Spatially-resolved wastewater-based surveillance enables COVID-19 case localization across a university campus, and confirms lower SARS-CoV-2 RNA burden relative to the surrounding community

_	
5	Jangwoo Lee ^{1,2} , Nicole Acosta ¹ , Barbara J. Waddell ¹ , Kristine Du ¹ , Kevin Xiang ² , Jennifer Van
6	Doorn ² , Kashtin Low ² , Maria A. Bautista ² , Janine McCalder ^{1,2} , Xiaotian Dai ³ , Xuewen Lu ³ , Thierry
7	Chekouo ^{3,4} , Puja Pradhan ^{1,2} , Navid Sedaghat ^{1,2} , Chloe Papparis ^{1,2} , Alexander Buchner Beaudet ¹ ,
8	Jianwei Chen ² , Leslie Chan ² , Laura Vivas ² , Paul Westlund ⁵ , Srijak Bhatnagar ^{2,6} , September Stefani ¹ ,
9	Gail Visser ¹ , Jason Cabaj ⁷⁻¹⁰ , Gopal Achari ¹¹ , Rhonda G. Clark ² , Steve E. Hrudey ^{12,13} , Bonita E.
10	Lee ^{14,15} , Xiaoli Pang ^{12,16,17} , Brandan Webster ¹⁸ , William Amin Ghali ^{7,8,10,19} , Andre Gerald Buret ² , Tyler
11	Williamson ^{7,10,19} , Danielle A. Southern ^{7,10,19} , Jon Meddings ⁸ , Kevin Frankowski ²⁰ , Casey R.J. Hubert ² ,
12	Michael D. Parkins ^{1,8,10,21} *
13	
14	¹ Department of Microbiology, Immunology and Infectious Diseases, University of Calgary, Calgary,
15	Canada
16	² Department of Biological Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada
17	³ Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada
18	⁴ Division of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA
19	⁵ C.E.C. Analytics Ltd., Calgary, Alberta, Canada
20	⁶ Faculty of Science and Technology, Athabasca University, Athabasca, Alberta, Canada
21	⁷ Department of Community Health Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada
22	⁸ Department of Medicine, University of Calgary and Alberta Health Services, Calgary, Canada
23	⁹ Provincial Population & Public Health, Alberta Health Services, Calgary, Canada
24	NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice. ¹⁰ O'Brien Institute for Public Health, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

	25	¹¹ Department	of Civil	Engineering,	University of	Calgary,	Calgary,	Canada
--	----	--------------------------	----------	--------------	---------------	----------	----------	--------

- 26 ¹² Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta,
- 27 Canada
- 28 ¹³ Analytical and Environmental Toxicology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
- 29 ¹⁴ Department of Pediatrics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
- 30 ¹⁵ Women & Children's Health Research Institute; Li Ka Shing Institute of Virology, Edmonton,
- 31 Alberta, Canada
- 32 ¹⁶ Alberta Precision Laboratories, Public Health Laboratory, Alberta Health Services, Edmonton,
- 33 Alberta, Canada
- ¹⁷ Li Ka Shing Institute of Virology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
- ¹⁸ Occupational Health Staff Wellness, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada
- 36 ¹⁹ Centre for Health Informatics, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada
- 37 ²⁰ Advancing Canadian Water Assets, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada
- ²¹ Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Calgary and Alberta Health
- 39 Services, Calgary, Canada
- 40
- 41 *Corresponding Author:
- 42 Michael D. Parkins, Professor, Departments of Medicine and Microbiology, Immunology & Infectious
- 43 Diseases, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary.
- 44 Section Chief, Infectious Diseases, Calgary Zone, Alberta Health Services
- 45 Postal address: 3330 Hospital Drive, NW, Calgary, Alberta, T2N 2V5. CANADA.
- 46 e-mail: mdparkin@ucalgary.ca
- 47 Phone: 403-220-5951, Fax: 403-270-2772.

48 Abstract

49 Wastewater-based surveillance (WBS) has been established as a powerful tool that can guide health 50 policy at multiple levels of government. However, this technology has not been well assessed at more granular scales, including large work sites such as University campuses. Between August 2021-April 51 52 2022, we explored the occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater from multiple complimentary 53 sewer catchments and residential buildings spanning the University of Calgary's campus and how this 54 compared to levels from the municipal wastewater treatment plant servicing the campus. 55 Concentrations of wastewater SARS-CoV-2 N1 and N2 RNA varied significantly across six sampling sites – regardless of several normalization strategies – with certain catchments consistently 56 57 demonstrating values 1–2 orders higher than the others. Additionally, our comprehensive monitoring strategy enabled an estimation of the total burden of SARS-CoV-2 for the campus per capita, which 58 59 was significantly lower than the surrounding community ($p \le 0.01$). Real-time contact tracing data was used to confirm an association between wastewater SARS-CoV-2 burden and clinically confirmed 60 cases proving the potential of WBS as a tool for disease monitoring across worksites. Allele-specific 61 qPCR assays confirmed that variants across campus were representative of the community at large, 62 and at no time did emerging variants first debut on campus. This study demonstrates how WBS can 63 be efficiently applied to locate hotspots of disease activity at a very granular scale, and predict disease 64 burden across large, complex worksites. 65

66

67 Keywords: Wastewater-based epidemiology, worksite, Epidemiology, dormitories, residences,

68 wastewater treatment plant, nodal monitoring

Synopsis: 'This study establishes that wastewater-based surveillance with a node-based sampling
strategy can be used to passively monitor for disease, locate disease "hotspots" and approximate the
burden of infected individuals'

72 **1. Introduction**

73 To cope with the COVID-19 pandemic crisis, governments worldwide have implemented a range of measures to mitigate the spread of the virus, including large-scale clinical testing. While diagnostic 74 75 testing is tremendously important, it is limited in its capacity to perform population-level surveillance 76 owing to tremendous human and capital resources to run community testing centers.¹ In addition, clinical testing is biased by relying on voluntary participation and towards individuals with 77 symptomatic disease.² Wastewater-based surveillance (WBS) has emerged as a novel tool for 78 79 monitoring population health³ serving to complement clinical testing providing real-time data on the burden of disease in a monitored sewershed. Advantages of WBS include i) comprehensive, inclusive, 80 serial monitoring of the population with relatively low costs, and ii) unbiased data collection of 81 82 biological material from all society members including marginalized populations and those unable to access clinical testing.^{1,3,4} WBS for SARS-CoV-2 surveillance has been adopted worldwide⁵, 83 including Canada where it currently covers ~62 % of the country's population.⁶ Generally, WBS 84 programs monitor SARS-CoV-2 RNA in untreated sewage from wastewater treatment plants 85 (WWTPs) and thus assess disease burden at the level of an entire community. Community-based 86 87 studies have identified SARS-CoV-2 WBS as a leading indicator for cases (4-6 days), hospitalizations, and deaths.⁷⁻¹⁰ However, studies where monitoring has been performed at a more granular scale (e.g., 88 89 defined sub-catchments within a larger sewershed or specific facilities) are less common, and more 90 work is needed to clearly demonstrate the similar benefits in more local contexts with sewer 91 catchments that enable wastewater sampling corresponding to smaller zones. 92 Such granular scale WBS is challenging when it comes to selecting sampling locations because i) it requires detailed data on defined sampling nodes (e.g., each node and their GPS coordinates) and their 93 connectivity (to determine if overlapping catchments exist and may confound analysis), ii) nodes 94 95 should have enough wastewater flow to ensure sufficient volume during continuous collection. A

96 recent study in the City of Calgary evaluating neighborhood-scale sub-catchment monitoring (serving

populations of 13,000 to 73,000) within larger WWTP catchments (serving 290,000 to 1,048,000)

98 showcased the utility of node-based sampling in identifying specific sub-catchment(s) with

