

1 **Wastewater sample site selection to estimate geographically-resolved community prevalence**  
2 **of COVID-19: A research protocol**

3  
4 Ray A. Yeager<sup>ab</sup>, Rochelle H. Holm<sup>a</sup>, Kumar Saurabh<sup>c</sup>, Joshua L Fuqua<sup>de</sup>, Daymond Talley<sup>f</sup>, Aruni  
5 Bhatnagar<sup>a</sup>, Ted Smith<sup>a\*</sup>

6  
7 <sup>a</sup>Christina Lee Brown Envirome Institute, University of Louisville, 302 E. Muhammad Ali Blvd.,  
8 Louisville, KY 40202, United States

9 <sup>b</sup>Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, School of Public Health and  
10 Information Sciences, University of Louisville, 485 E. Gray St., Louisville, KY 40202, United States

11 <sup>c</sup>James Graham Brown Cancer Center, School of Medicine, University of Louisville, 505 S.  
12 Hancock St., Louisville, KY 40202, United States

13 <sup>d</sup>Center for Predictive Medicine, University of Louisville, 505 S. Hancock St., Louisville KY, United  
14 States

15 <sup>e</sup>Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, University of Louisville, 505 S. Hancock St.,  
16 Louisville, KY 40202, United States

17 <sup>f</sup>Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District, Morris Forman Water Quality  
18 Treatment Center, 4522 Algonquin Parkway, Louisville KY 40211, United States

19  
20  
21 \* Corresponding author at: Christina Lee Brown Envirome Institute, University of Louisville, 302  
22 E Muhammad Ali Blvd., Louisville, KY 40202, United States; E-mail address:  
23 ted.smith@louisville.edu (Ted Smith).

24 **Abstract**

25

26 Background: Wastewater monitoring for virus infections within communities can complement  
27 conventional clinical surveillance. Currently, most SARS-CoV-2 testing is performed during  
28 clinical encounters with symptomatic individuals, and therefore likely underrepresents actual  
29 population prevalence. Randomized testing on a regular basis to estimate population-level  
30 infection rates is prohibitively costly and is hampered by a range of barriers associated with  
31 participation in clinical research. In comparison, community-level fecal monitoring can be  
32 performed through wastewater surveillance and can effectively surveil communities with less  
33 temporal lag than other surveillance methods. However, epidemiologically-defined protocols  
34 for wastewater sample site selection are lacking.

35 Methods: Herein we describe methods for developing a geographically-resolved population-  
36 level wastewater sampling approach in Jefferson County, Kentucky which may have general  
37 applicability for cities throughout the United States. This approach was developed by the  
38 selection of sampling locations along sewer lines transporting raw wastewater from  
39 geographically and demographically distinct areas that correspond with locations where  
40 random testing of residents occurs.

41 Conclusions: Development of this protocol for population-level sampling for SARS-CoV-2  
42 prevalence in wastewater can be utilized to inform consistent wastewater monitoring among  
43 cities for up-to-date and geographically-resolved information on COVID-19 prevalence within  
44 communities. This information could substantially supplement public health surveillance of

45 COVID-19 and thus serve to better guide targeted mitigation strategies throughout the United  
46 States.

47

48 Keywords: COVID-19; environmental surveillance; epidemiology; GIS; SARS-CoV-2; wastewater

49

## 50 **Background**

51

52 Wastewater monitoring can complement clinical surveillance for global virus infections when  
53 fecal shedding has been established for the viral strain (Bisseux et al., 2019). For example, the  
54 application of wastewater epidemiology has been used for wide-range monitoring including  
55 illicit drug use, poliomyelitis, Hepatitis E, Human Immunodeficiency Virus, adenoviruses, and  
56 coronavirus for low-cost, real-time estimates, and retrospective monitoring (Bibby and Peccia  
57 2013; Masclaux et al., 2013; Castiglioni et al., 2014; Pogka et al., 2017). Currently, COVID-19  
58 clinical diagnostic testing is largely focused on symptomatic individuals; however, this  
59 underrepresents prevalence (Moghadas et al., 2020), and limiting detection to symptomatic  
60 individuals makes it difficult to reconstruct clusters of infection in a timely fashion through the  
61 aggregation of clinical and occupational diagnostic testing.

