

**Meeting Announcement and Agenda
Mt. Pleasant Planning Commission**

**Thursday, April 9, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.
City Hall Commission Chamber**

- I. Roll Call: Boyd, Crespy, Devenney, Friedrich, Haveles, Kingsworthy, Martinez, Ortman
- II. Approval of Agenda:
- III. Approval of Minutes:
 - A. March 5, 2026, Regular Meeting
- IV. Zoning Board of Appeals report – Monthly report for March:
- V. Communications:
- VI. Public Hearings:
 - A. **TC-26-01 – Screening on Industrial Sites** – A proposed text change of the Zoning Ordinances to Table 154.405.A District Standards: SD-I Industrial Special District pertaining to Screens, to increase the maximum screen height not at Frontage or Adjacent to Civic Space from six feet to eight feet.
- VII. Site Plan Reviews:
 - A. None
- VIII. Public Comments:
- IX. Unfinished Business:
 - A. None
- X. New Business:
 - A. None
- XI. Staff Report:
 - A. Earth Day Event, Island Park, Farmers Market Pavilion Wednesday 4/22 12pm-4pm
- XII. Adjournment

INSTRUCTIONS TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION DURING PUBLIC HEARING OR PUBLIC COMMENT:
If in person, please proceed to the podium, state your name and address, and you will be given five minutes. To speak via Zoom, please use the raise hand feature and wait to unmute yourself until after your name is called.

All interested persons may attend and participate. Persons with disabilities needing assistance to participate may call the Personnel Office at 779-5314. A 48-hour advance notice is necessary for accommodation.

**Mt. Pleasant Planning Commission
Minutes of the Regular Meeting
March 5, 2026**

I. Ortman called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

Present: Boyd, Friedrich, Haveles, Kingsworthy, Ortman
Absent: Crespy, Devenney, Martinez

Staff: Manuela Powidayko, Kayleigh Cullen

II. Approval of the Agenda:

Motion by Friedrich, supported by Haveles to approve the agenda.

Motion approved unanimously.

III. Approval of the Minutes:

A. February 5, 2026, Regular Minutes

Motion by Friedrich, support by Haveles to approve the minutes from the February 5, 2026, regular meeting as presented.

Motion approved unanimously.

IV. Zoning Board of Appeals report for October:

Haveles reported that the Zoning Board of Appeals did not meet in February 2026.

V. Communications:

Powidayko reported on the letter received from Lorenz Surveying & Engineering, Inc regarding the Allowable Heigh of Fences in Industrial Zoning Districts.

VI. Public Comments:

Ortman opened the public comment.

Marja Nothstine of 1361 S Crawford St clarified prior comments as concerns with zoning personnel only and opposed the Crawford/Broomfield private school proposal and supporting residential use instead.

Tom Nothstine of 1361 S Crawford St spoke in support of the Planning Commission's work on the Master Plan asking that they do their best to do what the city needs. He voiced support

for more residential land and the desire to make sure infrastructure can support changes made.

Powidayko noted there were no other public comments submitted via zoom or electronically.

There being no one else who wished to speak, public comment was closed.

VII. New Business:

A. TC-26-01 (Introduction) – A proposed text change of the Zoning Ordinances to Table 154.405.A District Standards: SD-I Industrial Special District pertaining to Screens, to increase the maximum screen height not at Frontage or Adjacent to Civic Space from six feet to eight feet.

Powidayko introduced TC-26-01 with the requested action being for the Planning Commission to be to set the Public Hearing to April 9th, 2026. The goal being to raise fence height cap to provide greater security for outdoor storage inventory, while ensuring compatibility with surrounding non-industrial land uses.

Friedrich asked if there was any reason for the fence height beyond security. Powidayko replied that it also screens tall equipment, with 8 feet exceeding human height and eye level. Friedrich asked why the ordinance reduced the height from 8 to 6 feet and not higher. Powidayko explained that heights over 8 feet can be visually dominant and the Ordinance prioritizes urban design principles but added that the Ordinance was been drafted all at once therefore changes may be needed over time as it gets implemented and lessons are learned.

Motion by Friedrich, support by Haveles to set a public hearing for proposed text change of the Zoning Ordinances to Table 154.405.A District Standards: SD-I Industrial Special District pertaining to Screens, to increase the maximum screen height not at Frontage or Adjacent to Civic Space from six feet to eight feet.