99	disproportionate infection burden. ¹¹ WBS at an even more granular scale (e.g., buildings) as a node-
100	based sampling strategy could help to specify more clearly 'hotspots' for infection transmission. ^{12, 13}
101	One area of focused WBS that has generated significant interest is university/college campuses.
102	University campuses consist of a vast array of building complexes where a high degree of social
103	interaction is expected between students, staff, and faculty. High rates of SARS-CoV-2 transmission
104	are possible in the absence of mitigating steps. While there have been university campus-wide studies,
105	spatial distribution of SARS-CoV-2 RNA within the university campus, and studies enabling a
106	comprehensive assessment of the total disease burden have not as yet been performed. Thus far,
107	University-based studies assessing SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater have primarily focused on
108	longitudinal analysis rather than spatially resolved analysis ^{14, 15} or only on individual
109	dormitories/residential buildings ¹⁶⁻¹⁸ , limiting their impact.
110	Herein we describe a longitudinal nodal-based WBS monitoring program for SARS-CoV-2 RNA at
111	the University of Calgary (UofC), Calgary, Alberta, Canada. The main campus is situated on 530-
112	acres in the Northwest quadrant of the city and were monitored using WBS from Aug 31, 2021-Apr
113	24, 2022, along with the municipal WWTP which serves the campus. Our primary research objectives
114	were to i) locate specific sub-catchment(s) within the University where SARS-CoV-2 RNA exists in
115	differential abundance and associate this with COVID-19 case occurrence, and ii) determine the
116	relative risk of COVID-19 on campus, as inferred by SARS-CoV-2 wastewater burden, relative to the
117	surrounding community. We hypothesized that i) higher abundance of SARS-CoV-2 RNA would be
118	found in buildings with higher social connectivity and that this would be associated with COVID-19
119	reported cases; and, ii) the abundance of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in campus wastewater would be lower
120	than the surrounding community given a highly educated population, campus mandate for universal
121	masking, a high prevalence of accessible hand hygiene product through campus, and a vaccine
122	mandate (or weekly negative test) required to attend campus.

123 **2. Materials and Methods**

124 2.1. Defining sampling nodes across the UofC sewershed

125 UofC is among the ten largest Universities in Canada with >26,000 full-time undergraduate students, 6,000 graduate students and 1,800 academic and 3,200 non-academic staff.¹⁹ The main campus is 126 127 situated in Northwest Calgary on a parcel of 530-acres (2.13 km²). Campus sampling locations were chosen to deliver a minimum number of manhole-accessible sites providing maximum coverage of 128 129 campus buildings, using GIS-based analysis of the sewer pipe network (Fig. 1). Residence halls were also included based upon presence of an accessible sampling location within the building's plumbing 130 network capturing >50% of the residential areas of that building. This was accomplished by manually 131 reviewing the engineering drawings of the dormitory plumbing systems, visually inspecting each 132 133 prospective sampling location and then selecting the site that optimally captured the building's wastewater in a safe, access-controlled manner. 134

Three nodes were selected to capture the building complexes in the Northwest (NW), Northeast (NE), 135 136 and South (SO) zones of the campus (Fig. 1). Six buildings drain into both NW and NE within these 137 catchments and are indicated as MIX (see Fig. 1; colored in orange). Both residence halls (RH1 and 138 RH2) are within the NW catchment thus enabling even more granular scale sampling nodes. The entire 139 monitoring program captured 7 residential halls, 39 lecture/research facilities and 5 recreational 140 facilities (including dining/fitness buildings) (Fig. 1). Our monitoring catchments cover >80% of the total residence population (i.e., those living in dormitories) and >83 % of the campus aerial footprint. 141 Calgary is Canada's fourth largest city by population and its third most ethnically diverse.^{11, 20} Three 142 WWTPs serve an estimated 1,441,268 people.²¹ UofC falls exclusively within the catchment zone of 143 the largest WWTP, serving 1,047,662 individuals and receiving 303.7-604.6 ML/day. 144

145 2.2. Wastewater Collection

146 Wastewater samples were collected from the sites described above 2-3× per week from August 31,

147 2021–April 30, 2022, using a workflow described previously.^{11, 12} In short, CEC Analytics V1 (C.E.C

148 Analytics, Canada) and ISCO 6712 (Teledyne ISCO, USA) autosamplers collected 2L (CEC) or 10L

149 (ISCO) 24-hours composite samples that were stored at 4°C and transported to Advancing Canadian

- 150 Water Assets (ACWA). Upon arrival, samples were thoroughly mixed and aliquoted into 50mL
- 151 centrifuge tubes for downstream analysis. More details on field sampling techniques are described in

the Supplement.

- 153 2.3. Sample processing and RNA extraction
- 154 Sample processing and RNA extraction was performed following established workflows.^{11, 12, 22, 23} In

brief, 40mL of thoroughly mixed wastewater subsamples was added to 50mL falcon tubes prefilled

156 with 9.5 g of sterile NaCl and 400ul of TE buffer and were then spiked with 200µL of Bovine

157 Coronavirus (BCoV) (final concentration: 5×10^5 50% tissue-culture-infective dose (TCID₅₀) per mL)

as an internal control and vortexed for 30 seconds. Solids were then removed via vacuum filtration

through a 5 μm polyvinylidene difluoride membrane, where samples were filtered directly into 40ml

160 of 70% ethanol. This solution was then passed through a Zymo SpinTM III-P silica column (Zymo

161 Research, USA). ²⁴ More details can be found in the Supplement.

162 2.4. Quantitative RT-qPCR

RT-qPCR assays were performed following established workflows.^{11, 12, 24} In short, two regions of the 163 nucleocapsid gene (N1 and N2) were used to quantify total SARS-CoV-2 RNA copies/mL in every 164 wastewater sample.²⁵⁻²⁷ We also analyzed variants of concern (VOC), including Delta, Omicron 165 (BA.1, and BA.2) using the N200 multiplex assay^{24,28} or 69/70del assay²⁹ for a subset of samples for 166 WWTP (44 samples), RH1 (18 samples), SO (18 samples), NW (17 samples), and NE (9 samples) 167 from November 28, 2021-April 27, 2022. BCoV (Bovine Coronavirus) was analyzed as an internal 168 spike control, and PMMoV (Pepper Mild Mottle Virus) was analyzed as a potential human feces 169 biomarker.^{12, 23, 30} All samples were analyzed in triplicate, including non-template controls for each 170 run using QuantStudio-5 Real-Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems, USA). Samples with a 171 quantification cycle (Cq)<40 were considered positive.^{11, 12} Key quality parameters (i.e., efficiency, R² 172 173 of regression curve, Y-intercept, and slope) for qPCR standard curves are shown in Table S1. Detailed

information (e.g., oligonucleotide sequences and thermal cycling conditions) can be found in previous
publications.^{11, 12, 24} The raw data were subjected to further quality control and performed similarly to
previously published works(see Supplementary Results 2.1).^{11, 12, 24} Finally, concentrations for N1,
N2, and PMMoV were averaged weekly for each monitoring location. Those averaged concentrations
(for each week) were used in most downstream analyses, and the data presented in Dataset S1.

179 **2.5.** Chemical analysis

- 180 In addition to PMMoV, a total of five wastewater cations (sodium, chloride, potassium, magnesium,
- and calcium) were chosen to explore their association with SARS-CoV-2 as potential normalization
- 182 markers for human activity. These cations are associated with human excreta, especially urine 31,32 and
- 183 potentially useful for correcting possible underestimation of SARS-CoV-2 levels due to dilution
- 184 effect^{33, 34}, which could be particularly important in small catchments. Relationships between N1 and
- 185 N2 gene abundance and wastewater cations were examined for samples collected during August 31,
- 186 2021 to January 04, 2022 (n=13 to 36 depending on sampling site). To analyze cations, wastewater
- 187 samples were thoroughly homogenized, and filtered through 1.5µm dried pre-rinsed Grade 934-AH®
- 188 RTU glass microfiber filters (Whatman, UK) by 12mL. The filtrate was filtered again through a
- 189 0.45µm PVDF membrane UNIFLO® syringe filter (Whatman, UK), distributed to a tube for ion
- 190 chromatography, and then stored at 4°C until analysis. Those processed samples were analyzed using
- 191 Metrohm 930 Compact Ion Chromatography Flex (Metrohm, Switzerland).

192 2.6. Modelling expected COVID-19 cases per capita across UofC Campus

Cases per capita in UofC main campus (*CPC_{UofC}*) was calculated using raw (i.e. un-normalized)
SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations according to the following relationship referring to (Eq.S4) in the
Supplement

196
$$C_{WWTP}: C_{UofC} = \frac{n_{WWTP}}{N_{WWTP}}: CPC_{UofC}$$

197 i.e.,
$$CPC_{UofC} = CPC_{WWTP} \cdot \frac{C_{UofC}}{C_{WWTP}}$$
 (Eq.1)

198 Where, N_{WWTP} indicates the total population in the catchment area for WWTP (n=1,047,622¹¹; 199 n_{WWTP} is incident number of new cases occurring daily (i.e., confirmed COVID-19 infected 200 individuals) in the catchment area for WWTP; C_{UofC} and C_{WWTP} indicate concentration of SARS-201 CoV2 RNA for UofC and WWTP respectively, and could be calculated according to (Eq.S6) in the 202 Supplement.

