Public Tick IPM Working Group
August 9th, 2017

Please send additions, omissions or other corrections to flaufenberg@ipminstitute.org

The Working Group meets via conference call on the second Wednesday of each month at 1:00PM CT (2:00PM EST). The following notes are for August 9th, 2017.

Roll
• Frank Laufenberg, IPM Institute of North America
• Tom Green, IPM Institute of North America
• Mason Kauffman, US BIOLOGIC
• Chris Przybyszewski, US BIOLOGIC
• Steve Good, US BIOLOGIC
• Susan Weinstein, State Public Health Veterinarian
• Jill Auerbach, TRED and Hudson Valley Lyme Disease Association
• Tim Fox, Madison Area Lyme Association
• Chris Stelzig, Entomological Society of America
• Richard Taffner, Arkansas Department of Health
• Joellen Lampman, New York State IPM Program
• Bob Maurais, Mainely Ticks
• Tom Mather, University of Rhode Island
• Neeta Connally, Western Connecticut State University
• Mike Mrozinski, Pike County
• PJ Liesch, University of Wisconsin-Madison
• Kyndall Dye, Harris County Public Health
• Kirby Stafford, Connecticut Ag Research Station

Agenda
1. Presentation: LymeShield System – US BIOLOGIC
2. The nominations to the HHS non-Federal Public Workgroup closed on August 15th.
3. Additional updates, comments and announcements

2. Presentation: LymeShield System – US BIOLOGIC (Chris Przybyszewski, Mason Kauffman and Steve Good)
   a. The vaccine is novel in how it provides the Lyme vaccine to the tick.
      i. Developing logistical support in addition to the application.
   b. This tool is designed to be part of an IPM approach to reduce Lyme.
      i. Designed to rotate every 10 days (6 chambers)
      ii. Simple installation
      iii. Initial fill and 2 refills per year
      iv. Locked up tight—nearly impossible for anyone to break into chamber by accident.
c. Chipmunks would feed out of this? If it is a smaller chipmunk, then it could be possible—but the vaccine is approved by the USDA for white footed mice.
d. This year US BIOLOGIC worked with multiple partners to test this products design. Testing for reliability without vaccinated pellets.
e. Installation in under 5 minutes.
   i. Timing mechanism was reliable, durable timing elements.
   ii. No interference of note with wildlife, but had to improve staking system.
   iii. Strong consumption by the target species – the white footed mice.
   iv. Potential to add anti-fungal agent on pallets to maintain longevity of product.
   v. Working to maintain reliability and make it as economical as possible.
g. Steven Wikel (40 years of field experience with Ticks) to develop multi-level inhibitor of tick. “Hybrid-TBV”.
   i. Pellet can very easily be modified to have other treatments integrated into it.

h. BM: Could add multiple ITM methods to the system.
   i. Potential to add tick tube as bedding with the food for the mice.

i. TG: what’s the extent of data for efficacy of reducing disease and regulation concerns?
   i. We don’t deal with human health—that’s closer to the CDC’s work.
   ii. Previous published lab and field trials, working with Kirby Stafford on further testing now. Data is finalized and it should be published within the next year.
   iii. What sizes of regulatory aspects will need to be approved?
      1. The product is approved for vaccinating mice (specifically).
   iv. Licensing specifically: multistate distribution first, and then later in 2018 we should be able to get it distributed widely by pest professionals.

j. Provides neighborhood package by getting the travelling mice (not just the property lines), unlike acaricide sprays. However, acaricide sprays would still be compatible with this product in an ITM approach.

k. JA: Safety, acceptance by the public, ease of use, last variable is cost.
   i. For device and for maintaining it.
      1. CP: We don’t have a final price point, but we are trying to minimize the cost for full accessibility.
      2. Steve Good: Dealing with a wide variety of pest professionals in size. All have been amazed at how elegant this process is, they like how simple and effective the design is.
         a. All are excited about the product and including it with their services.
      3. Industry has evolved towards public health—this tool fits that approach.
      4. Current projections are lower than other current tick knock down products, which are not very accessible.
         a. Single mosquito services are sometimes $600-$700, this will be more rewarding and cheaper than that program.
      5. Could also try to get government support for these products.
         a. We would certainly work to get that support and also incorporate the LymeShield System into public areas – such as parks.

3. Nomination process for the HHS non-Federal Public Workgroup
a. Jill organized the group called TRED (Tick Research to Eliminate Disease), which is trying to add members onto the HHS Workgroup.
   i. Process: Someone has to nominate and nominees have to commit to serve for the following categories in the workgroup:
      1. Physicians
      2. Scientists and researchers
      3. Patients and family members
      4. Involved Non-profits
      5. Other individuals with expertise

b. Frank shared information with the Public Tick IPM Working Group membership.
   i. Tom, Kirby, Rick Ostfeld, etc. would fit either in the Scientists or Other individuals with expertise section.
   ii. A letter of nomination, a bio and a letter of accepting the role.

c. Nomination process closed on August 15th.
   i. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) announced establishment of the Working Group. The Secretary of Health and Human Services is responsible for ensuring the conduct of and support for epidemiological, basic, translational, and clinical research related to vector-borne diseases, including tick-borne diseases.
   ii. Working Group will consist of representatives of appropriate federal agencies and non-federal entities who represent diverse scientific disciplines and views. The Working Group will provide expertise and review all efforts within the Department of Health and Human Services related to all tick-borne diseases, to help ensure interagency coordination and minimize overlap, and to examine research priorities.
   iii. More information can be found at a link that details the workgroup and 21st century cures act language section 2062:

4. Additional updates, comments, announcements, questions
   a. 9th International IPM Symposium will be in Baltimore next March from the 19th-22nd. On March 21st there will be a full day of tick IPM sessions.
      a. Thursday morning Mosquito IPM sessions.
      b. Thursday afternoon there will be a D.C. visit.
      c. Registration will open on October.
      d. Frank shared the outline of the tick day session with the Working Group.
   b. Kirby: Tick management symposium in February or March in Kansas City.
   c. Mosquito association meeting will be in early March of 2018 as well.
   d. Tick Pest Alert Sharing
      a. Please notify Frank if the Tick Pest Alert has been shared with any new organizations or individuals so we can keep track of its reach!
      b. Here is the link to share: https://www.ncipmc.org/action/alerts/ticks.pdf
   e. If you come across articles that would benefit members of this group feel free to share them by sending an email to the PUBLIC_TICK_IPM_WG@LISTSERV.URI.EDU
These notes are for a Working Group call on **August 9th**. Future calls will continue to fall on the second Wednesday of each month at **1 PM Central time**. Please send Frank updates, announcements or other additions for August’s call.

The Public Tick IPM Working Group is funded by the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Crop Protection and Pest Management Program through the North Central IPM Center.