

Two-Year Evaluation of *Legionella* in an Aging Residential Building: Assessment of Multiple Potable Water Remediation Approaches

*Monica Lee-Masi^a, Caroline Coulter^a, Steven J. Chow^a, Benjamin Zaitchik^b, Joseph G. Jacangelo^{a,c}, Natalie G. Exum^a, and Kellogg J. Schwab^{*a}*

^a *Department of Environmental Health & Engineering, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, 21205, Baltimore, Maryland, United States*

^b *Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Johns Hopkins Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, 21218, Baltimore, Maryland, United States*

^c *Stantec, Washington, DC, 20005, United States*

*Email: kschwab1@jhu.edu

KEYWORDS: *Legionella*; drinking water; premise plumbing; building treatment; water management program

1 ABSTRACT. *Legionella* is an opportunistic waterborne pathogen that is difficult to eradicate in
2 colonized drinking water pipes. *Legionella* control is further challenged by aging water
3 infrastructure and lack of evidence-based guidance for building treatment. This study assessed
4 multiple premise water remediation approaches designed to reduce *Legionella pneumophila* (*Lp*)
5 within a residential building located in an aging, urban drinking water system over a two-year
6 period. Samples (n=745) were collected from hot and cold-water lines and quantified via most
7 probable number culture. Building-level treatment approaches included three single heat shocks
8 (HS), three single chemical shocks (CS), and continuous low-level chemical disinfection (CCD)
9 in the potable water system. The building was highly colonized with *Lp* with 71% *Lp* positivity.
10 Single HS had a statistically significant *Lp* reduction one day post treatment but no significant *Lp*
11 reduction one, two, and four weeks post treatment. The first two CS resulted in statistically
12 significant *Lp* reduction at two days and four weeks post treatment, but there was a significant *Lp*
13 increase at four weeks following the third CS. CCD resulted in statistically significant *Lp*
14 reduction ten weeks post treatment implementation. This demonstrates that in a building highly
15 colonized with *Lp*, sustained remediation is best achieved using CCD.

16 SYNOPSIS: Long-term *Legionella* control is difficult to maintain within aging premise
17 plumbing. This study supports continuous low-level building treatment as an effective long-term
18 remediation of a building highly colonized with *Legionella*.

19 INTRODUCTION

20 *Legionella* bacteria, the cause of Legionnaires' Disease, is the leading cause of waterborne
21 disease outbreaks attributed to drinking water in the United States (US).¹ Legionnaires' Disease
22 is a severe form of pneumonia with a 10% case fatality rate in the general population and 25%
23 case fatality rate in health-care settings.² The Centers of Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)
24 reported 10,000 cases of Legionnaires' Disease in 2018, however the actual number of cases is
25 estimated to be ~1.8-2.7-fold higher.^{1,3} While overall waterborne disease outbreaks in
26 community drinking water systems have decreased over past decades due to improved drinking
27 water regulations developed in the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Safe Drinking
28 Water Act, the number of reported Legionnaires' Disease cases has risen 5.5-fold since the year
29 2000.^{1,3} The cause of the increasing incidence is multi-factorial, with the aging drinking water
30 infrastructure (building water systems and engineered water systems) playing a major role.^{4,5}

31 The majority of Legionnaires' Disease outbreaks have been reported from buildings with
32 complex plumbing systems, with infection occurring via inhalation of contaminated water from
33 engineered water systems (e.g., cooling towers, air conditioners, taps and showers).⁶ *Legionella*
34 *pneumophila* commonly colonize in hot water systems with human aerosolization exposure
35 through faucets and showerheads.^{7,8} *L. pneumophila* thrive in areas with warm temperatures (25-
36 45 °C), low-water flow, and within biofilms, conditions which are characteristic to premise
37 plumbing systems.⁵ Over time, aging pipes and plumbing systems can experience deficiencies,
38 including leaks or corrosion, that lead to temperature fluctuations in pipes, water stagnation, and
39 increased biofilm formation.⁹ These conditions can create an even more favorable environment
40 for *L. pneumophila* growth and proliferation.⁹

41 Controlling for *Legionella* in premise plumbing systems can be a difficult and expensive
42 undertaking.⁵ Currently there is no US federal regulation for *Legionella* monitoring in drinking
43 water within premise plumbing.¹⁰ The CDC and EPA have developed guidelines for building
44 managers and owners for preventing and controlling *Legionella* growth.^{11,12} These guidelines
45 include a comprehensive framework for developing and implementing water management
46 programs (WMP) in buildings and treatment approaches.^{11,13} A review for controlling *Legionella*
47 bacteria in building systems found that the implementation of WMPs and periodic monitoring
48 was the most effective approach to prevent Legionnaires' Disease outbreaks.¹⁴ However the lack
49 of standardized guidelines and resource limitations for building managers to implement WMP
50 can lead to inadequate or inconsistent monitoring.¹⁴ Preventative controls that can be included in
51 a WMP include hot water temperature regulation, nutrient limitation, and prevention of
52 aerosolization to prevent *Legionella* exposure and growth in water systems.^{5,11} Building level
53 water treatment (physical, thermal and chemical) is typically deployed as an emergency measure
54 in water systems that are highly colonized with *Legionella* and need immediate corrective
55 action.¹² Flushing is the most frequently used treatment for *Legionella* in buildings, where water
56 lines are flushed to replace aged water with "fresh" water from the drinking water distribution
57 system (DWDS).¹⁵ However, the long-term success of flushing for *Legionella* remediation is
58 inconsistent across premise plumbing systems¹⁶⁻¹⁹. Thermal heat shocks are another widely used
59 approach to eradicate *Legionella* in hot water systems after an outbreak situation.¹² This
60 approach requires heating hot water tanks to above 60 °C (140 °F) then circulating the heated
61 water throughout hot-water lines to kill *Legionella*. This treatment typically achieves only short-
62 term success and recolonization can occur within weeks to months after implementation.^{12,20}
63 Chemical shock treatments have been used for a more aggressive approach to treat *Legionella* in

64 buildings by increasing the disinfectant (e.g. chlorine dioxide) in the water lines for bacterial
65 eradication.^{12,21} Hyperchlorination is a chlorine-based disinfection at high concentrations (e.g. 10-
66 50 mg/L Cl₂) that inactivates pathogens in drinking water, but its effectiveness is dependent on
67 pH and temperature in water.²² Chlorine dioxide and monochloramines are highly effective
68 chlorine-based treatments for *Legionella* in potable water systems due to their efficacy at higher
69 temperature and at wide range of pH.²² While treatments at the building level can reduce
70 *Legionella* within the short-term (days to weeks), *Legionella* can survive within biofilm and
71 resurge in drinking water from biofilm detachment weeks to months after treatment.²³ Biofilms
72 are difficult to treat and remove from premise plumbing systems, and as pipes age, more biofilm
73 can accumulate with further sequestration of pathogens like *Legionella*.²⁴

74 During the COVID-19 pandemic in the US and worldwide, many buildings experienced
75 complete or partial shutdowns. These shutdowns reduced water use and increased the likelihood
76 for *Legionella* growth within building water systems. These shutdowns, intended to prevent the
77 spread of the COVID-19 infections, led to prolonged water stagnation and negative impacts on
78 building water quality.²⁵⁻²⁸ The impact of decreased water demand on *Legionella* proliferation in
79 non-healthcare settings has been shown to have a wide range of outcomes with from no detection
80 to widespread detection of *L. pneumophila* during shutdowns.^{19,26,28,29}

