

**IRON RIVER CITY COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING
Tuesday, December 2, 2025
4 PM
Minutes**

Mayor Rodney Dood called the meeting to order at 4 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Iron River City Hall.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Roll Call – Dennis Powell, Anthony Clements, Benjamin Garcia and Dood. Absent: Leonoff.

Also Present – City Manager Rachel Andreski, Interim City Attorney Hannah Goodman (left at 4:28 p.m.) and City Clerk Tyana Elenbaas.

Public in attendance – Vicky Powell, Timm Ballinger, Erik Ballinger, Steven Saunders (DPW) and Adrienne Baker.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

OLD BUSINESS

E-Bike Ordinance/Policy

Garcia stated that the Council should go line by line to amend as necessary. He noted that the definitions section looked clear cut and dry. He then moved to Section 3, A) regarding the multi-use paths. He noted that there is only one in the City, which is the Apple Blossom Trail.

Dood agreed and stated that the whole section should be changed from prohibiting class 2 and class 3 bikes, to allow all classes. Clements confirmed that there are only three classes of e-bikes.

Dood stated that the main intention of this ordinance is to keep them off the sidewalks. Dood suggested keeping Section 3, items B and C.

Garcia noted that in Section 3, item D, as of right now it doesn't pertain to the City, but one day it might. He suggests keeping it in. Dood stated that he likes how it states "trail-specific rules." Garcia noted that Parks and Rec don't have anything to do with UTV trails and not a lot to do with the Apple Blossom Trail, besides plowing.

Dood suggested moving to Section 4 regarding speed limits and asked about how we plan to enforce a speed limit. Garcia stated that 15 mph is a reasonable speed. Clements asked if the speed limit is reasonable? Garcia stated that most will abide by the speed limit, but it might be the knuckle head kids that are not going to. He continued by saying that regarding enforcement, he was unsure of actual enforcement. Goodman stated the speed limit should be added not for just enforceability, continuing if someone is injured or there is property damage, it can help with protecting the City. With the suggestion from Goodman, Dood agreed to keep Section 4.

Dood moved to Section 5. Clements asked if most of the items were State laws. Dood stated that Goodman got the policy from another municipality and adapted it to reflect the City's needs.

Garcia noted that Michigan doesn't have a helmet law, so that would be something the City is enforcing that is beyond the State law. He continued that they could do this but then it comes down to enforcement. Dood noted that the policy states for individuals under the age of eighteen. Dood clarified that it is recommended for all but required for those under the age of eighteen.

Garica again asked about enforcement and a possible penalty for those that violated the ordinance. Goodman stated that it is not necessary to add penalty, that a warning may suffice. Goodman stated that requiring a helmet could help further protect the City from litigation. Goodman stated that she is looking at it from a different perspective, more from a safety perspective verses enforcement. The City is encouraging operators to be safe and if the operators choose not to follow the ordinance, then it makes the City less of a target because there is an existing ordinance.

Clements stated that the E-Bikes are more equivalent to a motorcycle than a bike as they do have motors on the bike. Garcia agreed that some of the E-bikes are like motorcycles. Clements brought up current laws that state that require helmet, to which Dood clarified the law states eighteen and under are required to wear a helmet on ATVs. Dood added that the DNR does enforce this law.

Dood then moved to Section 6. He agreed that no reckless behavior is a "no brainer." Dood stated that item C is not needed because it is redundant.

Garcia asked that item B be removed because it is already covered in Section 5. item E. He added that operators should use common courtesy on the trails. Clements agreed.

Garcia asked for clarification regarding E-Bikes on trails. He stated that when Attorney Goodman drew up the contract for the Trail Club, it has a clause that specifically stated that E-bikes were not allowed on trails. He asked if something needed to be added regarding E-bike use on city trails. Goodman stated that we should remain consistent. Garcia asked if Council had any issues with E-bikes being allowed on City property, none saw an issue.

Garcia then moved to the fines. Goodman stated that this just adds some level of accountability. Clements asked Garcia in his experience what would be the worst offense committed by the E-bike cyclists. Garcia stated that in his experience, the reckless people are going to have multiple infractions, not just speed or lack of safety equipment.

Goodman advised against getting too specific, and noted that Officer discretion could be a positive. She used the example of a child riding without a helmet, and the officer gives the child a warning and some education as to why safety is important. Garcia agreed, that an office could issue a \$10 fine to a child who is not wearing a helmet, and to have the child bring the helmet in and the ticket may be waved. Goodman reiterated that goal is not to punish but to educate and make sure everyone is safe. Dood suggested that fines rely on the officer's discretion then added not less than \$20 and no more than \$100. He added that the officers are going to know if the person is a repeat offender and can issue fines accordingly.

Garcia asked for clarification regarding a civil infraction. Goodman gave some examples of civil infraction. Andreski added that a third civil infraction may turn into a State citation, similar to the blight ordinance.

Garcia stated that we need to make sure that signage is included to alert operators. Garcia suggested that the ordinance go into effect in April, to give the City time to obtain signage. Clements agreed.

Clement motioned with support from Garcia to move forward with Ordinance 25-03 with the changes discussed at this meeting

Roll Call: Ayes – 5: Powell, Garcia, Clements and Dood. Nays – 0. Absent – 1: Leonoff. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Timm Ballinger began by thanking and recognizing the DPW, stating that with the limited manpower, the aging equipment and growing responsibilities, they continue to keep the City functioning to the best of their ability. He stated that their daily work goes unnoticed but is the backbone of our community and they deserve acknowledgement and appreciation. He continued that his concerns are not about the DPW and their effort but with the administrative decisions, oversites, failures and ADA Title II compliance. He read the Title II compliance. He alleged that the parking lots are not ADA compliant. He then alleged that the DDA parking lot needed a site plan review because he believes that the footprint was changed. He criticized the snow removal and blamed City administration. He asked that City Council investigate these claimed infractions.

Adrienne Baker asked if it would be out of realm for the City parking lot spaces to be cleared out. She noted there are ruts. She suggested getting it cleared before the public is out.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Clements moved with support from Dood to adjourn the meeting at 4:34 p.m. All in favor. Motion carried. Absent: Leonoff.



Tyana Elenbaas, City Clerk