To mitigate uncertainty which may arise from possible differences in human excreta across samples, CPC_{UofC} was also calculated using normalized SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration according to the following relationship referring to (Eq.S5) in the Supplement.

206
$$\frac{C_{WWTP}}{C_{e-WWTP}}: \frac{C_{UofC}}{C_{e-UofC}} = \frac{n_{WWTP}}{N_{WWTP}}: CPC_{UofC}$$

207 i.e.,
$$CPC_{UofC} = CPC_{WWTP} \cdot \frac{C_{UofC} \cdot C_{e-WWTP}}{C_{WWTP} \cdot C_{e-UofC}}$$
 (Eq. 2)

208 Where, C_{e-UofC} , and C_{e-WWTP} indicate concentration of human excreta surrogates for UofC and 209 WWTP, and could be calculated according to (Eq. S6) in the Supplement.

210 2.7. Uncertainty analysis

As wastewater flow data for UofC was unavailable, models described in 2.6 rely on assuming that 211 flow quantities are proportional to catchment surface areas (i.e., total footprint of all buildings) (see 212 Supplementary Method 1.3 in the Supplement). We assumed that uncertainty in this model derives 213 mostly from variability of gross surface area in prediction of flow quantity. Therefore, prediction 214 215 errors from these sources were propagated using a Monte-Carlo randomization simulation adapted from other relevant works.^{35, 36} The term surface area (A) was randomized by multiplying the 216 217 uncertainty factor (a) which is variable ranging from 0.2 (20%) to 2.0 (200%) assuming that the actual ratio of flow quantity lies within these boundaries. 218

219
$$V_{SO}: V_{NW}: V_{NE-MIX} = a_1 \cdot A_{SO}: a_2 \cdot A_{NW}: a_3 \cdot A_{NE-MIX}$$

220 Where, a_1 , a_2 , and a_3 are random variables ranging from 0.1 to 2.0, also are independent from each

221 other.

222	The simulation was repeated 1,000 times, and interquartile ranges (IQR, $Q1 - Q3$) for each prediction
223	value are displayed as error bars in the model. Furthermore, the p-value for permutation test was
224	defined as 'the ratio of counts where $CPC_{UofC} > CPC_{WWTP}$ to 1,000 (= the number of simulation
225	trials)' for each time point. Only time-paired data points were compared between each site. The
226	modelling was performed using R (v4.1.2), and related datasets/R codes will be available in the first
227	author's GitHub page (<u>https://github.com/myjackson</u>) upon acceptance of this manuscript.
228	2.8. Clinical case documentation
229	Information on city-wide, new daily cases of clinically confirmed COVID-19 (patient swabs
230	confirmed with a clinical RT-qPCR) were provided by a single comprehensive public health system,
231	Alberta Health Services (AHS) via the Centre for Health Informatics online COVID Tracker
232	(https://covid-tracker.chi-csm.ca/). The information was gathered between August 31, 2022, and
233	March 31, 2022, and a subset of this data (i.e., August 31, 2021 – January 04) was subjected to further
234	analysis. New cases were binned by individual postal codes (using the first three of six digits) as an
235	indicator of the home address of newly diagnosed cases. Cases were then assigned to the appropriate
236	WWTP serving their primary residence.
237	Comparative analyses were conducted across two distinct time periods; Period A (Aug 31, 2021-Dec
238	12, 2021) and Period B (Dec 13, 2021-April 25, 2021) owing to fundamental changes occurring
239	through the pandemic. In particular, during the Omicron waves (Period B, defined when the first case
240	was documented in Calgary), clinical case occurrence for the first time vastly exceeded the ability of
241	health services to screen and detect the population.
242	Documenting campus-associated confirmed-COVID-19 cases and ascribing them to a specific primary
243	building was performed in real-time by the University of Calgary's Occupational Health and Staff
244	Wellness for students and employees who self-reported a positive COVID-19 test during the pandemic
245	period from September 2021. Confirmed cases were excluded from attending campus for a minimum
246	of 10 days (reduced to 5 days after January 3 rd , 2022) and complete symptom resolution. The

- information gathered between September 21, 2021–April 2022 was used to trace the primary buildings
- 248 where individuals with confirmed COVID-19 were located. We assigned study-specific personal

249 identifiers to each affected individual and avoided personal identifying information. The information gathered in the original report includes: i) 'date of positive test result', ii) 'date university informed of 250 251 illness', iii) 'recent university location(s) visited and the date when the person visited that location', 252 and iv) 'date of onset of symptoms', etc. However, in some instances case information was not always 253 fully declared (i.e., the recent university location(s) visited, and the date(s) when the person visited), 254 and such cases were excluded. As a result, the information from 463 out of 721 reported individuals 255 was used in downstream analyses. The raw data is not shown for ethical consideration, but could be 256 provided upon reasonable request to the authors. The full set of processed data is shown in Dataset S2. 257 The patient identifiers (PID) are not known to anyone outside our research group, so individuals 258 remain anonymous.

259 To model the movement of confirmed COVID-19 infected individuals across campus, we relied on 260 self-reported activity tracing. To identify individual buildings where COVID-19 positive individuals 261 visited, we first counted the number of positive individuals who visited each building using the information iii) above. For example, for each building, the recently visited PIDs were listed (Dataset 262 S2). Then, we counted the total affected-visits for each building. In this way, each PID was often 263 264 counted multiple times in situations where the person visited multiple locations or one location on 265 multiple days during the monitoring period. As the majority of SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding occurs in the few days before and after symptom onset^{12, 22}, the visits ± 2 days of the 'date of onset of 266 267 symptoms' were considered valid, otherwise excluded in the following analysis. Total affected-visits 268 is named 'number of cases'. Finally, the number of cases was subjected to further analysis. For 269 instance, the cases were averaged weekly, and aggregated by monitoring catchment for each 270 monitoring week (Fig. S5).

During the monitoring period, on-campus residents (i.e. those residing full-time in dormitories) who were confirmed as COVID-19 positive were quarantined according to the following principles: i) if a case was reported by an individual living in a single unit with a bathroom– not shared with another, the individual was isolated in place (a total of 10 residential halls, CR, YA, CD, GL, KA, AU, RU, IH, OL, or VC (Fig. 1)), ii) if all occupants of a shared apartment are positive, they would continue to isolate in their same apartment in their residential hall, and iii) if the positive individual shares an

	277	apartment with some	one who is not als	o positive, they	were moved to	another suite.	VC for their
--	-----	---------------------	--------------------	------------------	---------------	----------------	--------------

- isolation period. Our monitoring program included most of the isolation places (i.e., a total of 8 out of
- 279 10 places, CR, YA, CD, GL, KA, AU, RU, and IH; see Fig. 1).

280 **2.9.** Statistical analysis

281	Kruskal-Wallis test followed by a post-hoc Wilcoxon rank-sum test was performed to test if there
282	were significant differences between groups. For pairwise tests, p-values were adjusted using the
283	Benjamini-Hochberg method. Additionally, Spearman correlation analysis was performed to test if
284	there were significant relationships between the two factors. Finally, Fisher's exact test was
285	implemented to test the potential association between two variables (i.e., SARS-CoV-2 signals versus
286	campus-associated COVID-19 cases). One-sided test was employed under the expectation that those
287	two might be positively associated. Then, Fisher's exact test was repeated for each pair of wastewater
288	SARS-CoV-2 signals (N1 or N2) against cases reported; a week earlier (-1 week) cases, those on the
289	same week (+0 week), or the week following (+1 week) under the hypothesis that wastewater signals
290	serve as an early warning sign of COVID-19 cases. The key rationale was explained in more detail in
291	the Supplementary Method 1.5. All analyses were done using R version 4.1.2., and related datasets/R
292	codes will be available in the first author's GitHub page (<u>https://github.com/myjackson</u>) upon
293	acceptance of this manuscript.

294 **2.10.** Ethics

295 This study received approval from the Conjoint Research Health Ethics Board of the University of296 Calgary (REB20–1544).

