

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

4

5 Jangwoo Lee^{1,2}, Nicole Acosta¹, Barbara J. Waddell¹, Kristine Du¹, Kevin Xiang², Jennifer Van
6 Doorn², Kashtin Low², Maria A. Bautista², Janine McCalder^{1,2}, Xiaotian Dai³, Xuewen Lu³, Thierry
7 Chekouo^{3,4}, Puja Pradhan^{1,2}, Navid Sedaghat^{1,2}, Chloe Papparis^{1,2}, Alexander Buchner Beaudet¹,
8 Jianwei Chen², Leslie Chan², Laura Vivas², Paul Westlund⁵, Srijak Bhatnagar^{2,6}, September Stefani¹,
9 Gail Visser¹, Jason Cabaj⁷⁻¹⁰, Gopal Achari¹¹, Rhonda G. Clark², Steve E. Hrudehy^{12,13}, Bonita E.
10 Lee^{14,15}, Xiaoli Pang^{12,16,17}, Brandan Webster¹⁸, William Amin Ghali^{7,8,10,19}, Andre Gerald Buret², Tyler
11 Williamson^{7,10,19}, Danielle A. Southern^{7,10,19}, Jon Meddings⁸, Kevin Frankowski²⁰, Casey R.J. Hubert²,
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

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 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

34 ¹⁷ Li Ka Shing Institute of Virology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

35 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

38 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
51 granular scales, including large work sites such as University campuses. Between August 2021-April
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
56 sites – regardless of several normalization strategies – with certain catchments consistently
57 demonstrating values 1–2 orders higher than the others. Additionally, our comprehensive monitoring
58 strategy enabled an estimation of the total burden of SARS-CoV-2 for the campus per capita, which
59 was significantly lower than the surrounding community ($p \leq 0.01$). Real-time contact tracing data was
60 used to confirm an association between wastewater SARS-CoV-2 burden and clinically confirmed
61 cases proving the potential of WBS as a tool for disease monitoring across worksites. Allele-specific
62 qPCR assays confirmed that variants across campus were representative of the community at large,
63 and at no time did emerging variants first debut on campus. This study demonstrates how WBS can
64 be efficiently applied to locate hotspots of disease activity at a very granular scale, and predict disease
65 burden across large, complex worksites.

66

67 **Keywords:** Wastewater-based epidemiology, worksite, Epidemiology, dormitories, residences,
68 wastewater treatment plant, nodal monitoring

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

72 **1. Introduction**

73 To cope with the COVID-19 pandemic crisis, governments worldwide have implemented a range of
74 measures to mitigate the spread of the virus, including large-scale clinical testing. While diagnostic
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,
77 clinical testing is biased by relying on voluntary participation and towards individuals with
78 symptomatic disease.² Wastewater-based surveillance (WBS) has emerged as a novel tool for
79 monitoring population health³ serving to complement clinical testing providing real-time data on the
80 burden of disease in a monitored sewershed. Advantages of WBS include i) comprehensive, inclusive,
81 serial monitoring of the population with relatively low costs, and ii) unbiased data collection of
82 biological material from all society members including marginalized populations and those unable to
83 access clinical testing.^{1, 3, 4} WBS for SARS-CoV-2 surveillance has been adopted worldwide⁵,
84 including Canada where it currently covers ~62 % of the country's population.⁶ Generally, WBS
85 programs monitor SARS-CoV-2 RNA in untreated sewage from wastewater treatment plants
86 (WWTPs) and thus assess disease burden at the level of an entire community. Community-based
87 studies have identified SARS-CoV-2 WBS as a leading indicator for cases (4-6 days), hospitalizations,
88 and deaths.⁷⁻¹⁰ However, studies where monitoring has been performed at a more granular scale (e.g.,
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
93 requires detailed data on defined sampling nodes (e.g., each node and their GPS coordinates) and their
94 connectivity (to determine if overlapping catchments exist and may confound analysis), ii) nodes
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
97 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 buildings¹⁶⁻¹⁸, 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,
126 6,000 graduate students and 1,800 academic and 3,200 non-academic staff.¹⁹ The main campus is
127 situated in Northwest Calgary on a parcel of 530-acres (2.13 km²). Campus sampling locations were
128 chosen to deliver a minimum number of manhole-accessible sites providing maximum coverage of
129 campus buildings, using GIS-based analysis of the sewer pipe network (Fig. 1). Residence halls were
130 also included based upon presence of an accessible sampling location within the building's plumbing
131 network capturing $\geq 50\%$ of the residential areas of that building. This was accomplished by manually
132 reviewing the engineering drawings of the dormitory plumbing systems, visually inspecting each
133 prospective sampling location and then selecting the site that optimally captured the building's
134 wastewater in a safe, access-controlled manner.

