



# OHV Access Initiative

## Appendix A: Initial Survey Summary

### I. INTRODUCTION

In 2023, CA State Parks administered an online survey via Google Forms to gather ideas to expand to OHV facilities across the state. The survey was available from February to September 2023, and it received 501 responses. This summary report presents a synopsis of the key findings from the survey.

Following is a summary of the big ideas and key take aways that came out of the first survey. CA State Parks used the comments received from the community outreach process to develop the plan to conduct in-depth feasibility analyses on potential sites for new or enhanced OHV facilities.

### II. SURVEY QUESTIONS

The survey had seven questions aimed at understanding where people would like more access to OHV facilities and the types of OHV activities people would like to participate in. Survey respondents could also share ideas for potential new locations for OHV trails and recreation.

The questions were available in multiple choice with opportunities for write-in responses. They are listed below:

1. What regions in the state would you like to see more opportunities for OHV recreation?
2. Are enough OHV opportunities near urban areas? If not, what urban areas do you recommend?
3. What rural areas need more access to OHV Recreation?
4. What types of trail opportunities do you feel is currently lacking or are hard to access?
5. Are you interested in seeing more practice tracks, obstacle courses, or challenge areas?
6. We can also lease property or co-manage with another organization like BLM and the US Forest Service. Do you have ideas on locations or property that might work under this scenario?
7. What other ideas would you like to share about expanding OHV recreation in the State?

### III. WHAT WE HEARD

#### AREAS IN THE STATE THAT NEED MORE OHV FACILITIES

**Regions in the state that could benefit from more OHV facilities:** The majority of respondents noted that they would like to have more opportunities for OHV recreation in Northern California, which included the counties of Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Joaquin, Calaveras, Alpine, and each county further north. This was followed by Central California, which included all counties below Northern California and above San Luis Obispo, Kern, and San Bernardino counties. Southern

California received the least amount of interest. Some responses specifically noted interest in locating OHV in the San Francisco Bay Area and in the Central Valley.

**OHV opportunities near urban areas:** Of the many urban areas in the state, survey respondents overwhelmingly would like to have more OHV opportunities in the San Francisco Bay Area. Other urban areas that were mentioned multiple times include Los Angeles, San Diego, Fresno, Bakersfield, San Bernardino, Sacramento, and Redding.

**OHV recreation in rural areas:** Of the rural areas in the state, survey respondents would also like more OHV recreation areas in the San Francisco Bay Area. Respondents also demonstrated interest for areas in the Central Coast, Central Valley, and western areas of Southern California.

## **OHV FACILITIES**

**Trail opportunities:** Survey respondents felt that there weren't enough multi-use trails, single-track trails, and one-way trails in the state, or those trails are hard to reach. They would also like to see more snow trails, children's areas, closed course tracks, and connectivity to hiking/equestrian trails.

**Practice tracks, obstacle courses, or challenge areas:** Survey participants would like to have more four-wheel drive obstacle courses, followed by bike trails area, motocross tracks, and vehicle-specific challenge courses.

**Other OHV activities:** Participants also proposed many other types of OHV activities that they would like to have more of. These include adventurous routes with scenic/historic features, mud and sand obstacles/areas, practice tracks for beginners, overlanding areas, non-motor bikes-only trail, enduro obstacle courses, and single-track motorcycle trails.

## **OTHER IDEAS/COMMENTS**

**Potential locations through collaboration or coordination with other organizations:** Participants noted Henry Coe State Park and Clear Creek Bureau of Land Management as a potential location for CA State Park to expand OHV facilities. Other frequently mentioned areas include the Southern Coast, and Counties of Santa Mateo, Santa Cruz, and Santa Clara, and Nevada.

**Ideas for expanding OHV recreation:** Survey respondents shared many creative ideas for how CA State Parks could expand OHV recreation; however, few were repeated. A selection of the ideas includes having more camping/lodging/ overlanding options; having OHV facilities at private parks instead of State Parks; using disturbed land instead of wilderness/ natural areas; using fire roads; having smaller OHV areas in urbanized areas; offering areas for younger users to practice and learn; using a reservation system or contractor to manage OHV usage at SVRAs; and conducting outreach campaigns to teach people about the benefits of OHV.

**Operation and maintenance of the OHV facilities:** Some survey respondents commented about the operation and maintenance of OHV facilities. They pointed to the desire to limit the destruction/ protection for natural resources, have more of the OHVs be electric, and enforce adverse behaviors.

**Support/opposition to OHV and Henry Coe State Park:** While the majority of survey respondents supported the initiative to expand OHV access, approximately 1/3 of participants used this survey to share their opposition to OHV in the state and/or in Henry Coe State Park.

## IV. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES BY QUESTION

### Question 1: What regions in the state would you like to see more opportunities for OHV recreation?

Survey respondents had a write-in opportunity to identify regions where they would like more OHV opportunities. For write-in questions, answers were grouped by specific point-based responses, such as cities, and broader regional responses that were attributed to the counties in which they were located. Responses for question 1 were more regional, with the top responses being Northern California (162), Central California (81), and Southern California (41). There were only a few other regional responses, which included the San Francisco Bay Area and counties in the central valley. There were three specific point answers around the southern part of the Bay Area.