62

63 Fecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2 has been documented in patients diagnosed with COVID-  
64 19 (Wölfel et al, 2020). It is unsurprising, then, that SARS-CoV-2 is detectable in sewer systems,  
65 which could be an important early indicator of COVID-19 in communities (Ahmed et al., 2020a;  
66 Bivins et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020; Peccia et al, 2020; Randazzo et al., 2020). However,  
67 interpretation of the signal, beyond presence/absence, of copies of SARS-CoV-2 RNA,  
68 independent of the direct sampling of known COVID-19 patients that contribute to that waste  
69 stream, continues to challenge broad application. Whereas a close relationship between stool  
70 and wastewater samples has been reported for poliomyelitis (Pogka et al., 2017), this is less  
71 well-established for SARS-CoV-2 (Kitajima et al., 2020; Wölfel et al., 2020). Because viral RNA

72 monitoring of wastewater is done passively and anonymously, it may be an important option  
73 for community-level monitoring with the added benefit that it includes pre-  
74 symptomatic/asymptomatic individuals, underserved populations with less access to testing  
75 resources, and others who experience other barriers to clinical testing (Bivins et al., 2020).  
76 Moreover, wastewater sampling may also provide geographic location of infection clusters  
77 (“hot spots”) that are much more difficult to detect with conventional in-person  
78 measurements.

79  
80 Wastewater monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 is available to complement community clinical  
81 diagnostic surveillance for infections at three units of analysis: 1) for an entire community at an  
82 established centralized wastewater facility; 2) for neighborhoods, within communities at sewer  
83 line manholes or pump stations; and 3) for congregate living facilities (e.g. ships, buildings) at  
84 effluent access points. Much of the published literature on the monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 in  
85 wastewater addresses samples collected at treatment facilities (Ahmed et al., 2020; Medema et  
86 al., 2020). Bisseux et al. (2019) report the usefulness of combining raw wastewater sampling  
87 with clinical encounters in an urban area. From an epidemiological perspective, sampling  
88 derived from hundreds of thousands of households may produce useful aggregate infection  
89 prevalence information and may provide advance early warning about impending clinical  
90 facilities’ burden or the need for adjusting broad social restrictions. However, this approach  
91 does not address the possibility that important changes in infection dynamics in component  
92 areas of the community could trigger spatially-focused attention; examples could include public

93 health intervention measures such as ad hoc “pop up” community testing or development of  
94 place- and culture-specific health communications and public service announcements.

95  
96 To the best of our knowledge, there is no published methodological framework for  
97 sample site selection to maximize the surveillance and response value of SARS-CoV-2  
98 wastewater testing within communities. Hence, we propose a pragmatic location-based  
99 method for selection of raw wastewater sample site locations, where wastewater testing  
100 results are representative of geographically-resolved community prevalence of SARS-CoV-2  
101 infection. Such an approach could serve to inform public health officials and decision-makers on  
102 the comparative prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection within communities as well as inform  
103 proactive place-specific public health interventions.

104  
105 Moving from central treatment facilities to neighborhood sewer lines introduces factors  
106 that preclude comparisons across sites. For example, sewer systems are not always accurately  
107 mapped, and sewer lines, in addition to household wastewater, may contain combined  
108 commercial, industrial, and often rain water, which complicates the consistent and comparable  
109 sampling of excreta due to inconsistent dilution of household waste. Furthermore, these lines  
110 often have complex technical and geographic characteristics from ad hoc expansion due to  
111 growing populations. Therefore, a key barrier to developing epidemiologically-comparable and  
112 geographically-resolved monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater is the lack of established  
113 methods for sample site selection specifically designed for community-wide disease  
114 surveillance.