135 Three nodes were selected to capture the building complexes in the Northwest (NW), Northeast (NE),
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
141 total residence population (i.e., those living in dormitories) and >83 % of the campus aerial footprint.
142 Calgary is Canada's fourth largest city by population and its third most ethnically diverse.^{11,20} Three
143 WWTPs serve an estimated 1,441,268 people.²¹ UofC falls exclusively within the catchment zone of
144 the largest WWTP, serving 1,047,662 individuals and receiving 303.7-604.6 ML/day.

145 **2.2. Wastewater Collection**

146 Wastewater samples were collected from the sites described above 2-3 \times 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
152 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
155 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)
158 as an internal control and vortexed for 30 seconds. Solids were then removed via vacuum filtration
159 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 Spin™ III-P silica column (Zymo
161 Research, USA).²⁴ More details can be found in the Supplement.

162 **2.4. Quantitative RT-qPCR**

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

174 information (e.g., oligonucleotide sequences and thermal cycling conditions) can be found in previous
175 publications.^{11, 12, 24} The raw data were subjected to further quality control and performed similarly to
176 previously published works(see Supplementary Results 2.1).^{11, 12, 24} Finally, concentrations for N1,
177 N2, and PMMoV were averaged weekly for each monitoring location. Those averaged concentrations
178 (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,
181 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**

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

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

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

198 Where, N_{WWTP} indicates the total population in the catchment area for WWTP ($n=1,047,622^{11}$;
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.

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

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

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

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**

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

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

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 (<https://github.com/myjackson>) 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 3rd, 2022) and complete symptom resolution. The
247 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
250 gathered in the original report includes: i) ‘date of positive test result’, ii) ‘date university informed of
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
262 information iii) above. For example, for each building, the recently visited PIDs were listed (Dataset
263 S2). Then, we counted the total affected-visits for each building. In this way, each PID was often
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
266 the few days before and after symptom onset^{12, 22}, the visits ± 2 days of the ‘date of onset of
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).

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

277 apartment with someone who is not also positive, they were moved to another suite, VC for their
278 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 (<https://github.com/myjackson>) 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 of
296 Calgary (REB20-1544).

297 **3. Results**

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

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

301 catchments, and 89 samples were obtained from WWTP, providing 12 – 25 data points per location
302 after being averaged weekly. The lower number of samples collected for campus locations primarily
303 relates to more complicated access for these sampling points (e.g., manholes in the open (public) area
304 for the campus sampling points versus either within buildings or from the WWTP facility. The outdoor
305 locations (manholes) also experienced a higher rate of failure to collect especially during cold weather
306 (<-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,
310 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
313 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
324 dominant in Period-B for SO, NW, NE, and RH1 while. In no instances did the emerging VOC occur
325 disproportionately within the campus environment relative to that of the community.

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

327 A median of 153 (IQR 73 – 240) cases per day were clinically confirmed across the catchment of the
328 WWTP during the period monitored (August 31, 2021 – January 04, 2022; a total of 36 data points).
329 These cases were correlated with raw-, and also normalized-SARS-CoV-2 N1 and N2 signals using
330 different investigational markers (i.e., PMMoV, sodium, chloride, potassium, calcium, and
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
336 those populations may be very different, e.g., residential versus non-residential areas of the campus.
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
344 monitoring sites during the study (Period-A to -B) based on Kruskal-Wallis test ($p < 0.001$). In Period-
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 ($p \leq 0.005$) (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
349 magnitude lower than NW and SO, and such difference was non-parametrically significant using
350 Wilcoxon rank-sum tests for NW ($p \leq 0.038$) (Table 1). SARS-CoV-2 N1 and N2 concentrations for
351 two dormitories (i.e., RH2 and RH1) were similar to NE ($p \geq 0.428$) but lower than SO ($p \leq 0.026$) and

352 NW ($p \leq 0.038$), based on Wilcoxon rank-sum test (Table 1). In general, normalized trends of SARS-
353 CoV-2 burden between sites mirrored those of raw values (Table S3). The normalized N1 and N2
354 concentrations for WWTP were higher than for all the campus locations using post-hoc Wilcoxon
355 rank-sum test in all comparisons ($p \leq 0.008$) (Table S3). Among university campus locations, the
356 normalized N1 and N2 values for NE were lower than NW or SO in many instances (Table S3).