81 Flushing is often recommended for the safe reopening of buildings after extended periods of
82 stagnation.^{13,15,30} However, flushing has been shown to have either a short-term benefit to reduce
83 *Legionella* in drinking water or led to an increase of *Legionella* occurrence in recommissioned
84 buildings.^{16,17,19,31,32} Rhoads et al. found that water stagnation alone does not always result in
85 *Legionella* growth, but reduced water demand in conjunction with other premise plumbing
86 characteristics (i.e. hot-water recirculation, water-use patterns at individual outlets, external


87 disturbances) contribute to increased *Legionella* occurrence in buildings.³¹ There is a need to
88 evaluate building-level treatments beyond flushing during and after the COVID-19 building
89 shutdown. Additionally, there are limited studies that monitor for *Legionella* in non-healthcare
90 buildings beyond the several months from the start of the COVID-19 shutdown.³¹

91 The objectives of this study were to: (1) assess the water quality of hot-water lines in an aging
92 residential building during and following the COVID-19 building shutdown over a two-year
93 period (2) evaluate multiple water treatment approaches that were targeted towards reducing *L.*
94 *pneumophila* colonization during intermittent water-use and occupancy. Physiochemical water
95 quality parameters were also measured, and cold-water line samples were collected to assess *L.*
96 *pneumophila* in drinking water from the entire building and the DWDS. This long-term study
97 represents one of the few studies that extensively monitored for *Legionella* growth in a non-
98 healthcare premise plumbing system during and long after the COVID-19 building shutdown.
99 Results from this research provides insight on *Legionella* occurrence during different periods of
100 building occupancy and the factors contributing to *Legionella* growth in real-time while building
101 managers worked to reduce the risk of *Legionella* exposure and infection.

102 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

103 **Site Selection.** Treatment interventions occurred in a residential building with known
104 colonization of *Legionella* on an educational campus in Maryland, USA. This building, denoted
105 Building A, experienced limited water-use with no occupancy from March 2020 to January 2021
106 due to the COVID-19 pandemic building shutdown implemented in March 2020. From January
107 2021 to May 2021, the building was partially re-occupied and full occupancy was initiated in
108 September 2021. Building A was built in the mid-1950s and is comprised of four floors
109 (Basement, Floor 1, Floor 2, Floor 3) and three wings i.e., risers (Riser A, Riser B, Riser C). A

110 4,000 L water heater tank located in the Basement of Riser B heats and stores the building's hot
111 water. The hot water was distributed in a recirculating system from the top to bottom floors
112 (Figure 1). Twelve showers were selected for hot water sampling with at least three showers
113 selected for Floors 1-3 and each riser. Cold-water was sampled from the basement (main line
114 entry from the DWDS located in the Basement in Riser C) and two sink faucets that were most
115 proximal and distal from the main line entry. The building's potable water was supplied by the
116 metropolitan drinking water utility which treats surface water for municipal use and distributes
117 the water using chlorine for disinfectant residual throughout an urban environment.



118
119 **Figure 1.** Building hydraulic flow of cold-water entering from the Drinking Water Distribution
120 System (DWDS), hot-water heating, and flow. (Left) The cold-water from the DWDS enters
121 through Riser C in the Basement and flows into Riser B and then Riser A, the cold-water then
122 rises to the top 3rd Floor and descends to the 2nd and 1st Floors. (Right) The hot-water is heated
123 first in a 4,000 L heat tank located in Riser B in the Basement. After heating, the hot-water flows
124 to Risers A & C simultaneously, then rises to the 3rd Floor and descends to the 2nd and 1st
125 Floors. The hot-water recirculates throughout the building's main hot-water lines.

126 **Sample Collection.** One-liter potable water samples were collected over the course of 22 months
127 (August 2020 to May 2022) from Building A. Samples were collected in sterile polypropylene
128 copolymer (PPCO) bottles from hot water lines at each of the 12 showers with shower heads
129 removed, and cold-water lines at the entry point in the basement (“Inlet”) and two sink faucets
130 with the aerators removed. First-draw samples, representing water at the outlet, were collected at
131 time zero (T0) at every sampling point. A second sample was collected after a five-minute flush
132 (T5), which represented water within the building pipes. Immediately after collection the
133 samples were portioned into 100 mL in Whirl-Pak bags containing vessels with 25 mg sodium
134 thiosulfate (Whirl-Pak; Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin) for *L. pneumophila* culture, and 40 mL
135 portioned into amber glass vials for turbidity and total organic carbon (TOC) analysis. Aliquots
136 were placed on ice and transported to the laboratory within two hours of collection.

137 **Culture of *L. pneumophila*.** Culturable *L. pneumophila* serogroup 1 to 15 were processed and
138 quantified using the IDEXX Legiolert reagents and protocol (IDEXX Laboratories; Westbrook,
139 Maine). Undilute and ten-fold diluted water samples (100 mL) were processed on the same day
140 of collection using the manufacturer's potable water protocol or modified protocol (described in
141 the Materials and Methods section of Supporting Information).³³ For ten-fold dilutions, 10 mL of
142 undiluted sample was diluted in 90 mL of 0.1% peptone solution per the manufacturer's
143 recommendation. After seven days of incubation at 39 °C and 85% humidity in a humidified
144 incubation chamber, positive wells were enumerated, and the most probable number (MPN)
145 calculated using the MPN table provided by IDEXX.

146 **Water Quality Analysis.** Free chlorine, temperature, and pH were measured on-site
147 immediately after collection to understand the factors associated with *Legionella* concentrations.
148 Temperature and pH were measured using HACH HQ40d portable meter with pH meter probe
149 PHC20101 (HACH; Loveland, Colorado). Free chlorine (mg/L Cl₂) was measured using the
150 DR300 Pocket Colorimeter (HACH; Loveland, Colorado). Turbidity was measured using an
151 OAKTON Turbidity Meter (Cole-Parmer; Vernon Hills, Illinois) and TOC was analyzed using
152 Sievers M9 TOC Analyzer (GE Analytical Instruments; Boulder, Colorado). All water quality
153 analyses were conducted using respective manufacturer instructions.

154 **Potable Water Building Treatments.** The following water treatment interventions were
155 examined to understand their impact on reduction of *Legionella* bacteria from the potable water
156 system.

157 **Heat shock.** Single heat shock treatments were conducted on August 9, 2020 (Heat Shock 1),
158 December 12, 2020 (Heat Shock 2), and May 18, 2021 (Heat Shock 3). The hot water pipe
159 temperature was elevated to 65 °C by heating the 4,000 L hot water tank located in the Basement

160 of Riser B. The hot water in the hot water pipes was flushed from all outlets until the targeted
161 temperature (65 °C) was measured. After the elevated hot water rested in the lines for 12 hours,
162 the hot water tank temperature was reduced to the operational temperature of 49 °C. The hot-
163 water was flushed again from every outlet until the normal temperatures (49 °C) was obtained.