115

116           Based on sanitary sewer system design and function, a survey of sub-population viral  
117 load in wastewater involves raw samples taken directly from locations along sewer lines  
118 transporting water from geographically distinct areas. These raw wastewater sites are closer to  
119 individual sewer users and thus have a higher specificity than sludge and wastewater samples  
120 collected from treatment facilities, which degrade more over a longer travel time (GPEI, 2015).  
121 Shorter travel times have been recommended for SARS-CoV-2 samples (Hart and Halden, 2020).

122

123           Sampling of centralized treatment facilities is traditionally completed as part of  
124 environmental regulatory compliance monitoring of the effluent, prior to release to a  
125 waterway. At centralized treatment facilities, cycle times present an upper limit to how many  
126 individuals might possibly contribute to settled combined solids. For most urban treatment  
127 plants, solids will turn over every 24 hours. Gaining certainty regarding the temporal  
128 representativeness of the sample is a critical parameter. One conventional approach is to  
129 establish a pooled or composite sample, which is typically achieved by using an automated  
130 sampling device that takes regularly timed grabbed samples which are combined over 24 hours  
131 or some other interval. For example, the recommendation for wastewater monitoring of  
132 poliomyelitis is a single composite 24-h sample, taken weekly for one to three years (GPEI,  
133 2015). The temporal dynamics of sampling frequency directly relate to the clinical actionability  
134 of the data obtained, as low frequency of aliquots will have low specificity to actual  
135 concentrations. For COVID-19, necessary frequency has yet to be empirically established for

136 neighborhood scale surveillance. Given the likely variations in residential outflow, dilution, and  
137 mixing rate, frequent aliquots will be necessary for a representative 24-hour sample.

138

139 We developed the method we describe here in conjunction with a larger community  
140 COVID-19 prevalence assessment research project conducted in Jefferson County, KY (the Co-  
141 Immunity Project). The method supports SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in wastewater for community  
142 monitoring. Our main objective is to describe the establishment of geographically-resolved  
143 urban community surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater. Our secondary aims are to: 1)  
144 identify wastewater field sampling techniques and limitations present in field conditions typical  
145 of urban settings which may require modified sampling site locations; and 2) describe scenarios  
146 for use of data from wastewater to inform public health interventions.

147

148

## 149 **Methods**

150

151 As a component of a longitudinal COVID-19 community prevalence study in Jefferson County,  
152 KY, USA, (the Co-Immunity Project) at the University of Louisville, we additionally analyzed  
153 wastewater for prevalence of SARS-CoV-2. With a population of approximately 770,000,  
154 covering 380 square miles, Jefferson County is physically and demographically representative of  
155 many urban areas across the United States. There are five Water Quality Treatment Centers  
156 (WQTC) operated by Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD), each  
157 treating wastewater from an average of 3.5 to 350 million gallons per day. We based our  
158 selection of sample media on the sanitary sewer system design and absence of WQTCs for  
159 sampling of sludge with consistent geographic resolution of areas with fewer than 100,000  
160 residents. Though the WQTCs are fixed, we have continuously added and removed sampling  
161 sites to refine our sampling approach during the pilot. Based on this approach and field  
162 sampling limitations (Figure 1), we selected a total 15 sample sites: 10 community sites  
163 collecting from manholes and pump stations and five WQTCs (Figure 2).

164

## 165 **Data**

166 We collected existing sewer data in Geographic Information Systems (GIS) format from the  
167 MSD, allowing for rapid design and deployment of this protocol. These data included  
168 information on the location and attributes of all sewer lines and access points within the city.  
169 Citywide socioeconomic data was collected from the U.S. Census Bureau, including information  
170 on the distribution of income, race, ethnicity, and population distribution characteristics.

171

172 Sample size justification

173 In Jefferson County, sludge samples would not allow a geographically-resolved understanding  
174 of SARS-CoV-2 infection rates and would be limited to monitoring the five WQTCs in the city.  
175 The recommendation for wastewater poliomyelitis monitoring is a sample population of  
176 100,000 to 300,000 persons (GPEI, 2015); however, our project required sample sensitivity to  
177 be directly comparable with our concurrent nasal diagnostic clinical study, justifying a smaller  
178 sample population at urban section or neighborhood resolution related to zip code populations  
179 with raw wastewater. Based on the specific design of sewer lines in Jefferson County, there was  
180 a steep decline in informative value of additional sites beyond these 15 locations.