357 In Period-B, the N1 and N2 concentrations increased considerably compared to Period-A at WWTP
358 and across campus (Fig. 3). However, the values for the campus were still significantly lower than for
359 WWTP for both N1 and N2 based on a post-hoc Wilcoxon rank-sum test ($p \leq 0.013$; see Table 1). The
360 degree of increase for RH1 was the most pronounced among all monitored sites. For instance, the
361 median N1 concentration for RH1, and SO samples profoundly increased, for instance by >2 order of
362 magnitude (from 0.0 to 184.7 copies/mL for RH1; from 7.6 to 369.8 copies/mL), while the median
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 ($p \leq 0.025$), 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 ($p \leq 0.014$), 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**

371 The association between COVID-19-confirmed clinical cases and wastewater-N1 or N2 concentrations
372 was tested using a one-sided Fisher's exact test under the null hypothesis that those two factors were
373 independent for each location (Table 2). An association between cases and a concentration was
374 observed at most monitoring sites (i.e., $p < 0.05$ at RH1, NE, or SO) for samples collected before (-1
375 week) and the same week (+0 week) using either N1 or N2 as an indicator. As expected, given the
376 mandatory exclusion of confirmed cases from campus following the diagnosis, samples collected the
377 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
381 during the entire monitoring period (both -A and -B) were estimated according to (Eq. 1) using raw
382 concentrations, and also (Eq. 2) using normalized concentrations. SARS-CoV-2 N2 data was used in
383 this analysis due to its stronger association with clinically confirmed cases (see 3.2, also Table S2).
384 Following this, the modelled aggregate SARS-CoV-2 burden for UofC was compared with the values
385 for the surrounding community (i.e., WWTP catchment) (Fig. 4). For most time points, cases per
386 capita in the community (as measured at WWTP) were significantly higher than for UofC ($p < 0.001$).
387 The results using different methods of potential normalization generally mirrored the raw
388 concentrations (Table 3).

389 Overall, median predicted incident cases per capita (cases per 100,000 scaling factor) for UofC was
390 5.9-fold lower than for WWTP using raw concentration ($p < 0.001$), and 2.2–5.2-fold lower than for
391 WWTP using normalized concentrations (≤ 0.01). For instance, the median cases per 100,000 was 8.8
392 (IQR 6.9-14.8) for the WWTP catchment, and predicted to be 1.5 (IQR 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**

398 **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
404 involved sewersheds and assessing the connectivity between sampling nodes so that the sub-
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
407 targeted residences and dormitories^{16, 18, 37} or combined residential and non-residential buildings in a
408 very limited fashion.^{15, 17, 38} A comprehensive longitudinal assessment of a campus community or
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
411 campus through the deployment of a modest number of sample collection devices.

412 SO and NW portions of the campus consistently showed high levels of SARS-CoV-2 using raw and
413 normalized data, demonstrating hotspots for COVID-19 occurrences. For example, RH1, a dormitory,
414 could be one of the buildings where highest disease incidence occurs and disproportionately contribute
415 to a high level of SARS-CoV-2 signals for NW, at least during Period-B (see Fig. 3). This is consistent
416 with other reports demonstrating high secondary COVID-19 case occurrence in dormitories.^{16, 17, 38}

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
421 offices – this might be one of the reasons why the level of SARS-CoV-2 concentration for NE was low
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
425 and SO in this study, during disease outbreaks, although this would significantly increase the cost of
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

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

443 A positive association between COVID-19 cases and wastewater signals in the majority of instances
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
447 and confirmed cases was observed in hospitals^{12,42} and university dormitories³⁸, and also larger
448 building complexes.¹⁴ However, adapting WBS as an early warning for COVID-19 cases on a more
449 granular scale may not provide the same lead time relative to clinical diagnoses as was observed early
450 in the pandemic now that testing capacity has markedly increased. Indeed, the early warning scenario
451 (-1 week) did not lead to lower p-values relative to the no time-lag scenario when comparing
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
454 for monitoring different neighborhoods at a range of scales (from 853 to 9,094 serving populations) in
455 Illinois, USA.⁴³ The authors reported that a correlation between wastewater signals and confirmed
456 cases varied significantly by neighborhood, and an early warning scenario (-1 week) did not
457 necessarily result in a better correlation.⁴³