164 *Chemical shock.* Single chemical shock treatments using chlorine dioxide or chlorine were
165 conducted on July 15, 2021 (Chlorine Dioxide 1), August 10, 2021 (Chlorine Dioxide 2), and
166 August 16, 2021 (Hyper-Chlorination). For the single chlorine dioxide shocks, the hot and cold-
167 water lines were treated with 2.5 mg/L of chlorine dioxide (ClO₂) by injecting disinfectant at the
168 diversion of hot and cold-water pipelines in the basement. Water was flushed at every outlet
169 from both hot and cold-water lines until the targeted 2.5 mg/L ClO₂ was reached. After resting
170 for 12 hours of treatment, water from both water lines were flushed from outlets until a residual
171 of 1.0 mg/L ClO₂ was measured. For the single Hyper-Chlorination shock, hot and cold-water
172 lines were treated by injection of a high concentration of chlorine (Cl₂) at 20 mg/L. Similar to the
173 chlorine dioxide treatment, both water lines were flushed to reach the targeted chlorine
174 concentration, rested in the lines for 12 hours, then were flushed from outlets until free chlorine
175 residuals were below 4 mg/L Cl₂. All single thermal and chemical shock treatments were
176 conducted when the building was vacant to ensure safety of building occupants.

177 *Continuous low-level treatment protocol.* An on-premise continuous low-level chlorine dioxide
178 was implemented on February 21, 2022, and continued long-term (10 weeks later). Both hot and
179 cold-water lines were treated by injecting 0.2-0.4 mg/L ClO₂ of stable chlorine dioxide into the
180 water main prior to the diversion into hot and cold-water pipelines.

181 **Data Analysis.** Statistical tests and data transformations were performed with STATA (Stata 10
182 Data Analysis and Statistical Software; StataCorp LP, College Station, Texas). On non-normally

183 distributed *L. pneumophila* data, two-sided Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test were performed on
184 paired samples between sampling events/treatment interventions and between first draws (T0)
185 and five-minute flush (T5). Non-parametric Kruskal Wallis H hypothesis test was performed to
186 compare samples between variables with multiple building characteristics (i.e., Risers, Showers).
187 Correlation between *L. pneumophila* and physiochemical parameters were assessed with Kendall
188 Tau Coefficient Correlation test with log-transformed *L. pneumophila* concentrations below the
189 limit of detection (<1 MPN/100mL) substituted as 0 (i.e., $\log_{10}(1)$). Positive samples were
190 indicated by *L. pneumophila* results with ≥ 1 MPN/100 mL. Statistical significance was defined a
191 priori using $p=0.05$. All graphs were produced by Microsoft Excel and STATA software.

192 RESULTS


193 **Microbiological Analysis.** A total of 624 samples were collected from hot-water lines with an
194 additional 121 samples collected from cold-water lines (total N=745). All samples were tested
195 and quantified for culturable *L. pneumophila* Serogroup 1 to 15. Culturable *L. pneumophila* were
196 detected in all hot-water shower locations and at both times of collection (T0 and T5) with
197 results ranging from <1 MPN/100mL to >22,736 MPN/100mL (Figure 2). The overall percent
198 positivity for *L. pneumophila* in all hot water samples was 76.6% (n=478/624) with a geometric
199 mean of 139 MPN/100 mL. Hot-water samples collected at T0 had a geometric mean of 245
200 MPN/100mL with 73.0% positivity (n=219/300) and those at Time 5 had a geometric mean of
201 83 MPN/100mL with 78.3% positivity (n=235/300). Statistical analysis found a significant 0.47
202 log decrease of *L. pneumophila* concentrations from T0 to T5 samples across matched samples
203 ($p<0.001$).

204 Riser A had the highest statistically significant concentration of *L. pneumophila* with a
205 geometric mean (GM) of 312 MPN/100 mL and 80.8% positivity (n=210/260) compared to

206 Riser B with a GM of 62 MPN/100 mL with 75.0% positivity (n=117/156) and Riser C with a
207 GM of 84 MPN/100 mL with 72.6% positivity (n=151/208) (p<0.001) (Figure S1). Shower 2
208 (Riser A) had the highest statistically significant GM of *L. pneumophila* (1,114 MPN/100 mL;
209 p<0.001) and Shower 3 (Riser A) had the highest statistically significant positivity (92.3% ;
210 p=0.007) (Figure S1). Shower 6 (Riser B) had the lowest statistically significant GM of *L.*
211 *pneumophila* (41 MPN/100 mL; p<0.001) and Shower 11(Riser C) had the lowest statistically
212 significant positivity (59.6%; p=0.007) (Figure S1).

213 The overall percent positivity for cold-water samples was 42.2% (n=51/121) with a GM of 46
214 MPN/100 mL. The majority of cold-water samples at the Inlet were negative for *L. pneumophila*
215 (GM: 2 MPN/100 mL; 2.2% positivity; n=45) (Figure S2). The distal cold-water location
216 experienced a higher GM of *L. pneumophila* (59 MPN/100 mL; 73.3% positivity; n=30)
217 compared to proximal location (43 MPN/100 mL;60.9% positivity; n=46) (Figure S2). Cold-
218 water samples from sink locations collected at T0 had a GM of 115 MPN/100mL with 68.4%
219 positivity and at T5 had a GM of 20 MPN/100mL with 63.1% positivity. Across matched cold-
220 water samples, there was a statistically significant 0.76 log decrease of *L. pneumophila*
221 concentrations from T0 to T5 (p<0.001).


235 after treatment (August 10, 2020) (Figure 3A). *L. pneumophila* concentrations remained constant
236 afterwards four months later (December 11, 2020) ($p=0.21$). The analysis for Heat Shock 2 did
237 not find a significant reduction in *L. pneumophila* ($p=0.87$) between samples collected one day
238 prior (December 11, 2020) and six days after treatment (December 18, 2020) (Figure 3B). There
239 was a significant 0.20 log increase of *L. pneumophila* comparing samples prior to Heat Shock 2
240 (December 11, 2020) and two weeks after treatment (December 29, 2020) ($p=0.05$) (Figure 3B).
241 For Heat Shock 3, samples collected one day prior (May 17, 2021) and one day after treatment
242 (May 19, 2021) experienced a significant 1.53 log reduction of *L. pneumophila* ($p<0.001$), but
243 comparison of pre-Heat Shock 3 samples to those four weeks after treatment (June 16, 2021)
244 found no significant difference in *L. pneumophila* concentrations ($p=0.92$) (Figure 3C).
245



246

247 **Figure 3.** Single heat shock treatments conducted in Building A. Hot-water samples were
248 compared using Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test on paired *L. pneumophila* shower results. (A)
249 Samples (n=12) were compared for reduction of *L. pneumophila* four days prior (Pre-Heat Shock
250 1) to one day after (Post-Heat Shock 1) treatment conducted on August 9, 2020 (Heat Shock 1).
251 (B) Samples (n=24) were compared for reduction on *L. pneumophila* one day prior (Pre-Heat
252 Shock 2) to six days after (Post-Heat Shock 2) and two weeks after (Post-Heat Shock 2)
253 treatment conducted on December 12, 2020 (Heat Shock 2). (C) Samples (n=24) were compared
254 for reduction of *L. pneumophila* one day prior (Pre-Heat Shock 3) to one day after (Post-Heat
255 Shock 3) and four weeks after (Post-Heat Shock 3) treatment conducted on May 18, 2021 (Heat
256 Shock 3). *↓ There was a statistically significant decrease in *L. pneumophila* compared to
257 samples prior to treatment. *↑ There was a statistically significant increase *L. pneumophila*
258 compared to samples prior to treatment.