181

182 Ethics

183 For wastewater surveillance, we over-selected geographic areas that are typically  
184 underrepresented in clinical testing. These are often low-income and communities of color. The  
185 research team has discussed this new approach to SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in community  
186 meetings and in local media interviews, and it typically is met with supportive interest.  
187 Wastewater samples cannot be used to identify individuals and are considered “community  
188 samples” by the sewer district; thus the sampling is not subject to institutional review for  
189 human studies.

190

191 Rationale for choosing sampling locations and field sampling limitations

192 • Inclusion criteria:

- 193                   •       Residential coverage with water toilets serviced by the municipal sanitary
- 194                               sewer system
- 195                   •       Locations overlapping recruitment areas for randomized resident testing
- 196                               of the corresponding prevalence study
- 197                   •       Anonymized SARS-CoV-2 concentration data in wastewater with a
- 198                               minimum population of 5,000
- 199                   •       Accessibility to sewer lines with free-flowing wastewater (street lines,
- 200                               pumping stations, and main treatment facilities)
- 201                   •       Contextual information (flow rate, temperature)
- 202                   •       Feasibility with field human resources
- 203                   •       For manhole locations, free-flowing wastewater at no more than 25 feet
- 204                               below the street level due to sampler equipment limitations
- 205                   •       Exclusion criteria:
- 206                               •       Downstream of a majority commercial and industrial sewer outflow
- 207                               industrial or hospital sites, even if surrounded by residential households
- 208                   •       Water toilets not connected to the municipal sanitary sewer system, such
- 209                               as areas where septic tanks are in use
- 210                   •       Any sites not practical for field sampling, such as the area around a
- 211                               manhole not offering enough space or safety for field personnel or traffic
- 212                               safety issues
- 213                   •       High temperature wastewater
- 214                   •       Specific additions:

- 215 • Each WQTC
- 216 • Higher sampling in northwestern portion of the city to ensure inclusion of
- 217 residents with disproportionate health risk

218

#### 219 Site selection

220 We identified ideal sample sites using a stepwise approach (Figure 1). Predominately residential

221 areas were prioritized over large commercial areas due to predictable outflows from residential

222 locations and the ability to precisely quantify area population and demographics with census

223 and property data. We based demographic estimates on 2018 American Community Survey

224 (ACS) block group data and aggregated to the sewersheds with overlapping block group

225 centroids. In some cases, a large main sewer line was not accessible in areas with smaller

226 feeder lines. Consequently, we moved sample sites upstream or sampled before two larger

227 sewer lines joined. This was justified since, if sites were moved downstream, they would have

228 overlapped zones that could not be geographically isolated. We then sent sample site

229 recommendations to MSD, which reviewed these recommendations for site-specific

230 practicality. Some practical obstacles included manholes that were not easily accessible for the

231 sampling team (requiring 4-wheel drive vehicles) and manholes that were located along high

232 traffic roadways. Contribution of hospitals or other facilities with high disinfectant effluent

233 were minimized via our sampling approach.

234

235 We sampled each treatment facility in the county (green points in Figure 2), giving

236 nearly 100% community coverage. The two major treatment facilities (Site ID 1 and 2) are

237 downstream from some of the neighborhood sampling zones but also include neighborhood  
238 lines which were not included in community sampling catchment areas. This circumstance  
239 provides future opportunity to validate virus detection from feeder lines that are sampled and  
240 also infer signals from lines that were not sampled in some neighborhoods.


241

242         After our initial site selection, we performed an initial round of sampling. Upon field  
243 observations, we excluded one site due to higher than expected industrial outflow visually  
244 observed within the sample. Additionally, this sample was at an elevated temperature due to  
245 high temperature industrial discharges into the sewer system. Elevated temperatures have  
246 been reported to make wastewater samples vulnerable to over or under estimation due to  
247 possible degradation over time (Hart and Halden, 2020; Kitajima et al., 2020).