297 **3. Results**

298 3.1. Longitudinal tracking wastewater-borne SARS-CoV-2 RNA across campus

Between August 3, 2021–April 30, 2022, a total of 58 (RH1) and 18 (RH2) samples were obtained
from the residence halls, 45 (NE), 48 (SO), and 42 (NW) samples were obtained from the campus

catchments, and 89 samples were obtained from WWTP, providing 12 – 25 data points per location
after being averaged weekly. The lower number of samples collected for campus locations primarily
relates to more complicated access for these sampling points (e.g., manholes in the open (public) area
for the campus sampling points versus either within buildings or from the WWTP facility. The outdoor
locations (manholes) also experienced a higher rate of failure to collect especially during cold weather
(<-20 °C) for campus sites.

307 During this time the City of Calgary experienced three successive "waves" of COVID-19

308 (corresponding to the fourth, fifth and sixth waves since the start of the pandemic). Tracked via

309 wastewater, the first of these waves during the monitoring period peaked on September 06, 2021,

followed by January 03 and April 18, 2022. Allele-specific PCR to detect VOC in WWTP samples

311 confirmed it was the Delta variant that was dominant during the fourth-wave (peaking September 06,

312 2021), and Omicron lineages were dominant during the fifth (BA.1 peaking January 03, 2022) and

sixth waves of this study (BA.2 peaking April 18, 2022, the third wave in this study) (Fig. S6).

314 Notably, the burden of wastewater-detected SARS-CoV-2 N1 and N2 for the two latter waves caused

315 by Omicron lineages vastly exceeded that of Delta.

316 SARS-CoV-2 N1 and N2 concentrations across campus monitoring sites generally, but not always

317 mirrored those of the community WWTP (Fig. 2). Values from WWTP were higher than those across

318 campus, with some exceptions. While the highest N1 and N2 values observed from campus

319 monitoring sites (i.e., SO, NE, and NW) occurred during the peaks of each wave experienced in the

320 community, random spikes in N1 and N2 also occurred during community troughs and appeared

321 randomly suggesting brief periods of increased disease burden. Analysis of VOC across UofC campus

322 mirrored those for WWTP – Delta was dominant in Period-A (Aug 31, 2021-Dec 12, 2021) for those

323 locations where data was available (i.e., SO, and NW) (Fig. S7 & S8) and Omicron lineages were

dominant in Period-B for SO, NW, NE, and RH1 while. In no instances did the emerging VOC occur

325 disproportionally within the campus environment relative to that of the community.

326 **3.2.** Correlating wastewater SARS-CoV-2 RNA with clinically confirmed cases

A median of 153 (IQR 73 - 240) cases per day were clinically confirmed across the catchment of the 327 328 WWTP during the period monitored (August 31, 2021 – January 04, 2022; a total of 36 data points). These cases were correlated with raw-, and also normalized-SARS-CoV-2 N1 and N2 signals using 329 different investigational markers (i.e., PMMoV, sodium, chloride, potassium, calcium, and 330 331 magnesium) for the corresponding date ranges. The raw (i.e., un-normalized) N1 and N2 signals (i.e., 332 copies/mL) correlated with confirmed cases the best (where N2 was more sensitive than N1) 333 suggesting biomarkers for normalization did not denoise variability associated with human excreta 334 over time. However, for comparing different smaller catchment results with each other, we expected 335 the variability in human wastes between sites could be large, especially when the characteristics of those populations may be very different, e.g., residential versus non-residential areas of the campus. 336 337 Accordingly, while we used raw SARS-CoV-2 concentrations as our primary outcome for intra-site 338 comparisons, PMMoV and ion normalization were assessed as a confirmatory secondary outcome 339 measure.

340 3.3. Comparing SARS-CoV-2 RNA signals across different sampling locations

341 Comparison across different locations was conducted for each of the two separate periods, for instance 342 Period-A (Aug 31, 2021-Dec 12, 2021) and B (Dec 13, 2021-April 25, 2021). There were significant 343 differences in both raw and normalized wastewater SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations between monitoring sites during the study (Period-A to -B) based on Kruskal-Wallis test (p<0.001). In Period-344 345 A, a post-hoc analysis using Wilcoxon-rank sum test revealed that SARS-CoV-2 RNA N1 and N2 346 concentrations in campus locations were 1-2 orders of magnitude lower than the community WWTP 347 $(p \le 0.005)$ (Table 1 & Fig. 3). Furthermore, there were significant differences in both N1 and N2 348 concentrations between campus locations. For instance, the values for NE were 1-2 orders of magnitude lower than NW and SO, and such difference was non-parametrically significant using 349 350 Wilcoxon rank-sum tests for NW ($p \le 0.038$) (Table 1). SARS-CoV-2 N1 and N2 concentrations for two dormitories (i.e., RH2 and RH1) were similar to NE ($p \ge 0.428$) but lower than SO ($p \le 0.026$) and 351

NW ($p \le 0.038$), based on Wilcoxon rank-sum test (Table 1). In general, normalized trends of SARS-352 CoV-2 burden between sites mirrored those of raw values (Table S3). The normalized N1 and N2 353 354 concentrations for WWTP were higher than for all the campus locations using post-hoc Wilcoxon rank-sum test in all comparisons (p≤0.008) (Table S3). Among university campus locations, the 355 normalized N1 and N2 values for NE were lower than NW or SO in many instances (Table S3). 356 357 In Period-B, the N1 and N2 concentrations increased considerably compared to Period-A at WWTP and across campus (Fig. 3). However, the values for the campus were still significantly lower than for 358 359 WWTP for both N1 and N2 based on a post-hoc Wilcoxon rank-sum test ($p \le 0.013$; see Table 1). The degree of increase for RH1 was the most pronounced among all monitored sites. For instance, the 360 median N1 concentration for RH1, and SO samples profoundly increased, for instance by >2 order of 361 magnitude (from 0.0 to 184.7 copies/mL for RH1; from 7.6 to 369.8 copies/mL), while the median 362 363 concentration for other campus locations increased only by approximately 1 order of magnitude (from 364 0.0 to 19.4 copies/mL for NE; from 8.1 to 94.3 copies/mL for NW). In all cases, the normalized 365 concentrations for SO were significantly higher than for NE based on Wilcoxon rank-sum tests in all 366 cases using N1 ($p \le 0.025$), and most cases for N2. The normalized concentrations for WWTP were 367 significantly higher than all the UofC campus locations in all cases using N2 (p≤0.014), and in many 368 cases except for chloride, sodium, and potassium using N1 ($p\leq 0.036$) (Table S4).

369 3.4. SARS-CoV-2 RNA measured in campus wastewater catchments correlates with regional case 370 occurrence

The association between COVID-19-confirmed clinical cases and wastewater-N1 or N2 concentrations was tested using a one-sided Fisher's exact test under the null hypothesis that those two factors were independent for each location (Table 2). An association between cases and a concentration was observed at most monitoring sites (i.e., p<0.05 at RH1, NE, or SO) for samples collected before (-1 week) and the same week (+0 week) using either N1 or N2 as an indicator. As expected, given the mandatory exclusion of confirmed cases from campus following the diagnosis, samples collected the week (+1 week) did not associate.

378 3.5. Wastewater-measured SARS-CoV-2 enabled estimation of COVID-19 cases per capita across 379 UofC campus

380 COVID-19 cases per capita for the entire UofC monitored catchments comprising NW, NE, and SO during the entire monitoring period (both -A and -B) were estimated according to (Eq. 1) using raw 381 concentrations, and also (Eq. 2) using normalized concentrations. SARS-CoV-2 N2 data was used in 382 this analysis due to its stronger association with clinically confirmed cases (see 3.2, also Table S2). 383 Following this, the modelled aggregate SARS-CoV-2 burden for UofC was compared with the values 384 385 for the surrounding community (i.e., WWTP catchment) (Fig. 4). For most time points, cases per capita in the community (as measured at WWTP) were significantly higher than for UofC (p < 0.001). 386 387 The results using different methods of potential normalization generally mirrored the raw 388 concentrations (Table 3). Overall, median predicted incident cases per capita (cases per 100,000 scaling factor) for UofC was 389 5.9-fold lower than for WWTP using raw concentration (p<0.001), and 2.2–5.2-fold lower than for 390 WWTP using normalized concentrations (≤ 0.01). For instance, the median cases per 100,000 was 8.8 391 392 (IOR 6.9-14.8) for the WWTP catchment, and predicted to be 1.5 (IOR 0.5-2.7) for the entire UofC 393 monitoring catchment using raw SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration. The median values of cases per 394 capita per 100,000 for UofC when assessed using normalized concentrations were 1.8 (IQR 0.7-3.3) 395 for PMMoV, 1.7 (IQR 0.6-3.1) for calcium, 2.9 (IQR 1.0-5.3) for chloride, 1.7 (IQR 0.6-3.1) for 396 magnesium, 2.6 (IQR 0.9-4.7) for potassium, and 4.0 (IQR 1.4-7.6) for sodium.