Ayes: Boyd, Friedrich, Haveles, Kingsworthy, Ortman

Nays: None

Motion passed unanimously.

B. 2025 Planning Commission Annual Report

Powidayko provided a background on the Planning Commission Annual Report and requested that the Planning Commission approve the 2025 Planning Commission Annual Report.

Motion by Friedrich, support by Haveles, to approve the 2025 Planning Commission Annual Report as presented.

VIII. Staff Report

A. Introduction to new Planning Commission members: Jake Boyd and Charles Crespy appointed at the February 9, 2026, City Commission meeting.

B. Regional Housing Partnership Annual Event: The Planning & Community Development Director was invited to present about the City of Mt. Pleasant's recent efforts on housing policy, including demographic trends and housing gap research and the updates to the master plan and zoning ordinances, aimed to improve housing option and affordability on March 4, 2026 at the Regional Housing Partnership Annual Event at Midland Center for the Arts.

C. Farley Resignation: Commissioner Rachel Putnam-Farley appointed February 24, 2025, resigned as of February 28, 2026.

IX. Adjourn:

Motion by Friedrich, supported by Haveles to adjourn.

Motion approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

To: Mt.Pleasant Planning Commission and City Commission

From: Marja Nothstine

Date: March 5, 2026

Re: Zoning in the city of Mt. Pleasant

Planning Commissioners and Mayor Wingard and City Commissioners

Yesterday I attended the Michigan Municipal League Event in Midland for Region G Housing Partnership (It was advertised in the February 2026 planning commission minutes), where many municipalities spoke about ideas for building more homes. They covered financing, zoning, land developers and our MtPleasant city planner spoke there, also. She spoke pro-actively about additional housing. I went for an education about all of these subjects and learned that the public needs 12 times as many homes built in central Michigan as we are doing now. I learned about smaller lot sizes, smaller houses (because fewer people live in each house), pocket communities like the Crosslane project.

You can erase what I said at last month's planning commission meeting about zoning, because there is no fighting the entire state of Michigan—municipalities everywhere want to make smaller and smaller and build more and more buildings on already established lots.

No matter what the secretary wrote in last month's planning commission minutes—I am not speaking negatively of the 99% hard working city employees, my husband was one of them. He loved being able to ride his bicycle through the parks to his office in the DPW building on North Franklin. I was only speaking of zoning personnel.


But I will not change my mind about the area of the city at the SW corner of Broomfield and Crawford Roads. It is already designated for planned residential—in other words it could be a place for a good many of the homes this city needs. It is 30 acres for a new neighborhood in the master plan. The acres north of Broomfield Road near Country Way were planned residential years ago. It looks planned with apartments near the crossing roads—spreading into duplexes and further into single family homes. I presume that was what was meant to be done to this empty land south of Broomfield, but there are people pushing to give this great land away FOREVER to a large mega-church-backed organization—lose it FOREVER for the city's TAX BASE and lose the houses which could have been built for MtPleasant families FOREVER. (By the way, driving from Midland yesterday I saw at least 3 empty fields with For Sale signs just east of MtPleasant and yet this private school can't find, for years, any land on which to build except our last few subdivision-worthy city acres.

Our city is land locked. But wouldn't it be great to use the new zoning ideas to build a planned neighborhood—and not have to squeeze it in somewhere. Use it on the 30 acres, Plan a newly zoned subdivision and use it for future city families.

I don't know what your official role is as commissioner but I should hope part of it is to protect the future of our city and to act to benefit the most people while thinking of the cost to our tax base and not to cater to small private interests. A difficult job.

I do want to write plainly, that since the PRD seems to be doomed and will be terminated—that the new zoning be only for residential purposes and not lose the tax base needed for the budget. Terminating the PRD will simplify many steps but should not allow private interests to do whatever they wish.

Thank you

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Marja Rothstine". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

PS. When it is advertised and announced in the planning commission meeting about a petition and many signers of it and then when the signers' addresses are inspected you see at least 100 were not living in MtPleasant or the state, and many were not living within the city limits—how does that statement prejudice a voter. I also wonder if it is legal to put a QR code for petitioners to sign and make monetary support on the city's government website. It seems that the city should be impartial.