259 *Single Chemical Shock Treatments.* Chemical shock treatments were conducted and evaluated
260 after the multiple single Heat Shock treatments failed to provide long-term reduction for *L.*
261 *pneumophila*. Analysis of Chlorine Dioxide 1 samples collected four weeks prior (June 16, 2021)
262 to four weeks after (August 9, 2021) treatment found a significant 2.29 log reduction of *L.*
263 *pneumophila* ($p < 0.001$) (Figure 4A). Results for Chlorine Dioxide 2 found a significant 1.29 log
264 reduction of *L. pneumophila* ($p < 0.001$) between samples collected one day prior (August 9,
265 2021) and two days after treatment (August 12, 2021) (Figure 4B). Comparison of samples
266 collected four days prior to Hyper-Chlorination (August 12, 2021) and four weeks after
267 (September 14, 2021) found a significant 1.80 log increase in *L. pneumophila* ($p < 0.001$) (Figure
268 4C).




269

270 **Figure 4.** Single chemical shock treatments conducted in Building A. Hot-water samples were
271 compared using Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test on paired *L. pneumophila* shower results. (A)
272 Samples (n=24) were compared for reduction on *L. pneumophila* four weeks prior (Pre-Chlorine
273 Dioxide 1) to three weeks after (Post-Chlorine Dioxide 1) treatment conducted on July 15, 2021
274 (Chlorine Dioxide 1). (B) Samples (n=24) were compared for reduction of *L. pneumophila* one
275 day prior (Pre-Chlorine Dioxide 2) to two days after (Post-Chlorine Dioxide 2) treatment
276 conducted on August 10, 2021 (Chlorine Dioxide 2). (C) Samples (n=24) were compared for
277 reduction of *L. pneumophila* four days prior (Pre-Hyper-Chlorination) to four weeks after (Post-
278 Hyper-Chlorination) treatment conducted on August 16, 2021 (Hyper-Chlorination). *↓ There
279 was a statistically significant decrease in *L. pneumophila* compared to samples prior to
280 treatment.*↑ There was a statistically significant increase *L. pneumophila* compared to samples
281 prior to treatment.

282 *Continuous Low-Level Chlorine Dioxide Treatment.* Single chemical shock treatments were
283 unable to control for *L. pneumophila* long-term (Figure 4), therefore a continuous low-level
284 chemical treatment was evaluated. Comparison of samples prior to implementation of treatment

285 (February 2, 2022) and one week later (March 2, 2022) found a significant 0.58 log reduction in
286 *L. pneumophila* ($p < 0.001$) (Figure 5). Six weeks after implementation (April 1, 2022), *L.*
287 *pneumophila* concentrations returned to pre-implementation levels ($p = 0.13$). Ten weeks after
288 implementation (May 4, 2022), there was a significant 0.79 log reduction in *L. pneumophila*
289 ($p < 0.001$) (Figure 5).

290



291

292 **Figure 5.** Continuous low-level chlorine dioxide treatment implemented in Building A. Hot-
293 water samples were compared using Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test on paired *L. pneumophila*
294 shower results (n=24). Samples were compared for reduction of *L. pneumophila* three weeks
295 prior (Pre-Continuous Chlorine Dioxide) to one week, six weeks, and ten weeks after treatment
296 implemented on February 21, 2022 (Continuous Chlorine Dioxide). *↓ There was a statistically
297 significant decrease in *L. pneumophila* compared to Pre-Continuous Chlorine Dioxide samples.

298 **Water Quality Indicators. Free Chlorine.** Residual free chlorine concentrations in cold-water
299 samples ranged from below the limit of detection (<0.02 mg/L Cl₂) to 1.06 mg/L Cl₂. The Inlet
300 cold-water sample from the DWDS had a mean concentration of 0.49 mg/L Cl₂ (Range: <0.02 to
301 0.82 mg/L Cl₂) (Figure S3). Chlorine levels in the proximal cold-water samples averaged 0.24
302 mg/L Cl₂ (Range: <0.02 to 1.06 mg/L Cl₂) compared to chlorine in the distal cold-water samples
303 of 0.13 mg/L Cl₂ (Range: <0.02 to 0.67 mg/L Cl₂) (Figure S3). Due to loss of chlorine at
304 elevated temperatures, hot-water samples had low concentrations on average (Mean: <0.1 mg/L
305 Cl₂; Range: <0.02 to 0.97 mg/L Cl₂) at each riser and shower (Except Shower 2: mean 0.13 mg/L

306 Cl₂) (Figure S3). At each cold-water sink location, residual free chlorine did statistically increase
307 across matched samples from T0 to T5 (T0 mean: 0.25 mg/L Cl₂; T5 mean: 0.36 mg/L Cl₂)
308 (p<0.001). After Building A was re-occupied with partial water-use (January 2021), chlorine
309 residual levels (hot and cold-water samples) significantly increased after three weeks (p=0.01)
310 but did not increase further after full re-occupancy (September 2021) with resumed normal
311 water-use (p=0.76). Within cold-water lines, free chlorine had a moderate negative correlation
312 with *L. pneumophila* concentrations (Kendall tau-b= -0.47, p<0.001) indicating that samples with
313 higher free chlorine residuals resulted in reduced *L. pneumophila* concentrations. Samples had a
314 70.7% (n=58) positivity for *L. pneumophila* when free chlorine concentrations were less than or
315 equal to 0.2 mg/L Cl₂ and 12.7% (n=63) positivity when concentrations were greater than 0.2
316 mg/L Cl₂.

317 *Temperature.* Hot-water temperatures were significantly different between T0 and T5 (p<0.001).
318 T0 hot-water samples averaged lower temperatures (Mean: 26.1 °C; Range: 15.6- 37.4 °C)
319 compared to T5 hot-water samples (Mean: 38.0 °C; Range: 22.1-50.9 °C) (Figure S4). The Inlet
320 cold-water samples had the lowest measured temperatures (Mean:14.9 °C; Range: 8.7-22.5 °C)
321 while the proximal and distal had higher cold-water temperatures (Mean: 23.1 °C; Range: 12.6-
322 33.1 °C).

323 *L. pneumophila* growth occurred in samples with temperatures ranging from 14.6 °C to 49.8
324 °C, with the majority of the positive *L. pneumophila* samples (70.4%) at temperatures within the
325 range suitable for *Legionella* growth (20 °C to 45 °C).³⁴⁻³⁶ Negative *L. pneumophila* samples
326 occurred in temperatures ranging from 8.7 °C to 50.9° C. Correlation analysis found no
327 association between hot-water line temperatures and *L. pneumophila* concentrations (Kendall

328 tau-b= -0.005, p=0.85). There was a moderate positive association between cold-water line
329 temperatures and *L. pneumophila* concentrations (Kendall tau-b=0.50, p<0.001).
330 pH. The pH ranged from 6.5 to 8.6 (Mean: 7.4) in both hot and cold-water samples. Positive
331 samples occurred at pH range of 6.5-8.4. Among hot-water samples, there was a significant
332 increase in pH between T0 and T5 samples (p<0.001), with average T0 pH (Mean=7.2) slightly
333 lower than the average T5 pH (Mean=7.50) (Figure S5). The cold-water samples also
334 experienced a significant increase in average pH between T0 (pH=7.25) and T5 (pH=7.50)
335 samples (p<0.001) (Figure S5). A strong negative correlation was found between *L. pneumophila*
336 and cold-water samples with a pH higher than 7.9 (Kendall tau-b= -0.62, p=0.004).

