, S.; Ricciardi, E.; Giacomuzzi, M.; Arauco Rivera, S. R.; Zotti, C. M. *Legionella* in water samples: How can you interpret the results obtained by quantitative PCR? *Mol. Cell Probe* **2015**, *29*, 7–12.



- (S14) Hamilton, K. A.; Ahmed, W.; Toze, S.; Haas, C. N. Human health risks for *Legionella* and *Mycobacterium avium* complex (MAC) from potable and non-potable uses of roof-harvested rainwater. *Water Res.* **2017**, *119*, 288–303.
- (S15) Ahmed, W.; Vieritz, A.; Goonetilleke, A.; Gardner, T. Health Risk from the use of roof-harvested rainwater in Southeast Queensland, Australia, as potable or nonpotable water, determined using quantitative microbial risk assessment. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2010**, *76*, 7382–7391.
- (S16) Engineering ToolBox, Roughness & Surface Coefficients. 2003; <https://www.engineeringtoolbox.com>.
- (S17) Liu, J.-q.; Luo, Z.-f.; Liu, K.; Zhang, Y.-f.; Peng, H.-x.; Hu, B.-l.; Ren, H.-x.; Zhou, X.-y.; Qiu, S.-d.; He, X.-f.; Ye, P.; Bastani, H.; Lou, L.-p. Effect of flushing on the detachment of biofilms attached to the walls of metal pipes in water distribution systems. *J. Zhejiang Univ.-SC A* **2017**, *18*, 313–328.
- (S18) Colebrook, C. F.; White, C. M. Experiments with fluid friction in roughened pipes. *P. Roy. Soc. Lond. A Mat.* **1937**, *161*, 367–381.