248

249         Specific accommodations for sample sites were also made based on field sampling  
250 logistics determined by MSD's occupational safety standards for field activities. The rationale  
251 for choosing the number of sampling sites was also constrained by MSD staff availability, which  
252 in this case was two field teams who each required a full day to collect six to eight sample sites.  
253 Additionally, the work needed to be completed in time to prepare the samples for delivery and  
254 processing in the University of Louisville laboratory.

255




256

257

258 Figure 1. Flow chart representing the protocol for selection of monitoring sites for SARS-CoV-2

259 in wastewater

260



261  
262 Figure 2. Location of wastewater sampling sites and corresponding catchment areas in Jefferson  
263 County, Kentucky

264

265

266 Table 1. Demographics of study sampling site catchment areas in Jefferson County, Kentucky<sup>a</sup>

ID	Household income (USD\$) (mean within catchment areas of reported block group median values)	Population	Race and Hispanic Origin		
			White (%)	Black (%)	Hispanic (%)
1	53,891	641,410	70	23	6
2	53,577	295,910	72	21	7
3	76,606	55,928	82	12	4
4	113,699	32,460	87	8	3
5	106,769	31,269	75	14	4
6	27,695	10,739	9	88	1
7	27,446	7,820	68	26	3
8	25,365	25,836	51	43	4
9	45,895	35,956	59	37	4
10	51,656	25,073	83	12	5
11	77,842	99,061	87	7	4
12	68,259	139,251	79	13	5
13	53,542	73,666	63	28	9
14	61,837	46,659	75	18	8
15	63,642	22,437	80	13	5

267

268 <sup>a</sup> Based on 2018 U.S Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS)

269  
270 Wastewater Sample Collection, Transport, Preservation, and Storage  
271 Monitoring data include 24-h composite sample wastewater samples for SARS-CoV-2 analysis  
272 collected at least once per week. All samples are considered raw wastewater. We contracted  
273 with MSD for access and sample extraction at sample sites. Sampling personnel from MSD set-  
274 up a portable automated composite autosampler (60-2954-001 Model GLS Sampler) the day  
275 prior to sampling. The sampler collects 30 ml into a 4L plastic container every 15 min. Ice was  
276 placed in the space between the cover and the collection jar as part of setting up the sampler.  
277 Transit time between different sites were less than 1 h to minimize differences that may lead to  
278 artifactual differences in virus count measurements, and the 15 samples were mostly collected  
279 within 5 h. This sampling approach minimizes variation in estimates of virus prevalence due to  
280 temperature fluctuations, even though viral degradation may vary because of temperature.  
281 Furthermore, population demographics will not change since we, consistently over time, collect  
282 samples from areas of known demographic characteristics.

283  
284 In a large-scale field sampling program, an exact 24-h composite sample is difficult, but  
285 Schwartzbrod et al. (1985) suggest a 15-h minimum composite sample for evaluation of viral  
286 populations in wastewater. The time should be next day, as close to a full 24-h as possible. The  
287 next day, the sampling container was accessed. In some cases, it was located below a manhole  
288 and suspended with rope or on the ground adjacent to a sampling site. The sample was stirred  
289 by hand and a portable pump was subsequently used to fill two sample containers (one 500 ml  
290 and one 150 ml). Sampling personnel from MSD wore standard personal protective equipment

291 (PPE) for wastewater sampling, including Tyvek coveralls, boots, hard hats, face shields, and  
292 gloves. After sampling, the portable pump and tubing were rinsed with bleach water and  
293 double rinsed with deionized water.