PPS. Please don't let private entities steal our city's future—its tax base and its homes for families—we do not have any additional land.0

Memorandum

Mt. Pleasant
[meet here]

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Manuela Powidayko
Director of Planning and Community Development
DATE: April 9, 2026
SUBJECT: TC-26-01 – Screening on Industrial Sites

At your March 5, 2026 meeting, the Planning Commission received a presentation from staff about the proposed text change TC-26-01 to amend Table 154.405.A District Standards: SD-I Industrial Special District pertaining to Screens. **The proposed text change increases the maximum screen height not at Frontage or Adjacent to Civic Space from six feet to eight feet.**

More information about the proposed text change can be found in the attached introduction memorandum.

REQUESTED ACTION:

Recommend that the City Commission adopt Text Change 26-01.

ATTACHMENT

1. Planning Commission Introduction Memorandum
2. Draft ordinance
3. Letter from Lorenz Surveying & Engineering, Inc

Memorandum



TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Manuela Powidayko
Director of Planning and Community Development
DATE: March 5, 2026
SUBJECT: TC-26-01 (Introduction) – Amendment to SD-I regarding Screens

Summary: A proposed text change of the Zoning Ordinances to Table 154.405.A District Standards: SD-I Industrial Special District pertaining to Screens, to increase the maximum screen height not at Frontage or Adjacent to Civic Space from six feet to eight feet.

Background: At the September 4, 2025 meeting, the Planning Commission approved Site Plan Review for J. Ranck Electric to build an 24,803 sq. ft. addition to the existing 51,685 sq. ft. facility at 1993 Gover Parkway, and associated site improvements including new pavement surfaces, fencing and utility connections. The site contains an existing eight-foot-tall fence at the south property boundary. The Planning Commission approved the extension of such fence to the east to include the new hard surface area, which will aid J. Ranck’s expanded operations. At the time, the applicant had asked for the fence height to match the existing eight-foot-tall fence, but the Planning Commission did not have the ability to approve it, since the new fence must meet the current code.

On January Pete Lorenz, surveyor & engineer for this project, who also works on many other industrial projects in the city, sent a letter requesting the Planning Commission’s consideration for a text change that would increase the maximum height limit for fences from six feet to eight feet. Per his letter:

“While an eight-foot fence is more costly to install, the owner recognizes benefits that outweigh the expense. A taller fence would provide superior security for valuable assets, enhanced screening for large equipment, and increased noise buffering. Although height restrictions often address aesthetic concerns, we believe that in an industrial district, the functional requirements for security and screening should take precedence over the aesthetic standards typically applied to residential or commercial districts”.

Mr. Lorenz’s letter included examples of nearby jurisdictions requirements for fences, showing that Union Township generally capped fences to no more than six feet, but allowed the ZBA to approve taller fences. Isabella County allows fences to be up to 8-feet and the City of Clare and Alma allow fences to be up to 12-feet in height. In addition, eight-foot fences have been approved by Mt Pleasant staff when reviewing fence permits for large outdoor storage areas, per the previous zoning ordinance (in effect until 2018). That includes a 2007 fence permit for J.Ranck for their existing eight-foot-tall fence on site.

Master Plan & Zoning Ordinance Standards: During the 2050 Master Plan development, outreach participants engaged on a “Fix, Keep, Aspire Exercise”, reporting the desire to improve the overall appearance of tech and manufacturing sites, including roads, beautification, industry variety, and general aesthetics. They also reported the need to fix poor screening of industrial sites from corridors and nonindustrial areas. Industrial fencing must prioritize security, safety, and compatibility with surrounding areas. The Mt. Pleasant Zoning Ordinances currently in effect, have additional controls on fence design, requiring the finish side to face adjacent properties and allowing wood, brick, wrought iron or aluminum, chain link, restricting vinyl and barbed/razor fences to the back of properties (the later also requiring screening from alley, streets and adjacent property).

Memorandum

Mt. Pleasant
[meet here]

Conclusion: The proposed change from six to eight-foot-tall fences and walls allow industrial sites provide greater security for outdoor storage inventory, while continuing to ensure compatibility with surrounding non-industrial land uses. Furthermore, the proposed text change aligns with the city's previous zoning ordinances and surrounding jurisdiction standards.

REQUESTED ACTION:

Set the TC-26-01 Planning Commission Public Hearing to April 2, 2026.