337 **DISCUSSION**

338 There was high colonization found in the hot water system of Building A and the treatment
339 found to be most effective for long term reduction of *Legionella pneumophila* was continuous
340 low-level chlorine dioxide dosing. While single heat shock and chemical shock treatments
341 reduced *L. pneumophila* in the short-term, these single treatments were ineffective in controlling
342 *L. pneumophila* in the building long-term. Single shock treatments may not be efficient in
343 complete removal of biofilm that can sequester *L. pneumophila* and surviving *L. pneumophila*
344 can repopulate the water system after treatment.^{37,38} Continuous low-level chlorine dioxide
345 treatment was effective in reducing *L. pneumophila* in hot water lines long-term.

346 **Building Characteristics and Water Quality Indicators for *L. pneumophila*.** Similar to other
347 studies, *L. pneumophila* was present in both hot-water lines and cold-water lines. Hot-water lines
348 experienced higher positivity and concentration in Riser A which may be indicative of higher
349 colonization of *L. pneumophila* in Riser A pipes compared to Riser B and C. The difference in
350 colonization by riser may be explained by the circulation of hot-water in the building. Building A

351 is designed with a recirculating hot-water system with a storage tank. Hot water storage tanks
352 have been linked to increased *Legionella* infection risk due to temperature ranges amenable to *L.*
353 *pneumophila* growth (20-45 °C) and stagnant water conditions.^{39,40} Additionally, suboptimal
354 recirculating systems, with temperatures below 48 °C to prevent scalding, can favor *Legionella*
355 growth in parts of the hot-water circulation system.^{40,41} Flushing showers for five minutes
356 reduced *L. pneumophila* concentrations across all hot-water samples (T0 vs T5) from individual
357 outlets ($p < 0.001$). While frequently recommended, short-term flushing of hot-water systems,
358 particularly in recirculating hot-water systems, may not be effective in *Legionella* reduction
359 long-term since *Legionella* can recirculate and return to shower outlets after flushes (Figure
360 2).^{11,40}

361 The cold-water samples experienced high *L. pneumophila* positivity in the proximal and distal
362 locations, but minimal positivity at the Inlet, which may indicate colonization of *L. pneumophila*
363 in the cold-water pipes and minimal influence from the DWDS (Figure S2). While *Legionella*
364 prefer warmer temperatures, these bacteria can still survive and grow within cold-water
365 systems.⁴² Compared to the hot-water lines, the cold-water samples had lower *L. pneumophila*
366 positivity and concentrations, which may be due to higher retention of free chlorine residual and
367 temperatures below *Legionella*'s optimal growth range.^{11,43}

368 The proximal location sample sites experienced lower *L. pneumophila* levels compared to
369 distal locations which may be correlated to the reduction of free chlorine residual as it travels
370 through the building premise plumbing system to distal sites (Figure S3).⁴⁴ Studies have found a
371 higher free chlorine residual was associated with lower *Legionella* growth, but as conditions
372 become less optimal for free chlorine (increased pH and higher temperature), the residual
373 becomes less effective in *Legionella* reduction.⁴⁵ In addition to the impact of pH on free chlorine

374 disinfection effectiveness, pH has also been known to directly reduce *Legionella* growth at
375 higher pH (8.2-10.5 pH).^{46,47} Although our sample size was limited, cold-water samples with
376 higher pH (>7.9) were associated with lower *L. pneumophila* concentrations despite lower
377 chlorine residual in these samples (Range: <0.02-0.46 mg/l Cl₂; n=14).

378 **Prolonged Stagnation and Building Treatments.** Building A experienced extended stagnation
379 for nine months from March 2020 to December 2020 and in response, building managers
380 implemented interventions in the hot and cold-water lines in accordance with the CDC's
381 published guidance to reduce *Legionella*.^{11,30,48} Heat Shock 1 and Heat Shock 2 resulted in a
382 reduction *L. pneumophila* short-term, however prolonged water stagnation may have exacerbated
383 growth weeks later (Figure 3A and Figure 3B).⁴⁹ The building was partially re-occupied on
384 January 13, 2021, after the shutdown, and with the return of partial water-use in the building, *L.*
385 *pneumophila* concentrations substantially rose months later (Figure 2). Heat Shock 3 resulted in
386 a short-term reduction of *L. pneumophila* then a rapid return to pre-heat shock levels in majority
387 of sampling sites in the building (Figure 3C). Guidance from the American Water Works
388 Association (AWWA) does not recommend heat shock treatments due to the rapid bounce back
389 of *Legionella* concentrations.⁵⁰ The heat resilience within biofilms may have also contributed to
390 the *L. pneumophila* resurgence after heat shock treatments.⁵⁰ After the single heat shocks failed
391 to control *L. pneumophila*, building operators turned to chemical disinfection to treat the hot and
392 cold-water systems. The first chlorine dioxide treatment (Chlorine Dioxide 1) was effective in
393 reducing *L. pneumophila* and the subsequent chlorine dioxide treatment (Chlorine Dioxide 2)
394 further temporarily ablated *L. pneumophila* to levels below detection (Figure 4A and 4B). An
395 additional chlorination shock (Hyper-chlorination) was conducted to further eradicate *L.*
396 *pneumophila* from the system but experienced an increase of *L. pneumophila* weeks later (Figure

397 4C). A possible explanation for *L. pneumophila* resurgence could be the detachment of biofilm
398 resulting from the chlorine shocks.⁵¹ As the building transitioned back to limited water-use from
399 short term vacancy (December 7, 2021 to January 12, 2022), *L. pneumophila* concentrations
400 increased further (Figure 2). The limited use may have resulted in water stagnation that may have
401 contributed to further biofilm formation within the pipes.⁵² As a response to the failure of single
402 chemical treatments on long-term *L. pneumophila* control, building managers shifted to
403 evaluating a continuous low-level chemical treatment approach. This decision was made to
404 provide continuous chemical treatment at levels that were safe for building occupants.⁵³ After the
405 implementation of the continuous low-level chlorine dioxide treatment, *L. pneumophila*
406 concentrations stabilized and finally reduced months after the implementation of treatment
407 (Figure 5). Since the levels of continuous chlorine dioxide treatments were low compared to
408 shock treatments, it may have taken months longer to experience the full effect of the
409 disinfection. Our findings are similar to several studies that have also shown the long-term
410 effectiveness of continuous chlorine dioxide treatment in potable water systems.^{54,55}

411 Examining the cold-water lines in this building was necessary to determine potential
412 *Legionella* exposure from the entire premise plumbing system. It should be noted that when a
413 continuous treatment approach was selected, building managers applied for and received
414 supplemental disinfection permits for building level treatment. One limitation of the study was
415 the consistency of sampling events and sample collection. The remediation challenges in
416 Building A were addressed in real-time, therefore there were constraints on consistent sampling.
417 While the researchers were prepared to collect samples on a periodic basis, the scheduling of
418 collection was constrained by operational decisions of the building managers.

