

Public comments submitted to MCE are unaltered and have not been assessed for accuracy. Any opinions expressed are attributable solely to the authors.
MCE welcomes engagement and appreciates written input from the public.
All letters from the public are available on our website [here](#).

Public Comment, Item 8a: Support for Reducing the Size of the MCE Board

From Marc Lewis <mhunterlewis@gmail.com>

Date Thu 10/15/2026 12:02 PM

To MCE Clerk <clerk@mcecleanenergy.org>

You don't often get email from mhunterlewis@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Chair Scales-Preston and Members of the Board,

I write in support of reducing the size of the MCE Board, and specifically in support of the county-based model Director Jacobs has proposed.

MCE buys power, sets rates and runs programs that affect the bills of hundreds of thousands of households and businesses. Those decisions are technical and often time-sensitive. A 34-member board is hard to convene, hard to brief and hard to hold accountable, and it grows every time a new community joins. The Civil Grand Jury reached the same conclusion: the Board's size and composition make it difficult to govern.

Director Jacobs' model addresses those problems directly. Each county would have three seats: one supervisor and two members selected by the county's cities. The two city seats would require proven expertise in finance, energy, or infrastructure. This structure:

- caps the size of the Board while membership keeps growing;
- treats every county equally, regardless of how many cities it has;
- puts members with relevant experience at the table; and
- keeps every city's direct role in choosing its representatives.

Representation should be measured by whether directors have the knowledge and time to protect ratepayers, not by the number of seats.

I ask the Board to take three steps tonight:

1. **Add this model to the options Leading Resources will assess.** The current list includes a generic 12-seat option but not the supervisor-plus-expertise structure or criteria for verifying expertise.
2. **Direct a recommendation and transition plan within six months.** The workplan now schedules a decision for May 2027. The Grand Jury asked the Board to decide by December 31, 2026 whether its size and composition impede governance, and that date should be met.
3. **Answer the open questions in the same report.** The report should cover voting weight, how cities select their seats and resolve disputes, how expertise is verified, and what happens when a

seat goes unfilled. Smaller cities and larger cities alike deserve clear answers on how their voices will be protected before any vote on the Joint Powers Agreement.

A smaller, more qualified board is the clearest step MCE can take to restore ratepayer confidence. I urge the Board to move it forward now.

Respectfully,

Marc Hunter Lewis
Novato, California