



*LoopWorks*

## **LoopWorks Quarterly Board Meeting Meeting Minutes for Sept. 18, 2021 at 2:00 pm**

**Location:** 1421 Yellowstone Ave, Milpitas **or online:** <https://zoom.us/j/8238203495>

1. Welcome and introductions. Board members attending: Matt Kennedy, Rob Means, Tam Overacker, Tiffany Vuong. PRT supporters attending: Carol Klein, Steve Hamilton (from CityTram.org in Florida)
2. Accomplishments this Quarter:
  - Tiffany Vuong agreed to become the Community Director on the LoopWorks Board. Her work mobilizing voters and advocating for tenant protections combined with a facility with multiple languages make her well-suited to both represent the community's interests and reach out to involve the public in this project.
  - Roughly 150 foundations have been investigated as candidates to fund the Milpitas PRT project. This research has surfaced the facts that 1) only 2% of global philanthropic funding is committed to solving the climate crisis, and 2) only 10% of foundations accept unsolicited grant proposals, requests, or letters of inquiry. Thus, our target market for grants is only 0.2% of foundation money (far smaller than expected in the [LoopWorks Business Plan](#)).
  - A 45-minute [video presentation](https://meansfordemocracy.org/Sierra-Club-Guadalupe.mp4) with Q&A for the Sierra Club Guadalupe Group was posted on our website: <https://meansfordemocracy.org/Sierra-Club-Guadalupe.mp4>
  - Morgan Hill Life published a [Guest column by Matthew Kennedy: Personal Rapid Transit might be way of the future](#) in the June 30 – July 13, 2021 issue.
3. For-profit investment firms with & without foundation connections. Research has also surfaced 2 other potential sources of funding. As an example, while Skoll has a foundation, they also have a for-profit investment arm (Capricorn Investment Group) with a focus on climate solutions. Several other foundation-affiliated investment groups also exist, along with stand-alone investment companies. Any of them may be willing to give LoopWorks money for an R&D project (Milpitas PRT) rather than expecting re-payment and a profit. The appeal of a profit-making PRT future may provide the incentive to consider our small project an up-front investment in a long-term plan. After pursuing the few foundations that seem a good fit for this project, for-profit investment firms with, then without, foundation connections will be contacted.
4. Linked In connections to foundations? 90% of foundations do not accept unsolicited grant proposals, but rely upon internal networks for leads on projects/programs to fund. Rob's daughter, Robin, recommended contacting people that I already have a connection with, and who also work for the foundation I want to contact. Lacking that, find some in my network who does know someone in the foundation. She demonstrated to him the possibility by quickly finding a couple of people in her Linked In connections – one of whom Rob actually knows! After compiling a list of target foundations and investment firms, an e-blast to PRT supporters will be sent asking for introductions. Advertising for other connections may be done by presenting the problem to the Thom Hartmann radio audience and the 2021 Podcar City

Conference.

5. Milpitas City Council support – LoopWorks building public support. Council support for the project would be helpful in securing support from others (funders and property owners). Currently, support from Council members Dominguez and Phan is likely, while opposition from Tran and Montano is expected. Although newly-elected Chua is an open question, her alignment with Tran and Montano suggest some resistance is likely. Tiffany pointed out the Phan’s interest in his image may make PRT an attractive component of his plan. Regardless, building public support and securing some funding will eventually push the Council to get on board. In the meantime, Tiffany will choose our public outreach path.
6. Conversation about strategy for creation of the Milpitas PRT. Steve Hamilton of CityTram noted the difficulty of getting governmental funding for an initial test facility. LoopWorks’ plan to seek \$60M in grants from foundations or investment firms presents an alternative source that may be more successful. Also noted is Steve’s CityTram design starts, like that of the ITNS design that LoopWorks is using, with minimizing guideway size/weight. In terms of installation cost, the CityTram design will likely be superior due to a design decision to allow no more than 2 cabs to occupy the space between posts. ITNS assumes a worst-case scenario of a continuous line of cabs – nose to tail – occupying the space between posts. Thus, a stronger/heavier/costlier guideway is required. Most PRT designs are heavier/costlier than these two.
7. Adjournment