458 Similar to other studies correlating wastewater measured SARS-CoV-2 with COVID-19 disease
459 occurrence was our reliance on clinically confirmed cases to build models. Individuals with
460 asymptomatic and pauci-symptomatic disease are thusly not captured in this syndromic surveillance-
461 driven manner.^{44, 45} As university campuses generally comprise a younger cohort relative to the
462 general population, the number of asymptomatic infections is expected to have been higher.⁴⁶
463 Furthermore, as case reporting to University staff was voluntary, it is possible that not all confirmed
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
469 discontinuous, and at times relatively low (median=1 and IQR=0-3 for NW; median=0 and IQR=0-1
470 for NE and SO; med=0 and IQR=0-0 for RH1 and 2), the paired comparison between wastewater
471 signals and reported cases was difficult for campus sites, which is why comparisons were made using
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**

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

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

495 **4.4. Other notable limitations**

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

503 Furthermore, the monitoring in this study was performed when not all students and employees had
504 fully returned to in-person learning/work; a small number continued to telecommute from home and,
505 therefore, may not fully represent the entire university community. Thus, care has to be taken when
506 interpreting our results – the results in this study do not indicate for instance that university members
507 tend to have lower disease infection rates than populations outside the campus, but rather suggest that
508 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
512 and the chances of capturing shedding events when autosamplers were being operated are highly
513 stochastic, etc. We attempted to address this issue by employing 24-hours composite sampling over a
514 “grab” sampling strategy, and by achieving a reasonably high sample size (i.e., up to 35 points for
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
519 across a large university campus using a spatially resolved, nodal based strategy. We have confirmed
520 the potential of this platform technology to perform population health monitoring through wastewater
521 analysis. This study has established wastewater-based surveillance is positively associated with
522 clinical cases at a granular scale, suggesting it can be used synergistically with contact tracing in order
523 to identify ‘hotspots’ for COVID-19 occurrence across campus (i.e., building). This study also
524 confirmed the markedly lower rates of SARS-CoV-2 across campus, lending support to the importance
525 of restrictive measures in mitigating COVID-19’s potential for spread across worksites.

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
529 are grateful for the assistance of the staff of City of Calgary Water Services and C.E.C. analytics for
530 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.