419 **Future Directions of Water Management Programs.** Multiple organizations including
420 American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE),
421 American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA), AWWA, and CDC have published guidance
422 for designing WMPs targeted at preventing the growth and spread of *Legionella* and other
423 opportunistic pathogens in premise plumbing water systems.^{11,41,50,56} Despite the
424 recommendation for formal WMPs across potable water systems, very few buildings have a
425 developed WMP due to limited knowledge and resources.²⁸ Even among WMP that are well-
426 developed, WMP can be poorly implemented which can be due to lack of expertise and long-
427 term investment for *Legionella* control.²⁸ In many instances, these guidance have recommend
428 flushing to reduce *Legionella* from potable water systems in premise plumbing, however our
429 study has demonstrated that flushing has minimal effect on *Legionella* control and more
430 extensive treatment is required especially for a building highly colonized with *Legionella*.^{11,41}
431 Our results suggest continuous low-level treatment would be the best method for control of
432 *Legionella* in highly colonized buildings. Continuous low-level treatment can provide sustained
433 levels of disinfection that would control for *Legionella* growth, prevent the formation of biofilm,
434 and remove existing biofilm over time.⁵⁷ However considerations for cost and regulations for
435 potable water treatment can be limiting factors for implementation.⁵⁸
436 Furthermore, current published guidelines propose using chemical or physical water quality
437 predictors be used to assess *Legionella* risk or control in premise plumbing systems.^{11,41} Testing
438 parameters such temperature, pH, and free chlorine have been recommended to predict the
439 presence or absence of *Legionella* at exposure points (shower and sink outlets).^{11,59,60} Despite
440 these suggestions, multiple studies have shown inconsistent relationships between surrogate
441 parameters and *Legionella*.^{11,60,61} Overall, culture-based detection is essential for monitoring

442 *Legionella* and should not be replaced by surrogates alone. Along with an improved sampling
443 approach, there is a need for more evidence-based guidance in preventing *Legionella* within
444 premise plumbing that can be widely accessible and inexpensively executed.^{28,61,62}
445 Understanding a building's characteristics and hydraulic engineering is critical for accurately
446 monitoring for *Legionella* in a premise plumbing system. This study demonstrates that a well-
447 developed and properly implemented WMP can reduce *Legionella* risk and prevent waterborne
448 disease outbreaks.

449 ASSOCIATED CONTENT

450 **Supporting Information.** The following files are available free of charge.
451 Supporting Information (PDF).

452 Experimental materials and methods, including sample collection and processing; supplemental
453 results, including water quality parameters (turbidity and total organic carbon); figures showing
454 *L. pneumophila* in hot-water samples, *L. pneumophila* in cold-water samples, mean free chlorine
455 concentrations, mean temperatures, mean pH, mean turbidity, and mean total organic carbon
456 concentrations.

457 AUTHOR INFORMATION

458 **Corresponding Author**

459 * **Kellogg J. Schwab**- *Department of Environmental Health & Engineering, Johns Hopkins*
460 *Bloomberg School of Public Health, 21205, Baltimore, Maryland, United States*

461 Email: kschwab1@jhu.edu

462 **Authors**

463 **Monica Lee-Masi** - *Department of Environmental Health & Engineering, Johns Hopkins*
464 *Bloomberg School of Public Health, 21205, Baltimore, Maryland, United States*

465 **Caroline Coulter** - *Department of Environmental Health & Engineering, Johns Hopkins*
466 *Bloomberg School of Public Health, 21205, Baltimore, Maryland, United States*

467 **Steven J. Chow** - *Department of Environmental Health & Engineering, Johns Hopkins*
468 *Bloomberg School of Public Health, 21205, Baltimore, Maryland, United States*

469 **Benjamin Zaitchik**- *Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Johns Hopkins Krieger*
470 *School of Arts and Sciences, 21218, Baltimore, Maryland, United States*

471 **Joseph G. Jacangelo**- *Department of Environmental Health & Engineering, Johns Hopkins*
472 *Bloomberg School of Public Health, 21205, Baltimore, Maryland, United States*

473 - *Stantec, Washington, DC, 20005, United States*

474 **Natalie G. Exum** - *Department of Environmental Health & Engineering, Johns Hopkins*
475 *Bloomberg School of Public Health, 21205, Baltimore, Maryland, United States*

476 **Notes**

477 The authors declare no competing financial interest.

478 **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

479 The authors thank the building directors, managers, and operators for their assistance with
480 building access and sampling. The authors also thank The Osprey Foundation of Maryland and
481 the National Institute of Health, USA (NIH Grant T32 ES007141) for their financial support for
482 this research.

483 **REFERENCES**

- 484 1. Centers for Control and Disease Prevention. (2020). *Legionnaires' Disease Surveillance*
485 *Summary Report, United States 2016-2017*. Retrieved from
486 <https://www.cdc.gov/legionella/health-depts/surv-reporting/2016-17-surv-report-508.pdf>
- 487 2. Soda, E. A., Barskey, A. E., Shah, P. P., Schrag, S., Whitney, C. G., Arduino, M. J., Reddy, S.
488 C., Kunz, J. M., Hunter, C. M., & Raphael, B. H. (2017). Vital signs: health care–
489 associated Legionnaires' disease surveillance data from 20 states and a large metropolitan
490 area—United States, 2015. In (Vol. 17, pp. 2215-2220): Elsevier.
- 491 3. Collier, S. A., Deng, L., Adam, E. A., Benedict, K. M., Beshearse, E. M., Blackstock, A. J.,
492 Bruce, B. B., Derado, G., Edens, C., & Fullerton, K. E. (2021). Estimate of burden and
493 direct healthcare cost of infectious waterborne disease in the United States. *Emerging*
494 *infectious diseases*, 27(1), 140.
- 495 4. American Water Works Association. (2012). Buried No Longer: Confronting Americas Water
496 Infrastructure Challenge. In: American Water Works Association.
- 497 5. National Academies of Sciences Engineering Medicine. (2019). *Management of Legionella in*
498 *Water Systems*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- 499 6. Garrison, L. E., Kunz, J. M., Cooley, L. A., Moore, M. R., Lucas, C., Schrag, S., Sarisky, J., &
500 Whitney, C. G. (2016). Vital Signs: Deficiencies in Environmental Control Identified in
501 Outbreaks of Legionnaires' Disease—North America, 2000–2014. *American Journal of*
502 *Transplantation*, 16(10), 3049-3058. doi:10.1111/ajt.14024
- 503 7. Wadowsky, R., Yee, R., Mezmar, L., Wing, E., & Dowling, J. (1982). Hot water systems as
504 sources of Legionella pneumophila in hospital and nonhospital plumbing fixtures.
505 *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 43(5), 1104-1110.

- 506 8. Borella, P., Montagna, M. T., Romano-Spica, V., Stampi, S., Stancanelli, G., Triassi, M.,
507 Neglia, R., Marchesi, I., Fantuzzi, G., & Tatò, D. (2004). Legionella infection risk from
508 domestic hot water. *Emerging infectious diseases*, *10*(3), 457.
- 509 9. Selvakumar, A., & Tafuri Anthony, N. (2012). Rehabilitation of Aging Water Infrastructure
510 Systems: Key Challenges and Issues. *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, *18*(3), 202-209.
511 doi:10.1061/(ASCE)IS.1943-555X.0000091
- 512 10. US Environmental Protection Agency. (1974). *The Safe Drinking Water Act*. United States
- 513 11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2017). Developing a water management
514 program to reduce Legionella growth and spread in buildings: A practical guide to
515 implementing industry standards Retrieved from
516 <https://www.cdc.gov/legionella/maintenance/wmp-toolkit.html>
- 517 12. US Environmental Protection Agency. (2016a). Technologies for Legionella Control in
518 Premise Plumbing Systems: Scientific Literature Review. EPA 810-R-16-001. Retrieved
519 from [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-09/documents/legionella_document_master_september_2016_final.pdf)
520 [09/documents/legionella_document_master_september_2016_final.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-09/documents/legionella_document_master_september_2016_final.pdf)
- 521 13. US Environmental Protection Agency. (2020). Maintaining or restoring water quality in
522 buildings with low or no use.
- 523 14. Springston, J. P., & Yocavitch, L. (2017). Existence and control of Legionella bacteria in
524 building water systems: A review. *Journal of occupational and environmental hygiene*,
525 *14*(2), 124-134.
- 526 15. Control, C. f. D., & Prevention. (2020). Guidance for reopening buildings after prolonged
527 shutdown or reduced operation.

