

1 **Research Paper**

2 **Running Title:** Environmental monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 in food production facilities

3

4

5 **Title:** Environmental monitoring shows SARS-CoV-2 contamination of surfaces in food plants

6

7 **Authors:** Ziwen Ming¹, Sukkyun Han¹, Kai Deng¹, Youngsil Ha¹, SungSoo Kim¹, Enrique

8 Reyes¹, Yu Zhao¹, Anatoly Dobritsa¹, Meiting Wu¹, Dandan Zhang¹, David P Cox¹, Emma

9 Joyner¹, Hemantha Kulasekara¹, Seong Hong Kim¹, Yong Seog Jang¹, Curtis Fowler¹, Xing

10 Fei¹, Hikari Akasaki¹, Eni Themeli¹, Alexander Agapov¹, Dylan Bruneau¹, Thao Tran¹, Cameron

11 Szczesny¹, Casey Kienzle¹, Kristina Tenney¹, Hao Geng¹, Mansour Samadpour^{1*}

12

13

14 *Author for correspondence, Tel: 206-522-5432, FAX: 206-306-8883, email: ms@iehinc.com

15 ¹ Institute for Environmental Health, 15300 Bothell Way NE, Lake Forest Park, WA 98155, USA

16

17 **Keywords:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Food manufacturing, Environmental monitoring, RT-PCR,

18 Pandemic

19

20 **ABSTRACT**

21

22 The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has presented new challenges to food manufacturers. In addition
23 to preventing the spread of microbial contamination of food, with SARS-CoV-2, there is an
24 additional focus on preventing SARS-CoV-2 infections in food plant personnel. During the early
25 phase of the pandemic, several large outbreaks of Covid-19 occurred in food manufacturing
26 plants resulting in deaths and economic loss. In March of 2020, we assisted in implementation
27 of environmental monitoring programs for SARS-CoV-2 in 116 food production facilities. All
28 participating facilities had already implemented measures to prevent symptomatic personnel
29 from coming to work. During the study period, from March 17, 2020 to September 3, 2020,
30 1.23% of the 22,643 environmental samples tested positive for SARS-CoV-2, suggesting that
31 infected individuals are actively shedding virus. Virus contamination was commonly found on
32 frequently touched surfaces. Most plants managed to control their environmental contamination
33 when they became aware of the positive findings. Comparisons of the personnel test results to
34 environmental contamination in one plant showed a good correlation between the two. Our work
35 illustrates that environmental monitoring for SARS-CoV-2 can be used as a surrogate for
36 identifying the presence of asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic personnel in workplaces and
37 may aid in controlling infection spread.

38

39 **Highlights**
40

- 41 • Environmental contamination by SARS-CoV-2 virus was detected in food plants
- 42 • Out of 22,643 environmental swabs, 278 (1.23%) were positive for SARS-CoV-2
- 43 • Frequently touched surfaces had the most contamination
- 44 • Surface testing for SARS-CoV-2 may indicate presence of asymptomatic carriers

45 Introduction

46

47 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), a highly infectious
48 novel coronavirus, which originated from a food market in Wuhan, China, in December 2019,
49 has caused a global pandemic (3). As of November 1st, 2020, there have been nearly 46 million
50 confirmed cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), with 1.2 million deaths globally (12).

51

52 The transmission of COVID-19 is facilitated mainly through direct personal contact and
53 respiratory droplets (1). Additionally, contaminated surfaces were also reported as another
54 mode of transmission (5, 6). SARS-CoV-2 remains viable on surfaces for days (9). The virus is
55 reported to be stable on surfaces such as metal, glass and plastic for up to 9 days (4). Surface
56 disinfection with 62-71% ethanol, 0.5% hydrogen peroxide or 0.1% sodium hypochlorite can
57 efficiently inactivate the virus within 1 minute (4).

