

SUBJECT LINE: Request for Factual Corrections in MCE Series

Hi Jennifer,

We were disappointed to see the Marin Independent Journal's series on MCE contain a number of factual inaccuracies, omissions and lack of context that we believe misrepresent our organization.

MCE's CEO, Dawn Weisz, spent nearly three hours with the reporter to answer all of his questions, contextualize the reality of the complex market environment that MCE and other CCA's operate in, and give him a detailed explanation of MCE's costs over time. Unfortunately, some of that information did not make it into the final stories, leaving key issues without balance or full context.

Our goal is to ensure readers receive accurate information about MCE's operations.

Attached is a list of factual errors and omissions where clarifications are warranted. We respectfully request that corrections or clarifying notes be issued.

Thank you for taking the time to review these details — we appreciate your attention to accuracy and fair reporting.

Regards,
Jared

--



Jared Blanton

Vice President of Public Affairs

(415) 250-1192

mceCleanEnergy.org

Corrections

- 1) Part Four states, "...other issues like MCE delivering less carbon-free electricity than advertised."

CORRECTION: MCE does not buy less carbon-free electricity than advertised as confirmed in our [Power Content Label](#). We follow the same annual [accounting methodology](#) that all LSE's are required to adhere to by the California Energy Commission.

- 2) Part Three and Part Four both reference 100,000 Deep Green customers.

CORRECTION: Across MCE's full service area, there are about 42,000 Deep Green customers. This includes both residential and commercial customers.

- 3) Part One states: "But for the past three years, its projections were nowhere near its audited actual expenses."

CORRECTION: In fiscal year 2022/23 MCE's variance was 13%. In 2023/24 variance was -14%. In 2024/25 variance was 12%. "Nowhere near" is a subjective statement that doesn't provide an accurate understanding of this variance and why it was present.

- 4) Part Four states, "Hours before it began, its 11 members received an email with a letter drafted by Justine Parmelee, the vice president of internal operations, targeting the critics on its board."

CORRECTION: MCE's chair and vice-chair drafted the letter, not Justine Parmelee. (Note: Justine Parmelee's name appears on pg. 3 only because she assisted with the docusign process)

- 5) Part One states, "MCE reported an operating loss of \$26.9 million between April 1 and June 30, 2025. Electricity costs were \$16 million more than sales."

CORRECTION: This refers to 'preliminary, unaudited financial results' that are not final (see MCE's [Treasurer's Report](#)) and reflect unusually mild summer temperatures which yield lower sales.

Omissions and Lack of Context

- 1) Part One states, "Total expenses increased by \$200 million from the year before — creating a net operating loss."

OMISSION AND LACK OF CONTEXT: While the cost of energy increased by \$200 million year over year in Fiscal Year 2024/2025, MCE had a net gain of \$13 million - see [audited financial report](#) and [10/6/25 Executive Committee CEO Report, slide 3](#).

- 2) Part Two states, “On Sept. 24, PG&E announced it was cutting residential electric rates by 2.1% as of Sept. 1.”

OMISSION AND LACK OF CONTEXT: This implies PG&E’s rate cut will not be passed along to MCE customers. However, it refers to an [adjustment](#) on the transmission and delivery side of the bill and therefore applied equally to PG&E and MCE customers.

- 3) Part Two states, “In March, MCE raised prices for commercial customers.”

OMISSION AND LACK OF CONTEXT: This implies the rate change impacts all commercial customers. However, it only impacted 3,000 large commercial customers (about 4.8% of commercial customers) which is less than 1% of MCE’s total customers. For reference, MCE [raised demand charges](#) for this small subset of customers by just 4.4%

- 4) Part Two states, “Staff compensation at MCE has quadrupled in the past seven years, from \$5.9 million in the 2017-2018 fiscal year to \$24.7 million in its 2024-2025 fiscal year, according to its audited financial statements. Weisz’s current salary is \$532,000, plus a cost-of-living adjustment, before a \$41,000 bonus and benefits.”

OMISSION AND LACK OF CONTEXT: This implies staff compensation does not align with norms in the market. However, compensation is in line with market norms, and MCE’s service area grew significantly during the same period, requiring added staff to support the agency. Relevant context should be included that among California CCA CEO’s, Dawn is the longest serving CEO with 17 years in the role. The next closest is almost 12 years with Geoff Syphers at SCP. Dawn’s base salary is the highest but not her total compensation. She [ranks third](#) in total compensation which is just 16% higher than the average. The article’s omission that Dawn’s compensation is comparable to her peers at other CCA’s leaves the impression that it is above market rate.

Additionally, while MCE’s staff compensation did increase by a factor of 4, our number of customers served and electricity load doubled, and our grant revenue increased by a factor of 9. There is almost a 1 to 1 correlation between grant revenue and staff compensation. Over that time MCE staff also doubled from 47 full-time employees to 100.

- 5) Part Four states, “During the executive committee meeting on Aug. 28, MCE finance staff barely mentioned the \$200 million — 33% — jump in energy costs compared to its prior fiscal year.”

OMISSION AND LACK OF CONTEXT: This implies the topic was not discussed by staff and the board in great detail. However, this item was addressed during this meeting as item #06, ([see Attachment B](#), page 10). This issue was also discussed at regular Executive Committee meetings on [10/6/25 item #06](#) (page 30), [2/3/25 item #09](#) (page

89), [3/3/25 item #06](#) (page 3), and [7/7/25 item #07](#) (page 31). After requests from our board for additional information we discussed this in detail at several subsequent meetings.

- 6) Part Two states, “When MCE held its September board meeting, its directors were told the not-for-profit renewable energy agency was overcharging the public.”

OMISSION AND LACK OF CONTEXT: This implies the source of information was reliable. However, the article fails to note that the board was told this by a member of the public, working for the Clean Coalition, and not by staff. The source of data was not provided and the methodology was not disclosed. The Clean Coalition did not respond when MCE staff requested sources in order to review the data and assess the approach used. The analysis from the Clean Coalition is referenced throughout the series, but they have been unresponsive when MCE staff made a good faith attempt to engage with the group and understand their approach.

MCE’s rates are based on cost of service. MCE’s generation rates rank 17 out of 28 across California’s CCAs and IOUs. Our customers total bill is reflective of MCE generation costs, PG&E fees, and PG&E delivery. MCE has the second highest total bill costs due to PG&E’s charges but MCE rates are still only 4% above average and 1% above PG&E. Among CCA’s, PG&E charges MCE customers the highest delivery costs in the state and rank 25/28 in PG&E fees. PG&E charges, not MCE’s rates are the reason for the higher total cost.

Lastly, while PG&E’s total bill costs are currently less expensive than MCE’s, PG&E has announced projected rate increases in 2027, 2028, 2029 and 2030. PG&E has executed over 10 rate changes over the last 3 years while MCE has had: one general rate change, one increase to the Deep Green premium, and one demand charge change to a small subset of commercial customers.