397 4. Discussion

4.1. A nodal-based sampling approach reveals 'hotspots' for COVID-19 cases within the campus

399 This study demonstrated that WBS using spatially resolved node-based sampling approach enables

400 SARS-CoV-2 activity to be located and quantified across a large University campus on a granular

401 scale. Such an approach has previously been proven effective in cities at a neighborhood scale.¹¹ One

402 of the challenges for granular scale monitoring is identifying sampling nodes that adequately cover

403 most of the targeted community. This requires a careful analysis of geographic information of involved sewersheds and assessing the connectivity between sampling nodes so that the sub-404 405 catchments (for each node) can be collected comprehensively. Other studies have explored SARS-406 CoV-2 WBS in individual buildings across university campuses. However, those studies either targeted residences and dormitories^{16, 18, 37} or combined residential and non-residential buildings in a 407 very limited fashion.^{15, 17, 38} A comprehensive longitudinal assessment of a campus community or 408 409 large work facility has not previously been performed. Our approach is unique relative to other studies 410 because our monitoring catchments cover the vast majority of buildings (>83%) on a 530-acres campus through the deployment of a modest number of sample collection devices. 411 SO and NW portions of the campus consistently showed high levels of SARS-CoV-2 using raw and 412 normalized data, demonstrating hotspots for COVID-19 occurrences. For example, RH1, a dormitory, 413 414 could be one of the buildings where highest disease incidence occurs and disproportionately contribute to a high level of SARS-CoV-2 signals for NW, at least during Period-B (see Fig. 3). This is consistent 415 with other reports demonstrating high secondary COVID-19 case occurrence in dormitories.^{16, 17, 38} 416 417 The catchment SO includes three additional residence halls (KA, AU, and RU; see pink sections of 418 Fig. 1), and these may be a reason why SO demonstrated particularly high levels of SARS-CoV-2 419 signals, especially during Period-B (Fig. 3). Unlike NW and SO, the catchment area for NE does not 420 include any such buildings, rather is predominately comprised of lecture halls and administration offices - this might be one of the reasons why the level of SARS-CoV-2 concentration for NE was low 421 422 relative to SO or NW. The ability to discern the building(s) with the highest number of cases per 423 capita however, is unknowable in this study. WBS at even more granular scales (i.e., building level) 424 could be followed for those specific building types within catchments of interests, for instance NW and SO in this study, during disease outbreaks, although this would significantly increase the cost of 425 426 active monitoring by introducing many more nodes. 427 Comparing the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater across different sampling locations, 428 makes it possible to locate the catchment(s) where infected individuals are disproportionally located.

429 However, for such cross-site comparisons, there is a possibility that target analyte abundance could be

430 underestimated in catchment(s) where a high volume of water use relative to individuals is expected

(e.g., non-residential buildings). For this reason, we used normalized concentration as a secondary 431 outcome measure when comparing SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations across different locations so 432 433 that we could, in theory, compensate for such underestimation, especially in NE. Other studies have also found that human-specific surrogates did not necessarily improve correlation between confirmed 434 cases and normalized SARS-CoV-2 signals using longitudinal data^{39, 40}, similar to our own 435 observations. Another study demonstrated that while normalization using human excretory surrogates 436 did not improve overall correlation of longitudinal data, it still significantly improved the correlation 437 when using "pooled" data for 12 different communities.⁴¹ This implies that whether normalization 438 439 improves the correlation between wastewater data and clinical cases depends on site, thus site-specific 440 longitudinal assessments should take precedence.

441 4.2. Campus-wide WBS is positively associated with confirmed COVID-19 case occurrence 442 demonstrating its potential for disease monitoring

A positive association between COVID-19 cases and wastewater signals in the majority of instances 443 444 (see 3.4 and Table 2) indicates that WBS has the potential for passive disease monitoring at a granular 445 scale. This positive association has previously been reported in other targeted, granular scale 446 monitoring programs. For instance, a positive correlation between wastewater SARS-CoV-2 levels and confirmed cases was observed in hospitals^{12, 42} and university dormitories³⁸, and also larger 447 building complexes.¹⁴ However, adapting WBS as an early warning for COVID-19 cases on a more 448 449 granular scale may not provide the same lead time relative to clinical diagnoses as was observed early in the pandemic now that testing capacity has markedly increased. Indeed, the early warning scenario 450 (-1 week) did not lead to lower p-values relative to the no time-lag scenario when comparing 451 452 confirmed COVID-19 cases and wastewater SARS-CoV-2 in this campus monitoring program. A 453 similar observation was reported in another study where node-based sampling strategies were applied for monitoring different neighborhoods at a range of scales (from 853 to 9.094 serving populations) in 454 Illinois, USA.⁴³ The authors reported that a correlation between wastewater signals and confirmed 455 456 cases varied significantly by neighborhood, and an early warning scenario (-1 week) did not necessarily result in a better correlation.⁴³ 457

Similar to other studies correlating wastewater measured SARS-CoV-2 with COVID-19 disease 458 occurrence was our reliance on clinically confirmed cases to build models. Individuals with 459 460 asymptomatic and pauci-symptomatic disease are thusly not captured in this syndromic surveillancedriven manner.^{44, 45} As university campuses generally comprise a younger cohort relative to the 461 general population, the number of asymptomatic infections is expected to have been higher.⁴⁶ 462 Furthermore, as case reporting to University staff was voluntary, it is possible that not all confirmed 463 464 cases were properly reported. As data was collected by university staff with the primary intent of 465 actionability, cases with missing data (i.e., those with inaccurate dates and details on campus 466 associated movements) were not necessarily followed up on resulting in an incomplete dataset. 467 Finally, the analysis of both wastewater samples and the corresponding campus-confirmed clinical 468 cases were confounded by the use of weekly-aggregate data comparisons. As daily reported cases were discontinuous, and at times relatively low (median=1 and IQR=0-3 for NW; median=0 and IQR=0-1 469 470 for NE and SO; med=0 and IQR=0-0 for RH1 and 2), the paired comparison between wastewater signals and reported cases was difficult for campus sites, which is why comparisons were made using 471 472 weekly-aggregate signals. Daily comparisons would allow for a more accurate analysis of the potential 473 lead time generated through granular WBS, however, such an approach would also create considerable 474 operational and cost challenges.

475 **4.3. SARS-CoV-2** activity across University campus was lower than the surrounding community

Our results in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 demonstrated a much lower viral burden in wastewater across the campus relative to the surrounding community. The relatively low SARS-CoV-2 burden within UofC campus wastewater likely relates to strict COVID-19 mitigating measures mandated within the campus. The 'COVIDSafe Campus' run by the university during the pandemic⁴⁷ included mandated proof of vaccination (or documented weekly-negative testing) in order to attend campus, an enforced universal masking mandate and wide availability of hand hygiene product, and a consistent effort for increasing public awareness of COVID-19.

Recent studies have suggested that similar COVID-19 mitigating strategies employed at other 483 university campuses have likewise been effective and that universities were not a large source of 484 485 disease propagation. For instance, a SARS-CoV-2 phylogenetic study performed at the University of Michigan, USA, revealed that the descendants of SARS-CoV-2 from student cases were rarely found 486 in the community during the next wave.⁴⁸ In another study performed at the University of Cambridge, 487 UK, the authors revealed that the majority of SARS-CoV-2 genomes from students originated from a 488 489 single genetic cluster – the cases occurred after a single event (e.g., social gathering outside the campus), suggesting a limited introduction of the virus into the community.⁴⁹ Likewise, we did not 490 491 observe new VOC occur earlier within the campus than the general community. Collectively these studies suggest that the intensive efforts to reduce forward transmission of COVID-19 adopted in 492 higher education settings could be applied to other contexts to mitigate further disease spread in those 493 494 environments.

495 **4.4. Other notable limitations**

There are several other noteworthy limitations of this study. For instance, toileting patterns do vary considerably across space and time. In particular, there have been reports documenting that many individuals prefer to defecate at home⁵⁰, and these active cases would therefore be underrepresented in work-based studies. Accordingly, work (or school)-based studies such as those monitoring campuses may underestimate the true burden of infected populations within. We attempted to mitigate for this factor by assessing SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration both raw, and normalized against fecal and population surrogates, where we observed the same general trends.