58

59 During the early phase of the pandemic, high SARS-CoV-2 positive rates among
60 environmental surfaces were associated with a large number of COVID-19 cases in places such
61 as hospitals and living spaces (13). At one hospital in Italy, air and surfaces had the most
62 positives within the areas designated for patients (7). In a study of 112 surface samples taken
63 from the living quarters of 13 laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases, Wei et al. (11) found that
64 44 (39.3%) of the samples were positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Research on built environments
65 emphasized the importance of proper disinfection of toilet areas, sanitization of surfaces, open
66 space, and window ventilation which can effectively limit the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 (6)

67

68 According to the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, USA (CDC), of the
69 130,578 people employed in the food industry who were tested for COVID-19 in April, 3% tested

70 positive (2). In a more comprehensive analysis, the CDC analyzed Covid-19 infections in the
71 food industry in 30 states spanning a period from March to May of 2020. Results showed that
72 some food plants had infection rates as high as 43%. Most workers who were Covid-19 positive
73 were ethnic minorities (83.2%). The asymptomatic rate was about 15%, indicating that
74 screening for Covid-19 symptoms alone is not adequate to combat infection spread (10).
75 Although it is highly likely that airborne transmission substantially contributed to observed
76 infection outcomes in the CDC study, transmission could have additionally occurred through
77 SARS-CoV-2 contaminated surfaces (8). However, the extent of virus contamination in the food
78 industry has not been reported yet. Here we present the analysis of 22,643 surface samples
79 from food processing facilities in the USA, tested for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Such
80 data can help food manufacturing plants to evaluate their decontamination protocols and can be
81 used as a surveillance method for detecting viral shedding from asymptomatic/presymptomatic
82 infections among workers.

83

84 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

85

86 **Environmental Sampling.** IEH SARS-CoV-2 Surface Swab Kits (P/N: PS-S02;
87 Microbiologique Inc., Lake City Way NE, WA) were used for sampling environmental surfaces.
88 Sampling was performed according to the manufacturer's instruction by plant personnel. The
89 sampling buffer impregnated swab was applied to designated areas, which were thoroughly
90 swabbed before the swab was transferred to a transport vial containing viral transport medium
91 (VTM). The vials were packed, labeled, and shipped to Molecular Epidemiology Inc. (Lake
92 Forest Park, WA, USA) for testing.

93

94 **RNA Extraction.** Total nucleic acids were extracted and purified from environmental
95 swabs using the IEH Nucleic Acid Extraction Reagent Kit (P/N: PM-23; Microbiologique Inc.,
96 Seattle, WA, USA) in an automated KingFisher-96 (Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc., Waltham, MA,
97 USA) nucleic acid purification system. MS2–RPP, an engineered MS2 phage particle
98 encapsulating an RNA fragment from the human ribonuclease P gene (RNase P), served as the
99 extraction control for RNA extraction and was processed with every set of samples.

100

101 **RT-PCR.** The IEH SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Test kit (P/N: PM-22; Microbiologique, Seattle,
102 WA, USA) was used for the detection of RNA from SARS-CoV-2 in environmental samples. This
103 test kit was derived from the SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic test “*CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-*
104 *nCoV) RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel*”, developed by the CDC. This kit contains N1, N2 and RPP
105 primer/probe sets to detect the viral nucleocapsid gene and the human RNase P RNA (internal
106 control).

107

108 **Clinical specimen analysis.** Clinical specimens from Establishment E were processed
109 at the CLIA certified laboratory of Molecular Epidemiology Inc. (Lake Forest Park, WA, USA)
110 using the same RNA extraction method and the RT-PCR method and using N1/RPP and N2
111 primers/probes.

112

113 **Data analysis.** The cycle threshold (Ct) values from the RT-PCR results were used as
114 indicators of the copy number of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in environmental samples with lower cycle
115 threshold values corresponding to higher viral copy numbers. Descriptive statistical analyses
116 were performed for both environmental data and clinical data by using SigmaPlot 14.0 (Systat
117 Software, Inc).

118

119 RESULTS

120

121 A total of 22,643 environmental samples with source information were received between
122 March 17th, 2020 and September 3rd, 2020 from 116 food manufacturing plants. Of these, 278
123 environmental samples (1.23%) were found to be positive for SARS-CoV-2 during the study
124 period (Table 1). Samples were analyzed by grouping into workplace source and surface types.
125 Workplace sources were divided into three groups: welfare area, working area, and entrance.
126 The welfare area and working areas had swabs that came from distinctly different locations
127 based on usage and were thus subdivided. The welfare area was split into three categories,
128 which were bathrooms, lunchrooms, and locker rooms. The working area comprised of
129 office/conference rooms, training rooms, and receiving rooms. The entrance and other ingress
130 points had the highest occurrence of positive SARS-CoV-2 swabs among tested areas, with a
131 frequency of 1.57% (38/2439) (Table 1). There were 32 out of 2255 (1.42%) positive samples
132 reported in the working area group, with 25/1883 (1.33%) positive from office/conference rooms
133 and 1/265 (0.38%) positive from training rooms. The receiving room showed the highest
134 positivity rate of 5.61% (6/107). An overall total of 1.36% (139/10226) of samples were positive
135 in the welfare area, where bathrooms, lunchrooms, and locker rooms tested positive with
136 percentages of 1.17% (31/2640), 1.33% (70/5260), and 1.63% (38/2326), respectively.