534 References

- 535 (1) Hart, O. E.; Halden, R. U. Computational analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 surveillance by
536 wastewater-based epidemiology locally and globally: Feasibility, economy, opportunities and
537 challenges. *Science of the Total Environment* **2020**, *730*, 138875.
- 538 (2) O’Keeffe, J. Wastewater-based epidemiology: current uses and future opportunities as a public
539 health surveillance tool. *Environmental Health Review* **2021**, *64* (3), 44-52.
- 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.
- 546 (5) Naughton, C. C.; Roman, F. A.; Alvarado, A. G. F.; Tariqi, A. Q.; Deeming, M. A.; Bibby, K.;
547 Bivins, A.; Rose, J. B.; Medema, G.; Ahmed, W. Show us the data: global COVID-19 wastewater
548 monitoring efforts, equity, and gaps. *medRxiv* **2021**.
- 549 (6) PHAC. PHAC (Public Health Agency of Canada) Current Federal, Provincial and Territorial
550 Wastewater Surveillance Networks. Doi: [https://nccid.ca/wp-](https://nccid.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2022/09/WWS_Map_September2022.pdf)
551 [content/uploads/sites/2/2022/09/WWS_Map_September2022.pdf](https://nccid.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2022/09/WWS_Map_September2022.pdf). Retrieved 2022 October 26.
- 552 (7) Zhu, Y.; Oishi, W.; Maruo, C.; Saito, M.; Chen, R.; Kitajima, M.; Sano, D. Early warning of
553 COVID-19 via wastewater-based epidemiology: potential and bottlenecks. *Science of The Total*
554 *Environment* **2021**, *767*, 145124.
- 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
557 Outbreaks through Wastewater-Based Epidemiology. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*
558 **2022**.
- 559 (9) Kumar, M.; Joshi, M.; Patel, A. K.; Joshi, C. G. Unravelling the early warning capability of
560 wastewater surveillance for COVID-19: A temporal study on SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection and need
561 for the escalation. *Environmental Research* **2021**, *196*, 110946.
- 562 (10) Róka, E.; Khayer, B.; Kis, Z.; Kovács, L. B.; Schuler, E.; Magyar, N.; Málnási, T.; Oravecz, O.;
563 Pályi, B.; Pándics, T. Ahead of the second wave: early warning for COVID-19 by wastewater
564 surveillance in Hungary. *Science of The Total Environment* **2021**, *786*, 147398.
- 565 (11) Acosta, N.; Bautista, M. A.; Waddell, B. J.; McCalder, J.; Beaudet, A. B.; Man, L.; Pradhan, P.;
566 Sedaghat, N.; Papparis, C.; Bacanu, A. Longitudinal SARS-CoV-2 RNA Wastewater Monitoring
567 Across a Range of Scales Correlates with Total and Regional COVID-19 Burden in a Well-Defined
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
571 wastewater. viral burden correlates with increasing hospitalized cases as well as hospital-associated
572 transmissions and outbreaks. *Water Research* **2021**, *201*, 117369.
- 573 (13) Bowes, D. A.; Driver, E. M.; Halden, R. U. A framework for wastewater sample collection from a
574 sewage cleanout to inform building-scale wastewater-based epidemiology studies. *Science of The*
575 *Total Environment* **2022**, *836*, 155576.
- 576 (14) Wright, J.; Driver, E. M.; Bowes, D. A.; Johnston, B.; Halden, R. U. Comparison of high-
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.
- 580 (15) Karthikeyan, S.; Nguyen, A.; McDonald, D.; Zong, Y.; Ronquillo, N.; Ren, J.; Zou, J.; Farmer,
581 S.; Humphrey, G.; Henderson, D. Rapid, large-scale wastewater surveillance and automated
582 reporting system enable early detection of nearly 85% of COVID-19 cases on a university campus.
583 *Msystems* **2021**, *6* (4), e00793-00721.
- 584 (16) Gibas, C.; Lambirth, K.; Mittal, N.; Juel, M. A. I.; Barua, V. B.; Brazell, L. R.; Hinton, K.;
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
589 wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 at residence halls. *Science of The Total Environment* **2022**,
590 *821*, 153291.
- 591 (18) Welling, C. M.; Singleton, D. R.; Haase, S. B.; Browning, C. H.; Stoner, B. R.; Gunsch, C. K.;
592 Grego, S. Predictive values of time-dense SARS-CoV-2 wastewater analysis in university campus
593 buildings. *Science of The Total Environment* **2022**, *835*, 155401.
- 594 (19) UofC. UofC (University of Calgary) Facts and Figures. Doi: [https://www.ucalgary.ca/about/our-](https://www.ucalgary.ca/about/our-organization/facts-and-figures)
595 [organization/facts-and-figures](https://www.ucalgary.ca/about/our-organization/facts-and-figures). Retrieved 2022 October 26.
- 596 (20) Calgary. 2019 Civic Census Results. Doi: [https://www.calgary.ca/content/dam/www/ca/city-](https://www.calgary.ca/content/dam/www/ca/city-clerks/documents/election-and-information-services/census2019/2019-censusresultsbook.pdf)
597 [clerks/documents/election-and-information-services/census2019/2019-censusresultsbook.pdf](https://www.calgary.ca/content/dam/www/ca/city-clerks/documents/election-and-information-services/census2019/2019-censusresultsbook.pdf).
598 Retrieved 2022 October 26.
- 599 (21) Alberta-Government. Opening soon: Alberta's relaunch strategy. Doi:
600 <https://www.youracsa.ca/wp-content/uploads/covid19-alberta-relaunch-strategy.pdf>. Retrieved
601 19.06.2021.
- 602 (22) Acosta, N.; Bautista, M. A.; Waddell, B. J.; Du, K.; McC Calder, J.; Pradhan, P.; Sedaghat, N.;
603 Papparis, C.; Beaudet, A. B.; Chen, J. Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 and its variants in wastewater
604 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.;
611 Bautista, M. A.; Gao, T.; Papparis, C. Tracking Emergence and Spread of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron
612 Variant in Large and Small Communities by Wastewater Monitoring in Alberta, Canada. *Emerging*
613 *Infectious Diseases* **2022**, *28* (9), 1770-1776.
- 614 (25) Medema, G.; Heijnen, L.; Elsinga, G.; Italiaander, R.; Brouwer, A. Presence of SARS-