ATTACHMENT

1. Proposed draft ordinance
2. Letter of Approval with Conditions for SPR-25-15 – 1993 Gover Parkway

**CITY COMMISSION
CITY OF MOUNT PLEASANT**

Isabella County, Michigan

Commissioner _____, supported by Commissioner _____, moved adoption of the following ordinance:

ORDINANCE NO. ____

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND TABLE 154.405.A DISTRICT STANDARDS: SD-I INDUSTRIAL SPECIAL DISTRICT REGARDING SCREENS.

It is Hereby Ordained by the People of the City of Mount Pleasant:

Section 1. Amendment to Table 154.405.A. The portion within Table 154.405.A District Standards: SD-I Industrial Special District pertaining to Screens is hereby amended to increase the maximum screen height not at Frontage or Adjacent to Civic Space from six feet to eight feet, reading as follows:

Wall or fence Screen Height not at Frontage or Adjacent to Civic Space	5 ft to 8 ft; Min. 6' for Dumpsters and Trash Receptacles
--	--

Section 2. Limitation on Amendments. Except as otherwise expressly amended by this Ordinance, all other provisions of the City's Zoning Code shall remain in full force and effect, except that, if necessary, internal numbering of sections or subsections shall be renumbered or re-lettered accordingly.

Section 3. Validity and Severability. If any part of this Ordinance is found invalid for any reason, such holding does not invalidate the remaining parts of this Ordinance.

Section 4. Repealer. Any ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict with this Ordinance are hereby repealed only to the extent necessary to give this Ordinance full force and effect.

Section 5. Publication and Effective Date. The City Clerk shall cause to be published a notice of adoption of this ordinance within 10 days of the date of its adoption. This Ordinance shall take effect 30 days after its adoption.

YEAS: Commissioner(s) _____

NAYS: Commissioner(s) _____

ABSTAIN: Commissioner(s) _____

ABSENT: Commissioner(s) _____

CERTIFICATION

As the City Clerk of the City of Mount Pleasant, Isabella County, Michigan, I certify this is a true and complete copy of an ordinance adopted by the Mount Pleasant City Commission at a regular meeting held on _____, 2026.

Boomer Wingard, Mayor

Holly Schmeltzer, City Clerk

PC Hearing: _____, 2026
Introduced: _____, 2026
Adopted: _____, 2026
Published: _____, 2026
Effective: _____, 2026

85714:00016:201539392-1

DRAFT

January 7, 2026

City of Mt. Pleasant
320 W. Broadway
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858

Subject: Allowable Height of Fences in Industrial Zoning Districts

Dear Esteemed Members of the City Commission and Planning Commission,

My name is Pete Lorenz and I am a Civil Engineer frequently working on projects in the City of Mt. Pleasant.

I recently prepared a site plan, which was approved by the Planning Commission, for the expansion of the J. Ranck Electric site on Gover Parkway. This property is in the Mt. Pleasant Industrial Park South and is zoned SD-I (Industrial Special District). The parcel has a large area in the rear of the site that is used for the storage of supplies, materials, and equipment.

Prior to the expansion, this storage area was secured by an 8-foot-tall chain-link fence with privacy slats. While the owner intended to maintain this height for the modified fenced area, Section 154.405.A of the current zoning ordinance restricts fence heights in this district to a maximum of six feet. Consequently, the plan was adjusted to comply with the current fence regulation (6-foot height).

While an eight-foot fence is more costly to install, the owner recognizes benefits that outweigh the expense. A taller fence would provide superior security for valuable assets, enhanced screening for large equipment, and increased noise buffering. Although height restrictions often address aesthetic concerns, we believe that in an industrial district, the functional requirements for security and screening should take precedence over the aesthetic standards typically applied to residential or commercial districts.

For your reference, I have included excerpts from the zoning ordinances of other nearby jurisdictions regarding fence heights in industrial districts:

City of Clare

Sec. 52-302. - Fences and walls.

- a) All fences and walls shall be of standard materials, design and construction.
- b) Essential retaining walls which do not extend above the ground, being retained by more than 18 inches, are permitted in any yard in all zoning districts.
- c) Fences or walls not exceeding six feet in height are permitted in rear and side yards of R-1 and R-2 zoning districts, except in the DDA district which shall be contingent upon securing downtown development authority approval.
- d) Subject to building inspector approval, decorative fences up to four feet in height and not more than 50 percent solid are permitted in front yards of R-1 and R-2 zoning districts. Subject to building inspector approval, decorative fences up to four feet in height and not more than 50 percent solid are permitted in front yards of C-1 zoning districts.
- e) **Fences or walls not exceeding 12 feet in height are permitted in all yards in C-1, C-2, I-1 and IP zoning districts, except that all fences located in front yards of such districts, which exceed four feet in height, shall be contingent on securing planning commission approval.**

City of Alma

Sec. 60-184. - Fences, walls and screens.