137

138 We also analyzed what surface types were more abundant with the virus (summarized in
139 Table 2). Among the positive samples, 46 (16.55%) had no specified surface information, and
140 93 (33.45%) were found on doorknobs/handles, the surface with the highest positive frequency
141 rate. Other surfaces that frequently tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 included tables/counters
142 (21), computer devices (20), sanitizer-dispensers (17), switches (12), rails (12), chairs/benches
143 (11) and timeclocks (10). There were 36 positive samples found on other surfaces.

144

145 We next analyzed to what extent these 116 food processing plants were affected. Figure
146 2 shows the frequency distribution of the percentage of positive cases for each individual plant.
147 A total of 53% (62/116) of food plants had at least one positive sample through the
148 observational period. The positive rate of individual plants ranged from 0% to 30% with a
149 median level of 0.25%.

150

151 As the time progressed from the early phase of the pandemic in February, almost all
152 food manufacturing companies implemented a variety of safety measures such as vigorous
153 decontamination, mandatory personal protective equipment, symptom screening, and SARS-
154 CoV-2 screening. We therefore undertook a longitudinal observational study of five companies
155 for timeline data analysis to determine the outcomes of SARS-CoV-2 preventive measures
156 (Figure 2). During the study period (March 17th-September 3rd, 2020), 1477, 1577, 912, 867 and
157 433 surface specimens were received from establishments A, B, C, D and E, respectively. A
158 decreasing trend of daily positive rate was observed in establishments A, B and E after reaching
159 peaks on 5/9/2020, 5/19/2020 and 5/7/2020. The other two establishments continued to have
160 sporadic findings of environmental contamination with the virus.

161

162 Establishment E additionally submitted 1248 human nasopharyngeal specimens from
163 plant personnel for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis from May 4th to June 18th, 2020. Our results
164 indicated that 10.90% of human samples were positive for SARS-CoV-2 (Figure 3). This
165 indicated that even with screening for symptomatic individuals and strict environmental
166 decontaminations, asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic individuals presumably contaminated
167 their surroundings with the virus.

168

169 **DISCUSSION**

170

171 The goal of our study was to provide a tool for monitoring the presence of SARS-CoV-2
172 in food production facilities. Environmental monitoring for foodborne pathogens such as *Listeria*
173 and *Salmonella* are routinely conducted in food production facilities to document the sanitary
174 conditions under which food is produced. The environmental monitoring results provide a
175 constant feedback to the sanitation and food safety teams, based on which they can take
176 corrective actions. The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has presented a new challenge to food
177 manufacturers. While food production is focused on preventing the spread of microbial
178 contamination of foods, with SARS-CoV-2, there is an additional focus on operating while
179 protecting personnel from the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Early on, consensus were developed around
180 using personal protective equipment (face masks, face shields, gloves, plastic and Plexiglas
181 barriers), health monitoring of the personnel, reducing density in otherwise crowded areas,
182 frequent sanitation of surfaces, closing down or reducing the capacity in break rooms, contact
183 tracing, quarantine of exposed personnel, and testing.

184

185 Currently there is not much information available about the level of work-place
186 contamination due to asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic COVID-19 infections. In March of
187 2020 we assisted in implementation of environmental monitoring programs for SARS-CoV-2 in
188 several food production facilities. All facilities had implemented measures to prevent
189 symptomatic/pre-symptomatic personnel from coming to work. During the study period 278 of
190 the 22,643 samples (1.23%) tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. 62 of the 116 food production
191 facilities had at least one positive sample for SARS-CoV-2. Among the production facilities the
192 rate of positive samples ranged from 0-30%.