- 528 16.Grimard-Conea, M., Deshommes, E., Doré, E., & Prévost, M. (2022). Impact of
529 recommissioning flushing on *Legionella pneumophila* in a large building during the
530 COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Water*, 4, 959689.
- 531 17.Greenwald, H., Nelson, K. L., Kantor, R., Kennedy, L. C., Ehde, A., Duan, Y., & Olivares, C.
532 I. Is flushing necessary during building closures? A study of water quality and bacterial
533 communities during extended reductions in building occupancy. *Frontiers in Water*, 135.
- 534 18.Meegoda, C. S., Waak, M. B., Hozalski, R. M., Kim, T., & Hallé, C. (2023). The benefits of
535 flushing for mitigating *Legionella* spp. in non-chlorinated building plumbing systems.
536 *Frontiers in Water*, 5. doi:10.3389/frwa.2023.1114795
- 537 19.Hozalski, R. M., LaPara, T. M., Zhao, X., Kim, T., Waak, M. B., Burch, T., & McCarty, M.
538 (2020). Flushing of stagnant premise water systems after the COVID-19 shutdown can
539 reduce infection risk by *Legionella* and *Mycobacterium* spp. *Environmental Science &*
540 *Technology*, 54(24), 15914-15924.
- 541 20.Molina, J. J., Bennassar, M., Palacio, E., & Crespi, S. (2022). Low efficacy of periodical
542 thermal shock for long-term control of *Legionella* spp. in hot water system of hotels.
543 *Pathogens (Basel, Switzerland)*, 11(2), 152.
- 544 21.Orsi, G. B., Vitali, M., Marinelli, L., Ciorba, V., Tufi, D., Del Cimmuto, A., Ursillo, P.,
545 Fabiani, M., De Santis, S., Protano, C., Marzuillo, C., & De Giusti, M. (2014). *Legionella*
546 control in the water system of antiquated hospital buildings by shock and continuous
547 hyperchlorination: 5 years experience. *BMC Infectious Diseases*, 14(1), 394.
548 doi:10.1186/1471-2334-14-394

- 549 22. Carlson, K. M., Boczek, L. A., Chae, S., & Ryu, H. (2020). Legionellosis and Recent
550 Advances in Technologies for Legionella Control in Premise Plumbing Systems: A
551 Review. *Water (Basel)*, 12(3), 1-676. doi:10.3390/w12030676
- 552 23. Shen, Y., Monroy, G. L., Derlon, N., Janjaroen, D., Huang, C., Morgenroth, E., Boppart, S.
553 A., Ashbolt, N. J., Liu, W.-T., & Nguyen, T. H. (2015). Role of Biofilm Roughness and
554 Hydrodynamic Conditions in Legionella pneumophila Adhesion to and Detachment from
555 Simulated Drinking Water Biofilms. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 49(7), 4274-
556 4282. doi:10.1021/es505842v
- 557 24. Pan, R., Zhang, K., Cen, C., Zhou, X., Xu, J., Wu, J., & Wu, X. (2021). Characteristics of
558 biostability of drinking water in aged pipes after water source switching: ATP evaluation,
559 biofilms niches and microbial community transition. *Environmental Pollution*, 271,
560 116293. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.116293>
- 561 25. Richard, R., & Boyer, T. H. (2021). Pre-and post-flushing of three schools in Arizona due to
562 COVID-19 shutdown. *AWWA Water Science*, 3(5), e1239.
- 563 26. Ye, C., Xian, X., Bao, R., Zhang, Y., Feng, M., Lin, W., & Yu, X. (2022). Recovery of
564 microbiological quality of long-term stagnant tap water in university buildings during the
565 COVID-19 pandemic. *Science of The Total Environment*, 806, 150616.
- 566 27. Salehi, M., DeSimone, D., Aghilinasrollahabadi, K., & Ahamed, T. (2021). A case study on
567 tap water quality in large buildings recommissioned after extended closure due to the
568 COVID-19 pandemic. *Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology*, 7(11),
569 1996-2009.
- 570 28. Dowdell, K. S., Greenwald, H. D., Joshi, S., Grimard-Conea, M., Pitell, S., Song, Y., Ley, C.,
571 Kennedy, L. C., Vosloo, S., & Huo, L. (2022). Legionella pneumophila occurrence in

- 572 reduced-occupancy buildings in 11 cities during the COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv*,
573 2022.2006. 2028.22277022.
- 574 29.Liang, J., Swanson, C. S., Wang, L., & He, Q. (2021). Impact of building closures during the
575 COVID-19 pandemic on Legionella infection risks. *American journal of infection
576 control*, 49(12), 1564-1566.
- 577 30.Proctor, C. R., Rhoads, W. J., Keane, T., Salehi, M., Hamilton, K., Pieper, K. J., Cwiertny, D.
578 M., Prévost, M., & Whelton, A. J. (2020). Considerations for large building water quality
579 after extended stagnation. *AWWA Water Science*, 2(4), e1186.
- 580 31.Rhoads, W. J., Sindelar, M., Margot, C., Graf, N., & Hammes, F. (2022). Variable Legionella
581 Response to Building Occupancy Patterns and Precautionary Flushing. *Microorganisms*,
582 10(3), 555.
- 583 32.Kim, T., Zhao, X., LaPara, T. M., & Hozalski, R. M. (2023). Flushing Temporarily Improves
584 Microbiological Water Quality for Buildings Supplied with Chloraminated Surface Water
585 but Has Little Effect for Groundwater Supplies. *Environmental Science & Technology*,
586 57(13), 5453-5463.
- 587 33.IDEXX Laboratories. (2018). Legiolert®Quantification Process Steps Potable Water 100mL
588 Protocol. In. Suffolk, UK IDEXX Laboratories
- 589 34.Alary, M., & Joly, J. R. (1992). Factors contributing to the contamination of hospital water
590 distribution systems by Legionellae. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 165(3), 565-569.
- 591 35.Bédard, E., Fey, S., Charron, D., Lalancette, C., Cantin, P., Dolcé, P., Laferrière, C., Déziel,
592 E., & Prévost, M. (2015). Temperature diagnostic to identify high risk areas and optimize
593 Legionella pneumophila surveillance in hot water distribution systems. *Water Research*,
594 71, 244-256.