294

295 Although composite samples are preferred, evidence during our piloting found that grab  
296 samples would be required in instances of battery malfunction of the composite sampler or the  
297 composite sampler tubing being clogged by solid waste. To collect a grab sample, a sampling  
298 cup on a rope was used. Though grab sample data is still important, it was flagged for analysis  
299 and use in any final decision-making, due its incomplete representation of SARS-CoV-2  
300 prevalence. Additionally, we used both 10L and 4L composite sample collection containers  
301 during the pilot The 4L containers were preferable to allow more volume of ice in the space  
302 between the cover and the collection jar. Additionally, our preferred set-up had the composite  
303 sampler placed securely at street/ground level, but in several neighborhood sample locations,  
304 for safety and security reasons, the composite sampler was lowered into the manhole and  
305 suspended. In that circumstance, the 4L sample collection container is preferable to reduce the  
306 weight of the sample that is manually raised to ground level.

307

308 Samples were transported on ice packs to the University of Louisville laboratory. One  
309 sample was stored at -60°C and one sample at 4°C for at least 5 h. The samples were split, with  
310 half retained for subsequent analysis at University of Louisville and the other half delivered to  
311 our academic lab for analysis. Samples were archived at least at -60°C for later analyses as  
312 needed (Dolfing, 2020). The further processing of these samples follows RNA extraction and

313 detection using methods that are nearly identical to the methods applied to nasal swab  
314 samples. For a review of these see Ahmed et al. (2020c).

315

## 316 **Discussion**

317

318 Here we propose a method to select locations for wastewater sampling for the purpose of  
319 geographically-resolved estimation of community prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection rates.

320 The development of an epidemiologically-sound methodology for COVID-19 surveillance

321 depends upon clear definition of the spatiotemporal properties of monitoring methods and

322 clarity regarding the assumptions about the correspondence between the amount of RNA

323 detected in different sampling configurations and the estimation of infected persons in that

324 service area. In Jefferson County, monitoring the five WQTCs in the city would allow for nearly

325 complete population surveillance, but it would not allow for an understanding of SARS-CoV-2

326 infection rates with high spatial resolution. Hence, we selected additional community-based

327 wastewater sampling sites to allow for additional geographic resolution among WQTC

328 catchment areas, utilizing a pragmatic approach to maximize public health value of our

329 monitoring resources. To date, we are not aware of any other work using a similar methodology

330 at the urban scale. While wastewater cannot be a substitute for clinical testing data, it may be

331 utilized to estimate community-level infection rates, and may lead to new interventions within

332 communities to contain emerging clusters of infection. This can also be done passively at a

333 lower cost and with fewer human resources, making it a more feasible approach than regular

334 widespread individual testing. The findings of this research strengthen the knowledge base to

335 utilize wastewater monitoring in conjunction with clinical surveillance to provide critical insight  
336 to isolating and quantifying community-level SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence and developing  
337 actionable public health responses.

338

339 This study contributes to advancement of knowledge by informing selection of sample  
340 sites for wastewater to correlate with spatial clinical data on infection rates from randomized  
341 testing. An important strength of this sampling approach is the provision of more accurate  
342 estimates of actual community-level SARS-CoV-2 infections, independent of the proportion of  
343 symptomatic individuals, individual testing capacity, healthcare capacity, socioeconomic  
344 capacity, and other substantial biases that skew prevalence estimates based on individual-level  
345 testing. Furthermore, sampling of wastewater closer to residences, as described here, allows  
346 for less time for virus to degrade before sampling, as opposed to centralized facility testing,  
347 thus allowing for more specific prevalence estimates than WQTC samples alone. The results of  
348 this geographically-resolved community testing approach provide a useful and cost-effective  
349 scenario for public health surveillance to inform interventions and countermeasures to allow  
350 geographically-targeted strategies to reduce transmission of SARS-CoV-2.