- a) Within the limits of the front yard space, or, in the case of corner lots, if abutting a side street or within 15 feet of the side property line which abuts the front yard of an adjacent property, of a lot within a residential district, no fence, wall or other screening structure shall exceed three feet in height. Other than the foregoing, a fence or wall adjoining a side or rear yard shall not exceed six feet in height.
- b) **In a commercial, industrial, or research office district, no fence, wall or other screening structure shall exceed 12 feet in height.**
- c) Barbed wire, spikes, nails, or any other sharp point or instrument of any kind on top or on sides of any fence, electric current, or charge in said fences is prohibited. Barbed wire cradles may be placed on top of fences enclosing public utility buildings or wherever deemed necessary in the interests of public safety.

Union Township

Section 6.31 Outdoor Storage, General

- A. Enclosure. All outdoor storage shall be secured within a fence or a wall that conforms to Section 7.6 (Fences and Walls) and shall be screened per Section 10 (Landscaping and Screening) requirements. Materials stored on the site shall not exceed the height of the fence or wall.

Section 7.6 Fences and Walls

Fences and walls shall conform to the following requirements:

- A. Height.
Fences or walls not more than six (6) feet in height are permitted in all yards. Fences or walls over six (6) feet in height are subject to approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals, unless specifically authorized elsewhere in this Zoning Ordinance.
- B. Clear Vision Triangle.
Walls and fences shall comply with the specification for maintenance of unobstructed vision for drivers in Section 4.6.
- C. Fence and Wall Maintenance.
Fences and walls shall be maintained in good condition. Rotten, crumbled, or broken components shall be replaced, repaired, or removed. As required, surfaces shall be painted, stained or similarly treated.
- D. Zoning Permit.
Permit approval shall be required per Section 14.1(A) (Zoning Permits) for construction, alteration, or relocation of all fences and walls, except short decorative fence elements less than ten (10) feet in length and fences associated with customary agricultural operations that otherwise conform to the requirements of this Section. Where a fence or wall is associated with a project subject to site plan approval, the approved site plan shall satisfy this requirement.

Isabella County

SECTION 3.15 FENCES AND WALLS

- A. Fences or walls of not more than 7 feet in height are permitted in all yards, except as provided herein. (89-05 Eff. January 26, 1990)
- B. Fences shall not be constructed within the required road right-of-way or across alleys which have not been vacated.
- C. Fences in the R-1, R-2 and L-R Districts are as follows: (13-01 Eff. February 2, 2013)
 - 1) Protective wire such as barbed wire or electric fences shall not be utilized.
 - 2) Fences no more than three feet (3') in height used for decorative purposes shall be permitted in the required front yard. Except as provided herein, fences no more than four feet (4') in height consisting of at least seventy-five percent (75%) open spaces uniformly distributed along its surface may be permitted in the required front yard.
 - 3) For waterfront lots, fences no more than three feet (3') in height used for decorative purposes may be located in the required rear yard. Except as provided herein, fences no more than four feet (4') in height consisting of at least seventy-five percent (75%) of open spaces uniformly distributed along its surface may be located in the required rear yard. This provision only applies to waterfront lots.
 - 4) A fence not more than seven feet (7') in height may be permitted in all yards along a property line which directly abuts a public park or public boat launch.
 - 5) For safety purposes, no fence shall be constructed which obstructs the view of pedestrian or vehicular traffic on adjacent streets.
- D. Fences in C-1, C-2, and I-1 Districts shall not exceed a height of eight feet. If required by the planning commission, screening shall be provided to protect adjacent property.**
- E. Walls and fences for screening purposes shall comply with Section 3.24.

SECTION 3.24 SCREENING PROVISIONS

All required screening referred to this section shall meet the following provisions.

- A. Screening shall not extend into or be located within any portion of an existing street right-of-way.
- B. Existing plant material, fences or walls may be counted as contributing to the screening requirement. Screening shall be provided on each lot or parcel independent of adjoining uses or adjoining vegetative matter.

