Outlook

Public Comment for Board Meeting on September 17th on Item 9 from 350 Contra Costa Action

From Lisa Jackson <67jacksonl@gmail.com>
Date Wed 9/16/2026 4:44 PM
To MCE Clerk <clerk@mcecleanenergy.org>

1 attachment (448 KB)
350CCACommentLettertoMCE9-16-2026.pdf;

[You don't often get email from 67jacksonl@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

To the Clerk of the Board,

Please find attached Public Comment from 350 Contra Costa Action, for the Board meeting on September 17th, relating to Item 9 on the agenda. Please distribute to the board members.

Regards

Lisa Jackson and Ogie Strogatz
350 Contra Costa Action.

September 16, 2026

MCE Board of Directors
1125 Tamalpais Avenue
San Rafael, CA 94901

RE: Comments on Item 9: Delivery of Findings on Governance Assessment for September 17 Board Meeting from 350 Contra Costa Action

Dear MCE Board Members,

350 Contra Costa welcomes the completion of the Governance Assessment, which has identified governance concerns, some of which were in line with the recent Grand Jury report.

We agree with several of the Governance Assessment's recommendations, particularly the need to:

- Clearly define CEO authority and Board oversight, including responsibility for major contracts, procurement, financial commitments and senior management decisions.
- Improve how decisions come to the Board. Management should present meaningful choices and alternatives rather than bringing forward decisions that are effectively already made, with committees given clear roles in reviewing important issues.
- Strengthen Board expertise and accountability. We support continuing education in finance, procurement and risk, together with CEO performance measures that include responsiveness to the Board, timely and complete information, and respect for governance processes.

There are two areas where we believe the recommendations should go further:

- Board size and timing. The assessment found that 77% of respondents, including 70% of responding Board members, believe MCE would be more effective with a smaller Board. We therefore disagree with postponing this issue. Discussion on board size should be addressed early as part of the initial governance work.
- Board expertise. While we support better training, the Civil Grand Jury went further, recommending greater financial and energy expertise on the Board and consideration of qualified non-elected experts. We believe the Board should consider whether training and advisers alone provide sufficient independent expertise for an organization approaching $1 billion in annual revenue.

Finally, we are concerned about the pace of implementation. With some reforms extending over 18–24 months, we encourage the Board to accelerate the most important changes, particularly while the search for a new CEO is underway. The Board should establish clear expectations for the authority, responsibilities and accountability of the CEO as part of that search, rather than after a new CEO is appointed.

We strongly support MCE's mission and believe acting promptly on these governance reforms will strengthen the organization, rebuild public confidence and provide a stronger foundation for its next CEO.

Sincerely,

Lisa Jackson/Ogie Strogatz

350 Contra Costa Action