351

352 There are several limitations to this protocol. The site selection is framed to consider  
353 physical variation in sample state (travel time, sample temperature, flow data, background  
354 chemistry, variation in shedding by infected persons); however, the rapidly evolving  
355 understanding of decay of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater may further refine sample location  
356 selection. In some cases, sewer line access was restricted. The number of sites was not

357 predetermined, but based on spatial resolution of sewer catchment areas and on physical  
358 limitations of the system to select ideal population distributions. Flow data was not included in  
359 the same site selection criteria. In some areas, MSD has a combined sewer and storm water  
360 system, possibly diluting residential sources of SARS-CoV-2 or introducing non-toilet sources of  
361 SARS-CoV-2. However, dilution may largely be accounted for by normalizing to population and  
362 flow rate, as well as biological measurements of fecal dilution markers. Further, while we can  
363 partially account for resulting dilution, it is not possible to fully exclude industrial and  
364 commercial outflow. It should be noted that clinical data from testing the community's  
365 residents potentially includes households not represented in the sanitary sewer system (e.g.,  
366 septic tank users, individuals living in one area but spending the majority of their day in another  
367 area of the city).

368

369 Areas for future exploration include: 1) sensitivity and temporal dynamics to determine  
370 if raw wastewater is a concurrent indicator of SARS-CoV-2 measurement in sludge; 2) sensitivity  
371 and community limits of detection including frequency of sampling or moving sites to  
372 determine community trends; 3) quantification of field samples such as turbidity or a rapid field  
373 proxy for SARS-CoV-2 in sewers; 4) waste travel time in relation to sampling location selections;  
374 5) attributes of physical sewer system infrastructure regarding age of sewage or opportunities  
375 for latent virus in the system; and 6) the need for sewer sampling infrastructure that is  
376 “pandemic ready” and a better fit design for answering human health surveillance instead of  
377 only industrial surveillance.

378

379 **Conclusion**

380

381 Development of this protocol for population-level sampling for SARS-CoV-2 prevalence in  
382 wastewater can be utilized to inform consistent wastewater monitoring among cities for up-to-  
383 date and geographically-resolved information on COVID-19 prevalence within communities.  
384 This information could substantially supplement public health surveillance of COVID-19 and  
385 thus serve to better guide targeted mitigation strategies throughout the United States.

386

387 **Declarations**

388 Ethics approval and consent to participate

389 Not applicable.

390

391 Consent for publication

392 Not applicable.

393

394 Availability of data and materials

395 The data are available upon request. For expression of interest, please contact

396 [ted.smith@louisville.edu](mailto:ted.smith@louisville.edu) (Ted Smith).

397

398 Competing interests

399 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal

400 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

401

402 Funding

403 This work was supported in part by grants from the James Graham Brown Foundation and the

404 Owsley Brown Family Foundation.

405

406 Authors' contributions

407 Conceptualization: R.A.Y, D.T., A.B. and T.S.; Methodology R.A.Y, D.T., A.B. and T.S; Writing-

408 original draft preparation: R.H.H.; Writing- review and editing: R.A.Y, R.H.H., K.S., J.L.F, D.T., A.B.

409 and T.S.; Supervision: A.B. and T.S.; Project administration: T.S. All authors have read and  
410 agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

411

412 Acknowledgements

413 We thank our field and analytical technicians Dwight Mitchell, David Hoetker, Rick Strehl, and

414 Ian Santisteban for their diligent commitment to this work.

415

416 **References**

417

418 Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, et al. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated  
419 wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the  
420 community. *Sci Total Environ.* 2020a;728:138764. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764

421

422 Ahmed W, Bertsch PM, Angel N, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in commercial passenger  
423 aircraft and cruise ship wastewater: a surveillance tool for assessing the presence of COVID-19  
424 infected travelers. *J of Travel Med.* 2020b. doi:10.1093/jtm/taaa116

425

426 Ahmed W, Bertsch PM, Bivins A et al. Comparison of virus concentration methods for the RT-  
427 qPCR-based recovery of murine hepatitis virus, a surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 from untreated  
428 wastewater. *Sci Total Environ.* 2020c;739:139960. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139960

429

430 Bibby K, Peccia J. Identification of viral pathogen diversity in sewage sludge by metagenome  
431 analysis. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2013; 47:1945–1951. doi:10.1021/es305181x