Furthermore, the monitoring in this study was performed when not all students and employees had fully returned to in-person learning/work; a small number continued to telecommute from home and, therefore, may not fully represent the entire university community. Thus, care has to be taken when interpreting our results – the results in this study do not indicate for instance that university members tend to have lower disease infection rates then populations outside the campus, but rather suggest that university campus is not the place where high cases per capita exist, or diseases were contained

509 relatively well 'within the campus'. Finally, wastewater-based monitoring at a granular scale may not 510 fully represent actual case burden within the catchment because individual confounding differences 511 may have a larger effect relative to community monitoring. Viral shedding may vary by individual⁵¹ and the chances of capturing shedding events when autosamplers were being operated are highly 512 stochastic, etc. We attempted to address this issue by employing 24-hours composite sampling over a 513 "grab" sampling strategy, and by achieving a reasonably high sample size (i.e., up to 35 points for 514 515 weekly aggregated signals from 89 individual data points) followed by various statistics (e.g., non-516 parametric tests such as Kruskal-Wallis, Wilcoxon tests). In this way, our wastewater results could 517 provide an "approximate" to the case per capita existing in each monitoring catchment. 518 To our knowledge, this is the first study to comprehensively assess SARS-CoV-2 (and VOC) burden across a large university campus using a spatially resolved, nodal based strategy. We have confirmed 519 520 the potential of this platform technology to perform population health monitoring through wastewater analysis. This study has established wastewater-based surveillance is positively associated with 521 522 clinical cases at a granular scale, suggesting it can be used synergistically with contact tracing in order to identify 'hotspots' for COVID-19 occurrence across campus (i.e., building). This study also 523 524 confirmed the markedly lower rates of SARS-CoV-2 across campus, lending support to the importance of restrictive measures in mitigating COVID-19's potential for spread across worksites. 525

526 Acknowledgements

527 This study was supported by Alberta Health and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. Dr.

528 Jangwoo Lee received salary support from a University of Calgary Eyes High Fellowship. The authors

- are grateful for the assistance of the staff of City of Calgary Water Services and C.E.C. analytics for
- training assistance in sewershed access and sample collection.

531 Statement of Conflict

532 P.W. is the owner and operator of CEC Analytics, who developed the autosamplers used in this study.

533 The remainder of authors declare no competing financial interests.

References 534

- (1) Hart, O. E.; Halden, R. U. Computational analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 surveillance by 535 wastewater-based epidemiology locally and globally: Feasibility, economy, opportunities and 536
- 537 challenges. Science of the Total Environment 2020, 730, 138875.
- (2) O'Keeffe, J. Wastewater-based epidemiology: current uses and future opportunities as a public 538 health surveillance tool. Environmental Health Review 2021, 64 (3), 44-52.
- 539
- 540 (3) Sims, N.; Kasprzyk-Hordern, B. Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology: 541 monitoring infectious disease spread and resistance to the community level. Environment 542 international 2020, 139, 105689.
- 543 (4) Polo, D.; Quintela-Baluja, M.; Corbishley, A.; Jones, D. L.; Singer, A. C.; Graham, D. W.; 544 Romalde, J. L. Making waves: Wastewater-based epidemiology for COVID-19-approaches and
- 545 challenges for surveillance and prediction. Water Research 2020, 186, 116404.
- (5) Naughton, C. C.; Roman, F. A.; Alvarado, A. G. F.; Tariqi, A. O.; Deeming, M. A.; Bibby, K.; 546 Bivins, A.; Rose, J. B.; Medema, G.; Ahmed, W. Show us the data: global COVID-19 wastewater 547 548 monitoring efforts, equity, and gaps. medRXiv 2021.
- (6) PHAC. PHAC (Public Health Agency of Canada) Current Federal, Provincial and Territorial 549 550 Wastewater Surveillance Networks. Doi: https://nccid.ca/wp-
- content/uploads/sites/2/2022/09/WWS Map September2022.pdf. Retrieved 2022 October 26. 551
- (7) Zhu, Y.; Oishi, W.; Maruo, C.; Saito, M.; Chen, R.; Kitajima, M.; Sano, D. Early warning of 552 553 COVID-19 via wastewater-based epidemiology: potential and bottlenecks. Science of The Total Environment 2021, 767, 145124. 554
- 555 (8) Halwatura, L. M.; Mclerran, I. S.; Weglarski, D. L.; Ahmed, Z. U.; Ye, Y.; Bradley, I. M.; Aga, D. 556 S. Complementing RNA Detection with Pharmaceutical Monitoring for Early Warning of Viral Outbreaks through Wastewater-Based Epidemiology. Environmental Science & Technology Letters 557 558 2022.
- 559 (9) Kumar, M.; Joshi, M.; Patel, A. K.; Joshi, C. G. Unravelling the early warning capability of wastewater surveillance for COVID-19: A temporal study on SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection and need 560 for the escalation. Environmental Research 2021, 196, 110946. 561
- 562 (10) Róka, E.; Khayer, B.; Kis, Z.; Kovács, L. B.; Schuler, E.; Magyar, N.; Málnási, T.; Oravecz, O.; Pályi, B.; Pándics, T. Ahead of the second wave: early warning for COVID-19 by wastewater 563 surveillance in Hungary. Science of The Total Environment 2021, 786, 147398. 564
- (11) Acosta, N.; Bautista, M. A.; Waddell, B. J.; McCalder, J.; Beaudet, A. B.; Man, L.; Pradhan, P.; 565 566 Sedaghat, N.; Papparis, C.; Bacanu, A. Longitudinal SARS-CoV-2 RNA Wastewater Monitoring Across a Range of Scales Correlates with Total and Regional COVID-19 Burden in a Well-Defined 567 568 Urban Population. Water Research 2022, 118611.
- 569 (12) Acosta, N.; Bautista, M. A.; Hollman, J.; McCalder, J.; Beaudet, A. B.; Man, L.; Waddell, B. J.; 570 Chen, J.; Li, C.; Kuzma, D. A multicenter study investigating SARS-CoV-2 in tertiary-care hospital
- wastewater. viral burden correlates with increasing hospitalized cases as well as hospital-associated 571 572 transmissions and outbreaks. Water Research 2021, 201, 117369.
- (13) Bowes, D. A.; Driver, E. M.; Halden, R. U. A framework for wastewater sample collection from a 573 574 sewage cleanout to inform building-scale wastewater-based epidemiology studies. Science of The 575 Total Environment 2022, 836, 155576.
- (14) Wright, J.; Driver, E. M.; Bowes, D. A.; Johnston, B.; Halden, R. U. Comparison of high-576 577 frequency in-pipe SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-based surveillance to concurrent COVID-19 random 578 clinical testing on a public US university campus. Science of the Total Environment 2022, 820,
- 579 152877.
- (15) Karthikeyan, S.; Nguyen, A.; McDonald, D.; Zong, Y.; Ronquillo, N.; Ren, J.; Zou, J.; Farmer, 580
- S.; Humphrey, G.; Henderson, D. Rapid, large-scale wastewater surveillance and automated 581
- 582 reporting system enable early detection of nearly 85% of COVID-19 cases on a university campus. Msystems 2021, 6 (4), e00793-00721. 583
- (16) Gibas, C.; Lambirth, K.; Mittal, N.; Juel, M. A. I.; Barua, V. B.; Brazell, L. R.; Hinton, K.; 584
- 585 Lontai, J.; Stark, N.; Young, I. Implementing building-level SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance 586 on a university campus. Science of The Total Environment 2021, 782, 146749.