615 Coronavirus-2 RNA in sewage and correlation with reported COVID-19 prevalence in the early
616 stage of the epidemic in the Netherlands. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* **2020**, *7* (7),
617 511-516.
- 618 (26) Randazzo, W.; Truchado, P.; Cuevas-Ferrando, E.; Simón, P.; Allende, A.; Sánchez, G. SARS-
619 CoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. *Water*
620 *Research* **2020**, *181*, 115942.
- 621 (27) Wu, F.; Zhang, J.; Xiao, A.; Gu, X.; Lee, W. L.; Armas, F.; Kauffman, K.; Hanage, W.; Matus,
622 M.; Ghaeli, N. SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater are higher than expected from clinically confirmed
623 cases. *Msystems* **2020**, *5* (4), e00614-00620.
- 624 (28) Fuzzen, M. L.; Harper, N. B.; Dhiyebi, H. A.; Srikanthan, N.; Hayat, S.; Peterson, S. W.; Yang,
625 I.; Sun, J. X.; Edwards, E. A.; Giesy, J. P. Multiplex RT-qPCR assay (N200) to detect and estimate
626 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.;
628 Mangat, C. S. RT-qPCR detection of SARS-CoV-2 mutations S 69–70 del, S N501Y and N D3L
629 associated with variants of concern in Canadian wastewater samples. *Science of the Total*
630 *Environment* **2022**, *810*, 151283.
- 631 (30) D'Aoust, P. M.; Mercier, E.; Montpetit, D.; Jia, J.-J.; Alexandrov, I.; Neault, N.; Baig, A. T.;
632 Mayne, J.; Zhang, X.; Alain, T. Quantitative analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater solids
633 in communities with low COVID-19 incidence and prevalence. *Water research* **2021**, *188*, 116560.
- 634 (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.
- 637 (32) Karak, T.; Bhattacharyya, P. Human urine as a source of alternative natural fertilizer in
638 agriculture: A flight of fancy or an achievable reality. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* **2011**,
639 *55* (4), 400-408.
- 640 (33) Hsu, S.-Y.; Bayati, M.; Li, C.; Hsieh, H.-Y.; Belenchia, A.; Klutts, J.; Zemmer, S. A.; Reynolds,
641 M.; Semkiw, E.; Johnson, H.-Y. Biomarkers selection for population normalization in SARS-CoV-2
642 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
645 concentrations in wastewater: The use of flow, electrical conductivity and crAssphage. *Science of the*
646 *Total Environment* **2022**, 161196.
- 647 (35) Lee, J. Tracking anthropogenic footprints of antimicrobial resistance in the river system: A Swiss
648 perspective. ETH Zurich, 2021. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000514663>.
- 649 (36) Ort, C.; Hollender, J.; Schaerer, M.; Siegrist, H. Model-based evaluation of reduction strategies
650 for micropollutants from wastewater treatment plants in complex river networks. *Environmental*
651 *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.;
653 Foster, A. R.; Sprissler, R. S.; Harris, D. T.; Sherchan, S. P. COVID-19 containment on a college
654 campus via wastewater-based epidemiology, targeted clinical testing and an intervention. *Science of*
655 *The Total Environment* **2021**, 779, 146408.
- 656 (38) Lu, E.; Ai, Y.; Davis, A.; Straathof, J.; Halloran, K.; Hull, N.; Winston, R.; Weir, M. H.; Soller,
657 J.; Bohrerova, Z. Wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in dormitories as a part of comprehensive
658 university campus COVID-19 monitoring. *Environmental Research* **2022**, 113580.
- 659 (39) Duvall, 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 SARS-
661 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.;
663 McLellan, S. L. Evaluation of sampling, analysis, and normalization methods for SARS-CoV-2
664 concentrations in wastewater to assess COVID-19 burdens in Wisconsin communities. *ACS ES&T*
665 *Water* **2021**, 1 (8), 1955-1965.
- 666 (41) Maal-Bared, R.; Qiu, Y.; Li, Q.; Gao, T.; Hrudey, S. E.; Bhavanam, S.; Ruecker, N. J.; Ellehoj,
667 E.; Lee, B. E.; Pang, X. Does normalization of SARS-CoV-2 concentrations by Pepper Mild Mottle
668 Virus improve correlations and lead time between wastewater surveillance and clinical data in
669 Alberta (Canada): comparing twelve SARS-CoV-2 normalization approaches. *Science of The Total*
670 *Environment* **2023**, 856, 158964.
- 671 (42) Spurbeck, R. R.; Minard-Smith, A.; Catlin, L. Feasibility of neighborhood and building scale
672 wastewater-based genomic epidemiology for pathogen surveillance. *Science of The Total*
673 *Environment* **2021**, 789, 147829.
- 674 (43) Oh, C.; Zhou, A.; O'Brien, K.; Jamal, Y.; Wennerdahl, H.; Schmidt, A. R.; Shisler, J. L.; Jutla, A.;
675 Schmidt IV, A. R.; Keefer, L. Application of neighborhood-scale wastewater-based epidemiology in
676 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.;
678 Hsiang, M. S.; Colford, J. M.; Reingold, A. Substantial underestimation of SARS-CoV-2 infection in
679 the United States. *Nature Communications* **2020**, 11 (1), 1-10.
- 680 (45) Subramanian, R.; He, Q.; Pascual, M. Quantifying asymptomatic infection and transmission of
681 COVID-19 in New York City using observed cases, serology, and testing capacity. *Proceedings of*
682 *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 Castofino, 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 <https://www.ucalgary.ca/risk/emergency-management/covid-19-response/covidsafe-campus>.
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
692 surveillance reveals little spread from a large university campus to the surrounding community.
693 *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* **2021**, 8 (11), ofab518.
- 694 (49) Aggarwal, D.; Warne, B.; Jahun, A. S.; Hamilton, W. L.; Fieldman, T.; Du Plessis, L.; Hill, V.;
695 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
698 and timing, and stool form in the general population: a prospective study. *Gut* **1992**, 33 (6), 818-824.

