I. Roll
- Jill Auerbach, Hudson Valley Lyme Disease Association
- John Carroll, Researcher [retired], USDA-ARS Invasive Insect Behavior and Biocontrol Laboratory
- Neeta Connally, Ass. professor of medical entomology Western Connecticut State University
- Adriana Costero, NIAID-NIH
- Tom Delaney, National Land Care Network, National Lawn Care Association
- Maria Diuk-Wasser, Professor, Yale School of Public Health
- Tom Green, IPM Institute
- Laura Hayes, Agricultural Post-Doctoral Research Scientist, CT Agricultural Experiment Station
- Bennett Jordan, National Pest Management Association
- Peter Krause, Senior research scientist, Yale School of Public Health
- Joe Laco, CDC National Center for Environmental Health
- Karla Lehtonen, Lyme disease advocate
- Tom Mather, Professor and director of Center for Vector-Borne Disease, University of Rhode Island
- Kathy Murray, Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry
- Kerry Padget, California Department of Public Health
- Sarah Robinson, Vector-borne disease coordinator, State of Maine
- Pat Smith, President, Lyme Disease Association
- Kirby Staffor, CT Ag Experiment Station
- Stephen Vantassel, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
- Meagan Vaughn, Department of Epidemiology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

II. Corrections to November conference call minutes:
   a. Add Jill Auerbach to list of participants.
   b. Error in date.
   c. Clarify minutes regarding priorities, which are overarching priorities rather than the longer list of priorities we will draft and update as a regular working group activity.

III. Introduction to, comments on Working Group Charter draft
   a. Initial draft prepared by Candace, modeled after the federal agency tick and tickborne-disease workgroup. Federal workgroups typically have charters.
   b. Purpose is to summarize risks, state a commitment to IPM, state mission, set scope, stress importance of collaboration.
      a. First overarching priority should be “Develop and promote adoption of IPM strategies.....”
      b. Coordinate with Fed Tick IPM Group should be with #3.
      c. Clarify 2b to “Clarify and minimize risks associated with acaricide and other tickborne disease management products.”
Public Tick IPM Working Group  
Minutes, Conference Call, December 11, 2013  
corrections to jpetzoldt@ipminstitute.org

d. Need definition of IPM. Jane and Tom to take snippet from USDA Roadmap to include in charter and include a reference to the Roadmap.
e. Include identifying, maintaining updated priorities.
f. Suggestion: Include monthly conference call mechanics.
g. Suggestion: Change control (last word) to management.
h. Vaccines:
   i. Revisit complete removal from Working Group scope.
   ii. Proposal:
       - Outside of scope: Vaccines designed to prevent infections in humans or wildlife for health benefits to the individual organism.
       - Within scope: Vaccines designed to reduce tick numbers or block ability of ticks to pass on pathogens. Includes for example, vaccines designed to prevent infection in mice and other reservoirs to break infection cycle.

i. Remove IX, put in separate document. The priorities will be updated regularly as part of our deliverables.

IV. Planned Working Group Activities

a. Conference calls, meetings, minutes circulation, listserv and website to Improve communications, networking, e.g., to increase adoption of effective tools that may be new, or used currently in a limited region but with greater potential use.

b. Conference calls as more formal educational opportunities for the group, e.g., planned presentation by a member or non-member on their work or solutions to increase awareness and use.

c. Identifying and maintaining current stakeholder priorities. Working Groups funded by the USDA Regional IPM Centers serve this function as a mandatory deliverable. These priority lists general include research, regulatory and education, and are useful for multiple purposes:
   i. Funders can use these to evaluate the need for projects proposed by potential grantees, i.e., do stakeholders view the proposed outcome as a priority need? Funders can also use priorities in challenge grant programs and in requests for proposals.
   ii. Likewise, potential grantees can use the priorities as evidence of need for their project.
   iii. Regulators may be able to use priorities to help guide registration or other decisions.
   iv. The School IPM Strategic Plan (http://www.ipminstitute.org/school_ipm_2015/SCHOOL_IPM_2015_v2%20DRAFT_FOR_COMMENT_071111.pdf) also includes management priorities, i.e., what do we need to be doing to manage the overall tickborne disease effort more effectively?

d. The Working Group could decide to work together on specific priorities, potentially as subgroups including developing a funding proposal and serving as co-principal investigators, collaborators, participants.

V. Member Updates
The Maine Medical Center submitted a grant proposal to the Northeastern IPM Center to develop homeowner videos. Also a Maine Vector Working Group

**VI. Process**

a. Agendas going forward should include prior-call minutes review as first agenda item to collect corrections, clarifications.

b. Corrected minutes should be circulated.

c. Tom Mather and Tom Green have volunteered to co-chair the working group.