- 587 (17) Wang, Y.; Liu, P.; Zhang, H.; Ibaraki, M.; VanTassell, J.; Geith, K.; Cavallo, M.; Kann, R.;
- 588 Saber, L.; Kraft, C. S. Early warning of a COVID-19 surge on a university campus based on
- wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 at residence halls. *Science of The Total Environment* 2022,
 821, 153291.
- 591 (18) Welling, C. M.; Singleton, D. R.; Haase, S. B.; Browning, C. H.; Stoner, B. R.; Gunsch, C. K.;
- Grego, S. Predictive values of time-dense SARS-CoV-2 wastewater analysis in university campus
 buildings. *Science of The Total Environment* 2022, *835*, 155401.
- (19) UofC. UofC (University of Calgary) Facts and Figures. Doi: <u>https://www.ucalgary.ca/about/our-organization/facts-and-figures</u>. Retrieved 2022 October 26.
- 596 (20) Calgary. 2019 Civic Census Results. Doi: <u>https://www.calgary.ca/content/dam/www/ca/city-</u>
 597 <u>clerks/documents/election-and-information-services/census2019/2019-censusresultsbook.pdf</u>.
 598 Retrieved 2022 October 26.
- 599 (21) Alberta-Government. Opening soon: Alberta's relaunch strategy. Doi:
- 600 <u>https://www.youracsa.ca/wp-content/uploads/covid19-alberta-relaunch-strategy.pdf</u>. Retrieved 601 19.06.2021.
- 602 (22) Acosta, N.; Bautista, M. A.; Waddell, B. J.; Du, K.; McCalder, J.; Pradhan, P.; Sedaghat, N.;
- Papparis, C.; Beaudet, A. B.; Chen, J. Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 and its variants in wastewater of tertiary care hospitals correlates with increasing case burden and outbreaks. *Journal of Medical*
- 605 Virology **2022**.
- 606 (23) Whitney, O. N.; Kennedy, L. C.; Fan, V. B.; Hinkle, A.; Kantor, R.; Greenwald, H.; Crits-
- 607 Christoph, A.; Al-Shayeb, B.; Chaplin, M.; Maurer, A. C. Sewage, salt, silica, and SARS-CoV-2
- 608 (4S): an economical kit-free method for direct capture of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater.
 609 *Environmental Science & Technology* 2021, *55* (8), 4880-4888.
- 610 (24) Hubert, C. R.; Acosta, N.; Waddell, B. J.; Hasing, M. E.; Qiu, Y.; Fuzzen, M.; Harper, N. B.;
- Bautista, M. A.; Gao, T.; Papparis, C. Tracking Emergence and Spread of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron
 Variant in Large and Small Communities by Wastewater Monitoring in Alberta, Canada. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 2022, 28 (9), 1770-1776.
- 614 (25) Medema, G.; Heijnen, L.; Elsinga, G.; Italiaander, R.; Brouwer, A. Presence of SARS-
- Coronavirus-2 RNA in sewage and correlation with reported COVID-19 prevalence in the early
 stage of the epidemic in the Netherlands. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* 2020, 7 (7),
 511-516.
- (26) Randazzo, W.; Truchado, P.; Cuevas-Ferrando, E.; Simón, P.; Allende, A.; Sánchez, G. SARSCoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. *Water Research* 2020, *181*, 115942.
- (27) Wu, F.; Zhang, J.; Xiao, A.; Gu, X.; Lee, W. L.; Armas, F.; Kauffman, K.; Hanage, W.; Matus,
 M.; Ghaeli, N. SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater are higher than expected from clinically confirmed
 cases. *Msystems* 2020, 5 (4), e00614-00620.
- (28) Fuzzen, M. L.; Harper, N. B.; Dhiyebi, H. A.; Srikanthan, N.; Hayat, S.; Peterson, S. W.; Yang,
 I.; Sun, J. X.; Edwards, E. A.; Giesy, J. P. Multiplex RT-qPCR assay (N200) to detect and estimate
- prevalence of multiple SARS-CoV-2 Variants of Concern in wastewater. *medRxiv* 2022.
- 627 (29) Peterson, S. W.; Lidder, R.; Daigle, J.; Wonitowy, Q.; Dueck, C.; Nagasawa, A.; Mulvey, M. R.;
- Mangat, C. S. RT-qPCR detection of SARS-CoV-2 mutations S 69–70 del, S N501Y and N D3L
- associated with variants of concern in Canadian wastewater samples. *Science of the Total Environment* 2022, *810*, 151283.
- (30) D'Aoust, P. M.; Mercier, E.; Montpetit, D.; Jia, J.-J.; Alexandrov, I.; Neault, N.; Baig, A. T.;
 Mayne, J.; Zhang, X.; Alain, T. Quantitative analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater solids
 in communities with low COVID-19 incidence and prevalence. *Water research* 2021, *188*, 116560.
- in communities with low COVID-19 incidence and prevalence. *Water research* 2021, *188*, 116560.
 (31) Rose, C.; Parker, A.; Jefferson, B.; Cartmell, E. The characterization of feces and urine: a review
- 635 of the literature to inform advanced treatment technology. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science* 636 *and Technology* 2015, 45 (17), 1827-1879.
- (32) Karak, T.; Bhattacharyya, P. Human urine as a source of alternative natural fertilizer in
 agriculture: A flight of fancy or an achievable reality. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 2011,
 55 (4), 400-408.
- 640 (33) Hsu, S.-Y.; Bayati, M.; Li, C.; Hsieh, H.-Y.; Belenchia, A.; Klutts, J.; Zemmer, S. A.; Reynolds,
- M.; Semkiw, E.; Johnson, H.-Y. Biomarkers selection for population normalization in SARS-CoV-2
 wastewater-based epidemiology. *Water Research* 2022, 223, 118985.

- 643 (34) Langeveld, J.; Schilperoort, R.; Heijnen, L.; Elsinga, G.; Schapendonk, C. E.; Fanoy, E.; de
- 644 Schepper, E. I.; Koopmans, M. P.; de Graaf, M.; Medema, G. Normalisation of SARS-CoV-2
- concentrations in wastewater: The use of flow, electrical conductivity and crAssphage. *Science of the Total Environment* 2022, 161196.
- (35) Lee, J. Tracking anthropogenic footprints of antimicrobial resistance in the river system: A Swiss
 perspective. ETH Zurich, 2021. Doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000514663</u>.
- (36) Ort, C.; Hollender, J.; Schaerer, M.; Siegrist, H. Model-based evaluation of reduction strategies
 for micropollutants from wastewater treatment plants in complex river networks. *Environmental Science & Technology* 2009, 43 (9), 3214-3220.
- 652 (37) Betancourt, W. Q.; Schmitz, B. W.; Innes, G. K.; Prasek, S. M.; Brown, K. M. P.; Stark, E. R.;
- Foster, A. R.; Sprissler, R. S.; Harris, D. T.; Sherchan, S. P. COVID-19 containment on a college
 campus via wastewater-based epidemiology, targeted clinical testing and an intervention. *Science of The Total Environment* 2021, 779, 146408.
- (38) Lu, E.; Ai, Y.; Davis, A.; Straathof, J.; Halloran, K.; Hull, N.; Winston, R.; Weir, M. H.; Soller,
- J.; Bohrerova, Z. Wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in dormitories as a part of comprehensive
 university campus COVID-19 monitoring. *Environmental Research* 2022, 113580.
- (39) Duvallet, C.; Wu, F.; McElroy, K. A.; Imakaev, M.; Endo, N.; Xiao, A.; Zhang, J.; Floyd-
- 660 O'Sullivan, R.; Powell, M. M.; Mendola, S. Nationwide Trends in COVID-19 Cases and SARS661 CoV-2 RNA Wastewater Concentrations in the United States. ACS ES&T Water 2022.
- 662 (40) Feng, S.; Roguet, A.; McClary-Gutierrez, J. S.; Newton, R. J.; Kloczko, N.; Meiman, J. G.;
- McLellan, S. L. Evaluation of sampling, analysis, and normalization methods for SARS-CoV-2
 concentrations in wastewater to assess COVID-19 burdens in Wisconsin communities. ACS ES&T
 Water 2021, 1 (8), 1955-1965.
- (41) Maal-Bared, R.; Qiu, Y.; Li, Q.; Gao, T.; Hrudey, S. E.; Bhavanam, S.; Ruecker, N. J.; Ellehoj,
 E.; Lee, B. E.; Pang, X. Does normalization of SARS-CoV-2 concentrations by Pepper Mild Mottle
- Virus improve correlations and lead time between wastewater surveillance and clinical data in
 Alberta (Canada): comparing twelve SARS-CoV-2 normalization approaches. *Science of The Total Environment* 2023, *856*, 158964.
- (42) Spurbeck, R. R.; Minard-Smith, A.; Catlin, L. Feasibility of neighborhood and building scale
 wastewater-based genomic epidemiology for pathogen surveillance. *Science of The Total Environment* 2021, 789, 147829.
- (43) Oh, C.; Zhou, A.; O'Brien, K.; Jamal, Y.; Wennerdahl, H.; Schmidt, A. R.; Shisler, J. L.; Jutla, A.;
 Schmidt IV, A. R.; Keefer, L. Application of neighborhood-scale wastewater-based epidemiology in
 low COVID-19 incidence situations. *Science of The Total Environment* 2022, *852*, 158448.
- 677 (44) Wu, S. L.; Mertens, A. N.; Crider, Y. S.; Nguyen, A.; Pokpongkiat, N. N.; Djajadi, S.; Seth, A.;
- Hsiang, M. S.; Colford, J. M.; Reingold, A. Substantial underestimation of SARS-CoV-2 infection in
 the United States. *Nature Communications* 2020, *11* (1), 1-10.
- 680 (45) Subramanian, R.; He, Q.; Pascual, M. Quantifying asymptomatic infection and transmission of
- COVID-19 in New York City using observed cases, serology, and testing capacity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2021, *118* (9), e2019716118.
- 683 (46) Poletti, P.; Tirani, M.; Cereda, D.; Trentini, F.; Guzzetta, G.; Sabatino, G.; Marziano, V.;
- 684 Castrofino, A.; Grosso, F.; Del Castillo, G. Association of age with likelihood of developing
- 685 symptoms and critical disease among close contacts exposed to patients with confirmed SARS-CoV-
- 686 2 infection in Italy. *JAMA Network Open* **2021**, *4* (3), e211085-e211085.
- 687 (47) UofC. UofC (University of Calgary) COVIDSafe Campus. Doi:
 688 <u>https://www.ucalgary.ca/risk/emergency-management/covid-19-response/covidsafe-campus.</u>
 689 Retrieved 2022 October 26.
- 690 (48) Valesano, A. L.; Fitzsimmons, W. J.; Blair, C. N.; Woods, R. J.; Gilbert, J.; Rudnik, D.;
- 691 Mortenson, L.; Friedrich, T. C.; O'Connor, D. H.; MacCannell, D. R. SARS-CoV-2 genomic
- surveillance reveals little spread from a large university campus to the surrounding community.
 Open Forum Infectious Diseases 2021, 8 (11), ofab518.
- (49) Aggarwal, D.; Warne, B.; Jahun, A. S.; Hamilton, W. L.; Fieldman, T.; Du Plessis, L.; Hill, V.;
 Blane, B.; Watkins, E.; Wright, E. Genomic epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 in a UK university
- 696 identifies dynamics of transmission. *Nature Communications* **2022**, *13* (1), 1-16.
- 697 (50) Heaton, K.; Radvan, J.; Cripps, H.; Mountford, R.; Braddon, F.; Hughes, A. Defecation frequency
- and timing, and stool form in the general population: a prospective study. *Gut* **1992**, *33* (6), 818-824.