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

702


703 **Figures and Tables**




704

705 **Figure 1.** University of Calgary main campus highlighting different sewer catchments (colour key is shown in the figure legend). NW, NE, and SO indicate
 706 Northwest, Northeast, and South catchments, respectively. RH1 and 2 represent the two student residence halls. The area MIX (colored in orange) belongs to both
 707 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
 708 light grey) represent un-serviced parking lots. The figure was modified from <http://www.ucalgary.ca/map>.

(a) SARS-CoV-N1 RNA




(b) SARS-CoV-N2 RNA




709

710 **Figure 2.** Log₁₀-transformed concentrations (copies/mL) of SARS-CoV-2 N1 and N2 profiles in campus wastewater sub-catchments demonstrate much lower
711 values relative to the receiving municipal WWTP during the study period (August 31, 2021 – April 30, 2022). WWTP indicates the municipal wastewater treatment
712 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) :
713 dd.mm.yyyy.



714

715 **Figure 3.** Log₁₀-transformed concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 N1 (left) and N2 (right) by sub-catchment
716 monitoring location variably demonstrate differences between locations during Period-A (Aug 31, 2021-
717 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

720 **Figure 4.** Log_{10} -transformed cases per capita estimated for UofC according to Eq.1 (for raw-
 721 concentration) or Eq.2 (for normalized-concentrations using PMMoV and chemical agents), and
 722 measured for the surrounding community (i.e., WWTP) during the entire monitoring period. Cases per
 723 capita was calculated for each data point (i.e., time point), and displayed using trend lines (linearly
 724 extrapolated between two data points) over time in (a), and using box plots after aggregated by group in
 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).

728

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

Period	Indicator	Location	RH2	RH1	NE	SO	NW
Period-A	N1	RH1	0.675	-	-	-	-
		NE	0.968	0.650	-	-	-
		SO	0.026	0.014	0.020	-	-
		NW	0.014	0.005	0.005	0.863	-
		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
Period-B	N1	RH1	-	-	-	-	-
		NE	-	0.019	-	-	-
		SO	-	0.156	0.000	-	-
		NW	-	0.491	0.002	0.006	-
		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

733

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

Location	N1			N2		
	(-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

740

741 **Table 3.** Comparing modelled COVID-19 cases per capita between WWTP and UofC campus using
 742 raw and normalized values. The p-values were calculated using Permutation test (see 2.7), and indicate
 743 the proportion of the number of cases where cases per capita for UofC > cases per capita for WWTP to
 744 1,000 (=the number of total simulation runs). Those pairs that statistically differed with ($p < 0.05$) are
 745 highlighted in red.

Date	Raw	Normalized					
		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

747