- 595 36.Rhoads, W. J., Ji, P., Pruden, A., & Edwards, M. A. (2015). Water heater temperature set
596 point and water use patterns influence *Legionella pneumophila* and associated
597 microorganisms at the tap. *Microbiome*, 3, 1-13.
- 598 37.Lautenschlager, K., Boon, N., Wang, Y., Egli, T., & Hammes, F. (2010). Overnight
599 stagnation of drinking water in household taps induces microbial growth and changes in
600 community composition. *Water Research*, 44(17), 4868-4877.
- 601 38.Kim, B., Anderson, J., Mueller, S., Gaines, W., & Kendall, A. (2002). Literature review—
602 efficacy of various disinfectants against *Legionella* in water systems. *Water Research*,
603 36(18), 4433-4444.
- 604 39.Borella, P., Montagna, M. T., Stampi, S., Stancanelli, G., Romano-Spica, V., Triassi, M.,
605 Marchesi, I., Bargellini, A., Tato, D., & Napoli, C. (2005). *Legionella* contamination in
606 hot water of Italian hotels. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 71(10), 5805-5813.
- 607 40.Serrano-Suárez, A., Dellundé, J., Salvadó, H., Cervero-Aragó, S., Méndez, J., Canals, O.,
608 Blanco, S., Arcas, A., & Araujo, R. (2013). Microbial and physicochemical parameters
609 associated with *Legionella* contamination in hot water recirculation systems.
610 *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 20(8), 5534-5544. doi:10.1007/s11356-
611 013-1557-5
- 612 41.American Society of Heating Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE).
613 (2015). Legionellosis: risk management for building water systems. ANSI/ASHRAE
614 Standard 188–2015. In. Atlanta, GA: ASHRAE.
- 615 42.Stout, J. E., & Yu, V. L. (1997). Legionellosis. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 337(10),
616 682-687.

- 617 43. Proctor, C. R., Dai, D., Edwards, M. A., & Pruden, A. (2017). Interactive effects of
618 temperature, organic carbon, and pipe material on microbiota composition and *Legionella*
619 pneumophila in hot water plumbing systems. *Microbiome*, 5(1), 130.
- 620 44. Haig, S.-J., Kotlarz, N., Kalikin, L. M., Chen, T., Guikema, S., LiPuma, J. J., & Raskin, L.
621 (2020). Emerging investigator series: bacterial opportunistic pathogen gene markers in
622 municipal drinking water are associated with distribution system and household plumbing
623 characteristics. *Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology*, 6(11), 3032-
624 3043.
- 625 45. Cervero-Aragó, S., Rodríguez-Martínez, S., Puertas-Bennasar, A., & Araujo, R. M. (2015).
626 Effect of common drinking water disinfectants, chlorine and heat, on free *Legionella* and
627 amoebae-associated *Legionella*. *PloS one*, 10(8), e0134726.
- 628 46. States, S., Conley, L., Towner, S., Wolford, R., Stephenson, T., McNamara, A., Wadowsky,
629 R., & Yee, R. (1987). An alkaline approach to treating cooling towers for control of
630 *Legionella pneumophila*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 53(8), 1775-1779.
- 631 47. Wadowsky, R. M., Wolford, R., McNamara, A., & Yee, R. B. (1985). Effect of temperature,
632 pH, and oxygen level on the multiplication of naturally occurring *Legionella*
633 pneumophila in potable water. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 49(5), 1197-
634 1205.
- 635 48. Dey, R., & Ashbolt, N. J. (2020). *Legionella* infection during and after the COVID-19
636 pandemic. *ACS ES&T Water*, 1(1), 13-14.
- 637 49. Rhoads, W. J., & Hammes, F. (2021). Growth of *Legionella* during COVID-19 lockdown
638 stagnation. *Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology*, 7(1), 10-15.

- 639 50. William J. Rhoads, M. P., Kelsey J. Pieper, Tim Keane, Andrew J. Whelton, Franziska Rölli,
640 Caitlin R. Proctor, Marianne Grimard-Conea, . (2020). Responding to Water Stagnation in
641 Buildings with Reduced or No Water Use: A Framework for Building Managers. In:
642 American Water Works Association.
- 643 51. Vatansever, C., & Türetgen, I. (2015). Survival of Biofilm-Associated Legionella
644 pneumophila Exposed to Various Stressors. *Water environment research*, 87(3), 227-232.
- 645 52. Bédard, E., Laferrière, C., Déziel, E., & Prévost, M. (2018). Impact of stagnation and
646 sampling volume on water microbial quality monitoring in large buildings. *PloS one*,
647 13(6), e0199429.
- 648 53. US Environmental Protection Agency. (2022). Safe Drinking Water Information System
649 Federal Reporting Services. Retrieved from
650 <https://ofmpub.epa.gov/apex/sfdw/f?p=108:200>
- 651 54. Marchesi, I., Marchegiano, P., Bargellini, A., Cencetti, S., Frezza, G., Miselli, M., & Borella,
652 P. (2011). Effectiveness of different methods to control legionella in the water supply:
653 ten-year experience in an Italian university hospital. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 77(1),
654 47-51.
- 655 55. Srinivasan, A., Bova, G., Ross, T., Mackie, K., Paquette, N., Merz, W., & Perl, T. M. (2003).
656 A 17-Month Evaluation of a Chlorine Dioxide Water Treatment System to Control
657 Legionella Species in a Hospital Water Supply. *Infection Control & Hospital*
658 *Epidemiology*, 24(8), 575-579. doi:10.1086/502254
- 659 56. Kerbel, W. (2016). *Recognition, evaluation, and control of Legionella in building water*
660 *systems*: American Industrial Hygiene Association.

- 661 57. Dupuy, M., Mazoua, S., Berne, F., Bodet, C., Garrec, N., Herbelin, P., Ménard-Szcebara, F.,
662 Oberti, S., Rodier, M. H., Soreau, S., Wallet, F., & Héchard, Y. (2011). Efficiency of
663 water disinfectants against *Legionella pneumophila* and *Acanthamoeba*. *Water Res*,
664 45(3), 1087-1094. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2010.10.025
- 665 58. Cotruvo, J., Craun, G. F., & Hearne, N. (2019). *Providing safe drinking water in small*
666 *systems: Technology, operations, and economics*: Routledge.
- 667 59. Ditommaso, S., Giacomuzzi, M., Gentile, M., Moiraghi, A. R., & Zotti, C. M. (2010).
668 Effective environmental sampling strategies for monitoring *Legionella* spp contamination
669 in hot water systems. *American journal of infection control*, 38(5), 344-349.
- 670 60. Bargellini, A., Marchesi, I., Righi, E., Ferrari, A., Cencetti, S., Borella, P., & Rovesti, S.
671 (2011). Parameters predictive of *Legionella* contamination in hot water systems:
672 association with trace elements and heterotrophic plate counts. *Water Research*, 45(6),
673 2315-2321.
- 674 61. Pierre, D., Baron, J. L., Ma, X., Sidari, F. P., 3rd, Wagener, M. M., & Stout, J. E. (2019).
675 Water Quality as a Predictor of *Legionella* Positivity of Building Water Systems.
676 *Pathogens (Basel, Switzerland)*, 8(4). doi:10.3390/pathogens8040295
- 677 62. Wang, H., Bedard, E., Prevost, M., Camper, A. K., Hill, V. R., & Pruden, A. (2017).
678 Methodological approaches for monitoring opportunistic pathogens in premise plumbing:
679 A review. *Water Research*, 117, 68-86.

680 For Table of Contents Only



681