- (51) Ke, R.; Martinez, P. P.; Smith, R. L.; Gibson, L. L.; Mirza, A.; Conte, M.; Gallagher, N.; Luo, C.
- H.; Jarrett, J.; Zhou, R. Daily longitudinal sampling of SARS-CoV-2 infection reveals substantial
- heterogeneity in infectiousness. *Nature Microbiology* **2022**, *7* (5), 640-652.

703 Figures and Tables



704

Figure 1. University of Calgary main campus highlighting different sewershed catchments (colour key is shown in the figure legend). NW, NE, and SO indicate

Northwest, Northeast, and South catchments, respectively. RH1 and 2 represent the two student residence halls. The area MIX (colored in orange) belongs to both
 NW, and also NE. Five university buildings outside our monitoring catchments, but which still belong to the main campus were colored in 'dark grey'. L1 – 64 (in

707 Nw, and also NE. Five university buildings outside our monitoring calcillents, but which sum belong to the main campus were colored in dark grey $L_1 = 0^2$

708 light grey) represent un-serviced parking lots. The figure was modified from <u>http://www.ucalgary.ca/map</u>.





Figure 2. Log₁₀-transformed concentrations (copies/mL) of SARS-CoV-2 N1 and N2 profiles in campus wastewater sub-catchments demonstrate much lower
 values relative to the receiving municipal WWTP during the study period (August 31, 2021 – April 30, 2022). WWTP indicates the municipal wastewater treatment
 plant servicing the surrounding community, and also UofC main campus. See Fig. 1 for the locations and catchment area. *=missing data. Date (in x-axis) :
 dd.mm.yyyy.



Figure 3. Log₁₀-transformed concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 N1 (left) and N2 (right) by sub-catchment
 monitoring location variably demonstrate differences between locations during Period-A (Aug 31, 2021 X) and -B (Y-April 30, 2022) with (upper), and without normalization (lower). See Table 2 and 3 for

718 the results from Wilcoxon rank-sum tests.



719

Figure 4. Log₁₀-transformed cases per capita estimated for UofC according to Eq.1 (for raw-720 concentration) or Eq.2 (for normalized-concentrations using PMMoV and chemical agents), and 721 measured for the surrounding community (i.e., WWTP) during the entire monitoring period. Cases per 722 capita was calculated for each data point (i.e., time point), and displayed using trend lines (linearly 723 extrapolated between two data points) over time in (a), and using box plots after aggregated by group in 724 725 (b). Only paired data points were shown, and statistically compared between each other using 726 Permutation test. Error bars for the modelled (UofC's) values indicate IQR (Q1-Q3) derived from 727 uncertainty analysis (see 2.7).

729 Table 1. Comparing SARS-CoV-2 RNA raw concentrations between different UofC monitoring

730 locations during Period-A and -B using Wilcoxon rank-sum test. P-adjusted for pairwise comparison

via using Benjamini & Hochberg method. Those pairs that statistically differed with (p<0.05) are highlighted in red.

Period	Indicator	Location	RH2	RH1	NE	SO	NW
		RH1	0.675	-	-	-	-
		NE	0.968	0.650	-	-	-
		SO	0.026	0.014	0.020	-	-
		NW	0.014	0.005	0.005	0.863	
Period-A	N1	WWTP	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.005	0.001
		NE	0.944	0.428	_	-	-
		SO	0.052	0.020	0.068	-	-
		NW	0.038	0.015	0.038	0.736	
		WWTP	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.002
	N1	RH1	-	-	-	-	-
		NE	-	0.019	-	-	-
		SO	-	0.156	0.000	-	-
		NW	-	0.491	0.002	0.006	-
Period-B		WWTP	-	0.003	0.000	0.013	0.000
		NE	-	0.107	-	-	-
		SO	-	0.238	0.001	-	-
		NW	-	0.829	0.006	0.029	-
		WWTP	-	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 2. The Fisher's exact test results (p-value) for testing interdependency between wastewater**SARS-CoV-2** signals and COVID-19 confirmed cases across UofC campus under each assumption. '-1week', '+0 week', and '+1 week' indicate an early warning, no time lag, and time lag scenario,respectively (see Fig. S1 in the Supporting Information for details). The results with p < 0.05 were</td>highlighted in red.

T 4 ²		N1		N2			
Location	(-1 week)	(+0 week)	(+1 week)	(-1 week)	(+0 week)	(+1 week)	
RH1	0.001	0.000	1.000	0.001	0.000	1.000	
RH2	0.273	0.333	0.333	1.000	1.000	0.083	
NE	0.029	0.008	0.154	0.029	0.071	0.433	
SO	0.021	0.205	0.163	0.002	0.048	0.163	
NW	0.099	0.193	0.063	0.099	0.193	0.063	

739

741 Table 3. Comparing modelled COVID-19 cases per capita between WWTP and UofC campus using

raw and normalized values. The p-values were calculated using Permutation test (see 2.7), and indicate

the proportion of the number of cases where cases per capita for UofC > cases per capita for WWTP to

1,000 (=the number of total simulation runs). Those pairs that statistically differed with (p < 0.05) are

highlighted in red.

		Normalized					
Date	Raw	PMMoV	Magnesium	Potassium	Sodium	Calcium	Chloride
18.10.2021	< 0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
25.10.2021	< 0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
01.11.2021	< 0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
08.11.2021	0.247	0.278	0.328	0.578	0.809	0.318	0.658
15.11.2021	0.981	0.972	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999	0.999
22.11.2021	< 0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
29.11.2021	< 0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.007	0.003	0.003
06.12.2021	< 0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
10.01.2022	< 0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
31.01.2022	< 0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
07.02.2022	< 0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
21.02.2022	< 0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.022	0.003	0.003
28.02.2022	< 0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.124	0.003	0.004
21.03.2022	< 0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003

746