193

194 The data (Table 1 and 2) clearly show that all frequently touched areas can be expected
195 to have contamination. Door knobs/handles had the highest rate of contamination (33.5%),
196 followed by computers, desks/tables, sanitizer dispensers, hand rails, switches, chairs/benches,
197 and timeclocks. Figure 2 shows the course of contamination in five plants over the study period.
198 As environmental contamination with SARS-CoV-2 is a reflection of the infection among
199 personnel, it is to be expected that contamination would be detected sporadically over time. In
200 establishments A and B contamination was detected early on, and all subsequent samples were
201 negative for SARS-CoV-2 virus. While in the other establishments the viral contamination
202 appears and disappears over time. Although a positive SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test of an
203 environmental sample does not necessarily mean that the sampling site is contaminated with
204 infectious viral particles, it is a clear indication of active shedding of the virus by infected
205 individuals. SARS-CoV-2 contamination occurred even with decontamination protocols
206 implemented in place, indicating that they were inadequate. During the course of this study, our
207 findings enabled all participating production facilities to fine-tune their COVID safety protocols
208 and helped them make decisions regarding personnel testing.

209
210 In Establishment E where we performed environmental testing, initial high positive rates
211 (~40%) prompted testing of personnel. Comparisons of the human and environmental samples
212 taken in the same facility at the same time showed that 10.90% of human and 8.54% of the
213 environmental samples were positive for the virus. This shows that in the absence of personnel
214 testing, environmental testing for SARS-CoV-2 could indicate active human infections.

215
216 Our results clearly show that monitoring for the SARS-CoV-19 in work places can be a
217 valuable tool in the control of the spread of SARS-CoV-2 virus. The limitation of the study is that
218 we were not able to determine the role of the environmental contamination in the spread of the

219 infection. This is because RT-PCR test cannot differentiate between infectious and non-
220 infectious virus.

221

222 Potential conflict of interests. None.

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231 **REFERENCE**

232

233 1. Chan, J. F.-W., S. Yuan, K.-H. Kok, K. K.-W. To, H. Chu, J. Yang, F. Xing, J. Liu, C. C.-Y.

234 Yip, and R. W.-S. Poon. 2020. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019

235 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. *The*

236 *Lancet*. Elsevier 395:514–523.

237 2. Dyal, J. W. 2020. COVID-19 Among Workers in Meat and Poultry Processing

238 Facilities—19 States, April 2020. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* 69.

239 3. Guan, W., Z. Ni, Y. Hu, W. Liang, C. Ou, J. He, L. Liu, H. Shan, C. Lei, and D. S. Hui.

240 2020. Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 in China. *N. Engl. J. Med.* Mass

241 Medical Soc 382:1708–1720.

242 4. Kampf, G., D. Todt, S. Pfaender, and E. Steinmann. 2020. Persistence of coronaviruses on

243 inanimate surfaces and their inactivation with biocidal agents. *J. Hosp. Infect.* Elsevier

244 104:246–251.

245 5. Otter, J., C. Donskey, S. Yezli, S. Douthwaite, Sd. Goldenberg, and D. Weber. 2016.

246 Transmission of SARS and MERS coronaviruses and influenza virus in healthcare

247 settings: the possible role of dry surface contamination. *J. Hosp. Infect.* Elsevier 92:235–

248 250.

249 6. Otter, J. A., S. Yezli, J. A. Salkeld, and G. L. French. 2013. Evidence that contaminated

250 surfaces contribute to the transmission of hospital pathogens and an overview of strategies

251 to address contaminated surfaces in hospital settings. *Am. J. Infect. Control.* Elsevier

252 41:S6–S11.

253 7. Razzini, K., M. Castrica, L. Menchetti, L. Maggi, L. Negroni, N. V. Orfeo, A. Pizzoccheri, M.