432

433 Bisseux M, Debroas D, Mirand A, et al. Monitoring of enterovirus diversity in wastewater by  
434 ultra-deep sequencing: An effective complementary tool for clinical enterovirus surveillance.  
435 *Water Res.* 2020;169:115246. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2019.115246

436

437 Bivins A, North D, Ahmad A, et al. Wastewater-based epidemiology: Global collaborative to  
438 maximize contributions in the fight against COVID-19. *Sci Total Environ.* 2020;54:7754–7757.  
439 doi:10.1021/acs.est.0c02388

440  
441 Castiglioni S, Thomas KV, Kasprzyk-Hordern B, Vandam L, Griffiths P. Testing wastewater to  
442 detect illicit drugs: State of the art, potential and research needs. *Sci Total Environ.*  
443 2014;487:613–620. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.10.034

444  
445 Dolfing J. The importance of sewage archiving in coronavirus epidemiology and beyond. *Environ*  
446 *Sci & Tech.* 2020;54(13):7740-7741. doi:10.1021/acs.est.0c02972

447  
448 Global Polio Eradication Initiative. Guidelines on environmental surveillance for detection of  
449 polioviruses. Global Polio Eradication Initiative, World Health Organization, Geneva,  
450 Switzerland. Available at: [http://polioeradication.org/wp-](http://polioeradication.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/GPLN_GuidelinesES_April2015.pdf)  
451 [content/uploads/2016/07/GPLN\\_GuidelinesES\\_April2015.pdf](http://polioeradication.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/GPLN_GuidelinesES_April2015.pdf) (accessed 15 July 2020)

452  
453 Hart OE, Halden RU. Computational analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 surveillance by  
454 wastewater-based epidemiology locally and globally: Feasibility, economy, opportunities and  
455 challenges. *Sci Total Environ.* 2020;730:138875. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138875

456  
457 Kitajima M, Ahmed W, Bibby K, et al. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and  
458 research needs. *Sci Total Environ.* 2020;739:139076. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076

459

460 Lodder W, de Roda Husman AM. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: potential health risk, but also data  
461 source. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2020;5(6):533-534. doi:10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30087-X

462

463 Masclaux, FG, Hotz P, Friedli D, Savova-Bianchi D, Oppliger A. High occurrence of hepatitis E  
464 virus in samples from wastewater treatment plants in Switzerland and comparison with other  
465 enteric viruses. *Water Res*. 2013;47:5101-5109. doi: 0.1016/j.watres.2013.05.050

466

467 Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA  
468 in sewage and correlation with reported COVID-19 prevalence in the early stage of the  
469 epidemic in The Netherlands. *Environ. Sci. Technol*. 2020;7(7):511-516.  
470 doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357

471

472 Moghadas SM, Fitzpatrick MC, Pandey A, Shoukat A, Singer BH, Galvani AP. The implications of  
473 silent transmission for the control of COVID-19 outbreaks. *PNAS*. 2020.  
474 doi:10.1073/pnas.2008373117

475

476 Peccia J, Zulli A, Brackney DE, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in primary municipal  
477 sewage sludge as a leading indicator of COVID-19 outbreak dynamics. *medRxiv* 2020.  
478 doi:10.1101/2020.05.19.20105999

479

480 Pogka V, Labropoulou S, Emmanouil M, et al. Laboratory surveillance of polio and other  
481 enteroviruses in high-risk populations and environmental samples. *Appl Environ Microbiol.*  
482 2017;83(5):e02872-16. doi:10.1128/AEM.02872-16

483  
484 Randazzo W, Truchado P, Cuevas-Ferrando E, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated  
485 COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. *Water Res.* 2020;181:115942.  
486 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.115942

487  
488 Schwartzbrod L, Vilaginès Ph, Schwartzbrod J, et al. Evaluation of the viral population in two  
489 wastewater treatment plants: Study of different sampling techniques. *Water Res.*  
490 1985;19(11):1353-1356.

491  
492 Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with  
493 COVID-2019. *Nature.* 2020;581(7809):465-469. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x

494  
495 U.S. Department of Commerce <https://www.census.gov/> (accessed 25 June 2020)