- C. Plant material other than ground cover (up to three feet in height) shall not be placed closer than four feet from the property line. Where plant materials are placed in two or more rows plantings shall be staggered in rows.
- D. Evergreen trees shall be not less than three feet in height and shall be planted not more than 30 feet on centers.
- E. Deciduous trees shall be not less than six feet in height and shall be planted not more than 30 feet on centers.
- F. Deciduous shrubs shall be not less than three feet in height and shall be planted not more than four feet on centers.
- G. The following landscape/plant materials are suggested for required screening:
 - 1. Deciduous Trees: Ash, Beech, Birch, Flowering Crab, Ginkgo (male), Hackberry, Hard Maple, Hawthorn, Honeylocust, Linden, Magnolia, Redbud, Sycamore.
 - 2. Evergreen Trees: Cedar, Fir, Hemlock, Juniper, Pine, Spruce.
 - 3. Shrubs: Cotoneaster, Dogwood, Euonymus, Forsythia, Hazelnut, Honeysuckle, Hydrangea, Lilac, Privet, Russian Olive.
- H. The following trees are not permitted for new plantings for required screening: Box Elder, Soft-maples (Red-Silver), Elms, Aspen, Cottonwood, willows, Horse Chestnut (nut bearing), Tree of Heaven, Catalpa, Female Ginkgo.
- I. The planting shall be maintained in a neat and attractive manner commensurate with the adjoining area and shall maintain their density and screening effect throughout the calendar year.
- J. Walls or fences for screening purpose shall be at least four feet in height, but in not case shall the fence or wall be lower than the installation, structure or activity to be screened, unless said installation, structure or activity exceeds eight feet in height.**
- K. If required by the planning commission, screening shall be provided along walls or fences to protect adjacent property.
- L. All walls herein required shall be constructed of weather resistant, rust proof and easily maintained materials.
- M. Masonry walls used for required screening purposes may be constructed with openings which do not in any square section (height and width) exceed 20 percent of the surface. Where walls are so pierced, the openings shall be spaced to maintain the obscuring minimum height requirement.
- N. Wood walls may be permitted for screening under the following conditions:
 - 1. All walls must be solid and appearance (no openings) and must be similar to 1 of the following wall types.
 - a. Board
 - b. Staggered Board

- c. Wood 1-inch x 4-inch screen
 - d. Board and Batten
 - e. Solid Stockade Fence
 - f. Panel
 - g. Solid Picket
2. Lumber shall be spruce, cedar, redwood or wolmanized or of equal construction quality or grade.
 3. Grade of lumber shall be at least "construction grade."
 4. An anchor post set in concrete a minimum of 8" thick and 16" deep and 6" wider than the post (or other equivalent anchoring) shall be located at fence ends, corners and at approximately 20-foot centers for all types of wood screening fences.
- O. Other appropriate screening that meets the equivalent of the standards specified in this Section may be allowed contingent upon approval of a sketch plan submitted to the planning commission.


Summary of Allowable Fence Heights in Industrial Districts for Other Local Jurisdictions:

City of Clare	12 feet
City of Alma	12 feet
Union Township	6 feet (taller fence heights subject to approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals)
Isabella County	8 feet

Based on reasons stated above, we respectfully request that the city consider amending the zoning ordinance for the SD-I district to allow taller fences.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully Requested,



Pete Lorenz, P.E., P.S.

Lorenz Surveying & Engineering, Inc.

Join Us & Celebrate Earth Day!

April 22, 2026 | 12PM - 4PM

**Farmers Market Pavilion
Island Park, Mt. Pleasant, MI**

**Activities for everyone, waste audit
demonstration, and food trucks!**

Central Sustainability
Chippewa Valley Audubon Club
Chippewa Watershed Conservancy
Chippewa River District Library
City of Mt. Pleasant
Forest Hill Nature Area
Great Lakes Renewable Energy
Association
GreenTree Co-op
J Ranck Electric
League of Women Voters

Isabella Conservation District
Isabella County MRF
Middle Michigan Development
Corporation
Mt. Pleasant Citizen's Climate
Lobby
Mt. Pleasant Discovery Museum
Mt. Pleasant Martial Arts
SCIT Planning
ServPro
Zonta Club

Mt. Pleasant
[meet here]