254 Stocco, S. Muttini, and C. M. Balzaretta. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in the air and

- 255 on surfaces in the COVID-19 ward of a hospital in Milan, Italy. *Sci. Total Environ.* Elsevier
256 140540.
- 257 8. Rizou, M., I. M. Galanakis, T. M. Aldawoud, and C. M. Galanakis. 2020. Safety of foods,
258 food supply chain and environment within the COVID-19 pandemic. *Trends Food Sci.*
259 *Technol.* Elsevier.
- 260 9. Van Doremalen, N., T. Bushmaker, D. H. Morris, M. G. Holbrook, A. Gamble, B. N.
261 Williamson, A. Tamin, J. L. Harcourt, N. J. Thornburg, and S. I. Gerber. 2020. Aerosol and
262 surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 as compared with SARS-CoV-1. *N. Engl. J. Med.* Mass
263 Medical Soc 382:1564–1567.
- 264 10. Waltenburg, M. A., C. E. Rose, T. Victoroff, M. Butterfield, J. A. Dillaha, A. Heinzerling, M.
265 Chuey, M. Fierro, R. H. Jervis, and K. M. Fedak. 2020. Coronavirus Disease among
266 Workers in Food Processing, Food Manufacturing, and Agriculture Workplaces. *Emerg.*
267 *Infect. Dis.* 27.
- 268 11. Wei, L., J. Lin, X. Duan, W. Huang, X. Lu, J. Zhou, and Z. Zong. 2020. Asymptomatic
269 COVID-19 patients can contaminate their surroundings: an environment sampling study.
270 *Msphere.* Am Soc Microbiol 5.
- 271 12. World Health Organization. 2020. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): weekly
272 epidemiological update. World Health Organization.
- 273 13. Ye, G., H. Lin, L. Chen, S. Wang, Z. Zeng, W. Wang, S. Zhang, T. Rebmann, Y. Li, and Z.
274 Pan. 2020. Environmental contamination of SARS-CoV-2 in healthcare premises. *J. Infect.*
275 Elsevier.
276

277 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

278

279 Figure 1. Histogram of percentage of positive cases for each individual plant (n=116). The upper
280 bounds of each interval ranges are inclusive while lower bounds are excluded. 0% has no
281 interval range but only containing one value.

282

283 Figure 2. Positive environmental samples in five food establishments during the study period
284 (Daily positive rate = number of daily positive samples / number of daily total samples ×100%).

285

286 Figure 3. Daily Positive rate of Clinical samples vs. Environmental samples from Establishment
287 E from April 30 to July 18, 2020.

288 Table 1. Results summary of environmental testing for SARS-CoV-2, in different work areas in
289 food plants.

Sites	Positive tests	Total tests	Percent Positive (%)
Welfare Area			
Bathroom	31	2640	1.17
Lunchroom	70	5260	1.33
Locker room	38	2326	1.63
Subtotal	139	10226 ^a	1.36
Working area			
Office/conference	25	1883	1.33
Receiving	6	107	5.61
Training	1	265	0.38
Subtotal	32	2255 ^a	1.42
Building Entrance/Hall	38	2439	1.56
Not-specified ^b	69	7723	0.89
Total	278	22643	1.23

290 ^a Total number of tests done for each area group.

291 ^b Results from surface samples in which area information was lacking.

292

293

294

295 Table 2. Results summary for environmental testing for SARS-CoV-2 in different surface areas.

Surface	Area ^a	Total Positive Samples (n=278)	Percent Positive (%)
Computer devices		20	7.19
	Office	20	
Chair/bench		11	3.96
	breakroom	1	
	Locker Room	7	
	Not-specified ^b	3	
Sanitizer Dispensers		17	6.12
	bathroom	2	
	breakroom	6	
	Entrance/hallway	2	
	Locker Room	4	
	Not-specified	3	
Door knob/ handles ^c		93	33.45
	bathroom	19	
	breakroom	15	
	Entrance/hallway	18	
	Locker Room	8	
	Office	5	
	Not-specified	28	
Rail		12	4.32
	breakroom	1	

	Entrance/hallway	3	
	Not-specified	8	
Switch		12	4.32
	bathroom	3	
	breakroom	3	
	Locker Room	1	
	Office	1	
	Not-specified	4	
Table/Counter		21	7.55
	breakroom	13	
	Locker Room	1	
	Office	2	
	Not-specified	5	
Timeclock		10	3.6
	Entrance/hallway	3	
	Not-specified	7	
Others^d		36	12.95
Not-specified^e		46	16.55

296 ^a Work areas belonging to specific surface types.


297 ^b Results from surface samples in which area information was lacking

298 ^c Including doorknobs, door pushbars, handles of devices such as microwave, refrigerator, faucet
299 and etc.

300 ^d Number of positive test persurface that is less than ten were combined in this group.


301 ^e Surface is not indicated by customers, only area information is provided.

302 **Figure 1**



303


304 **Figure 1.** Histogram of percentage of positive cases for each individual plant (n=116). The
305 upper bounds of each interval ranges are inclusive while lower bounds are excluded. 0% has no
306 interval range but only containing one value.



307

308 **Figure 2.** Positive environmental samples in five food establishments during the study period

309 (Daily positive rate = number of daily positive samples / number of daily total samples × 100%).



310

311 **Figure 3.** Daily Positive rate of Clinical samples vs. Environmental samples of Establishment E

312 from April 30 to July 18, 2020.