Table 1. Question 1 Responses

Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency
Northern California	162	Vasco Road, Byron, CA	1	Fresno County	1
Central California	81	Henry Coe State Park	1	Siskiyou County	1
Southern California	41	North SF Bay Area	1	Tuolumne County	1
SF Bay Area	5	Sacramento County	1	N/A	N/A
Monterey Bay, CA	1	San Joaquin County	1	N/A	N/A

### Question 2: Are enough OHV opportunities near urban areas? If not, what urban areas do you recommend?

Respondents had the opportunity to write-in responses for urban areas where they may like more OHV opportunities. There were 226 regional responses, with 206 of these responses being for the San Francisco Bay Area. The most popular cities included in the responses were Los Angeles (12), San Diego (9), and Fresno (7). There were many other cities listed three or fewer times that were spread widely across the state, but especially in coastal areas and the northern part of the Central Valley.

Table 2. Question 2 Responses

Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency
SF Bay Area	206	Santa Clara County	1	Henry Coe State Park	1

Los Angeles, CA	12	Los Angeles County	1	Lakeside, CA	1
San Diego, CA	9	Santa Barbara County	1	Palm Springs, CA	1
Fresno, CA	7	Morgan Hill	1	Central California	1
Bakersfield, CA	7	Monterey	1	Napa County	1
Redding, CA	5	San Luis Obispo	1	Solano County	1
San Bernardino, CA	5	Santa Cruz	1	Stanislaus County	1
Sacramento, CA	3	Oakland	1	Central Coast	1
Orange County	3	Stanislaus National Forest	1	Santa Cruz County	1
Ventura County	2	Santa Barbara	1	San Benito County	1
Sacramento	2	Placerville	1	El Dorado County	1
San Jose, CA	2	Stockton, CA	1	Sierra Mountains	1
Riverside, CA	2	Tracy, CA	1	Sonoma County	1
Sacramento County	2	Santa Cruz Mountains	1	Lake County	1
Ventura County	2	Mendocino National Forest, CA, 95988	1	Mendocino County	1
Stonyford, CA 95979	1	Carnegie State Vehicular Recreation Area	1	Riverside County	1
Los Angeles	1	Livermore, CA	1	Tuolumne County	1
San Mateo County	1	Paradise, CA	1		

### Question 3: What rural areas need more access to OHV Recreation?

Survey respondents had the opportunity to write in answers in addition to several pre-identified locations. The most answers were given for Henry Coe State Park (23). Many other specific answers occurred five or fewer times and were often clustered around the southern coast, the San Francisco and Monterey Bay Areas, and the northern part of the Central Valley. The most frequent regional answers included the San Francisco Bay Area (13), Santa Clara County (8), Sonoma County (8), and the Central Coast (8).

Table 3.Question 3 Responses

Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency
Henry Coe State Park	23	Orange County	2	San Gabriel, CA	1
SF Bay Area	13	San Bernardino County	2	Los Angeles, CA	1
Sonoma County	8	Ojai, CA	1	Napa, CA	1
Central Coast	8	Piru, CA	1	San Luis Obispo County	1
Santa Clara County	8	Los Padres National Forest	1	Modoc County	1
Central Valley	6	Marina, CA	1	Lassen County	1
Santa Cruz County	6	Salinas, CA	1	San Mateo County	1
Livermore, CA	5	Santa Cruz, CA	1	Stanislaus County	1
SF East Bay	5	Arroyo Grande, CA	1	San Joaquin County	1
Sierra Mountains	5	Oakland, CA	1	Merced County	1
Central California	4	Modesto, CA	1	Contra Costa County	1
Tuolumne County	4	San Benito, CA	1	Central Sierra Foothills	1
Northern Coast	4	Hollister, CA	1	East Sierra Foothills	1
Morgan Hill, CA	3	Grass Valley, CA	1	San Lorenzo Valley	1
Fresno, CA	3	Santa Clara, CA	1	East Contra Costa County	1
Mendocino County	3	Elk Grove, CA	1	Imperial County	1
Monterey County	3	Boulder Creek, CA	1	Placer County	1
Santa Cruz Mountains	3	Lake Tahoe	1	Tri-Valley	1
SF South Bay	3	Auburn, CA	1	Tahoe Basin	1
Solano County	3	Sacramento, CA	1	Calaveras County	1
Colusa County	3	Martinez, CA	1	West Sonoma County	1
Marin County	3	Mendocino National Forest	1	Yolo County	1
El Dorado County	3	Danville, CA	1	Sutter County	1

Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency
Humboldt County	3	Patterson, CA	1	Yuba County	1
Santa Barbara, CA	2	Sonora, CA	1	Sierra Nevada Foothills	1
Gilroy, CA	2	Clear Creek, CA	1	Southern Coast	1
Monterey, CA	2	Fort Ord	1	Alameda County	1
Bakersfield, CA	2	Truckee, CA	1	Shasta County	1
Stanislaus National Forest	2	Frazier Mountain	1	West San Joaquin County	1
Tracy, CA	2	Santiago Peak	1	West San Mateo County	1
San Jose, CA	2	San Bernardino National Forest	1	Santa Barbara County	1
Vacaville, CA	2	Gorman, CA	1	Riverside County	1
Mt Diablo	2	Big Bear, CA	1	Saddleback Mountains	1
Plumas County	2	Menifee, CA	1	Los Angeles County	1
San Benito County	2	Palomar Mountain, CA	1	East San Diego County	1
Kern County	2	Lakeside, CA	1	North San Diego County	1
Glenn County	2	North Shore, CA	1	Ventura County	1
Amador County	2	Riverside, CA	1	Butte County	1
San Diego County	2	Little Rock, CA	1		

#### Question 4: What types of trail opportunities do you feel is currently lacking or are hard to access?

Survey respondents had several multiple-choice options to select from (as shown below), along with an option to provide additional information. Approximately 60% of respondents (289) selected from the available options, while 117 respondents wrote their comments. An additional 97 didn't respond to the survey question.

The top three answers from the multiple options were:

- Multi-use trails for all vehicle types (137 responses)
- Single-track trails (100 responses)
- One-way trails (31 responses)

Table 4. Question 4 Responses – Multiple-Choice Options

Name	# of Responses
Multi-use trails (for all vehicle types)	137
One Vehicle	6
One vehicle only trails	10
One Way trails	31
Single track trails	100
All	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>297</b>

There were 21 responses that pertained to other OHV experiences, but that weren't a part of the multiple-choice selections. Many comments touched on snow trails, trail maintenance, the desire for children areas, closed course tracks, and connectivity to hiking/equestrian trails; these are shown below:

- Trails.
- Closed course MX & Mini-Bike tracks.
- Electric dirt bikes.
- High-quality, managed campgrounds adjacent OHV recreation opportunities.
- Jeep/4X4 trails.
- Kids areas.
- MX tracks.
- Mountain biking in the buffer areas.
- Single Track and over snow vehicle access is lacking.
- Snow trail.
- Over the snow access.
- Trial sections areas.
- Trials riding areas.
- Trails with obstacle courses like at an abandoned strip mail. Think of it like a skateboard park for vehicles.
- Quiet, electric powered vehicles can be on open areas. Noisy vehicles driven by fuel engines should be on noisy motor roads.

- There are enough opportunities of all types.
- Trails for vehicles for individuals (with disabilities) should receive precedence over general OHVs.
- I feel driven off many trails by motorcycles in the Hollister Hills area.
- Convert the trails to mountain biking.
- I think most people just want to be able to overland and experience nature with friends.
- Private tracts.

There were 22 comments that were related to non-OHV trail usage, such as the request for trails dedicated to hikers, equestrians, and not for OHVs. The comments are listed below:

- Protection for hiker/family/equestrian trails.
- Safe and peaceful urban trails.
- Access to all many hiking/equestrian trail heads.
- Non-motorized trails.
- Trails reserved for hikers with no OHVs.
- Hiking trails that do not allow electric bikes and other motor vehicles.
- Trails reserved for hikers, horses, or mountain bikes without motors.
- Trails which are not open to vehicles.
- Non-motorized trails.
- Hiking and bicycling.
- Trails that are dog-free.
- Hiking trails with no motorized vehicles.
- Trails with no OHVs or motorized vehicles.
- Non-motorized trails, where people can enjoy the land and wildlife without the disruption of OHVs.
- Mountain bike (not e-bike) trails, hiking only trails that are accessible to less-able individuals.
- OHVs should not be on trails.
- Trails for actual athletes that don't need a motor to enjoy the outdoors.
- Trails for hikers and equestrians that don't have mechanical/motorized vehicles.
- Hiking (no vehicle) trails.
- Trails that remain quiet and disturbed as little as possible. Mountain bike use in parks that don't allow it to destroy important vegetation, to the detriment of hikers and casual walkers.
- Quiet trails for the hiker seeking refuge from human noise.
- Pedestrian-only trails/areas in which to backpack in on foot/camp.

Some respondents used the section to express their opposition for OHVs and OHVs in state parks (26 comments) and OHVs in Henry Coe (1 comment).

A small handful wrote there were enough trails already (6 comments), “Don’t know” (5 comments), “No Opinion” (1 comment), or “None of the Above” (1 comment).

Of the total responses received, 37 wrote “None”. It’s unclear if the respondents meant they don’t want to see more OHV facilities, they don’t have other comments, or other interpretations.



There were also nine comments that addressed a variety of topics that didn't correspond to any of the topics discussed above. They are listed below:

- Only an OHV rider could answer this.
- Trails are great just need OHV.
- Very limited area. Keep away from wildlife refuges.
- Corporations that profit from the sale of these vehicles should be responsible for providing sites for this type of recreation.
- We are good
- None, there are plenty.
- Check your grammar.
- This entire questionnaire is biased in favor of OHVs.
- Habitat restoration.

### **Question 5: Are you interested in seeing more practice tracks, obstacle courses, or challenge areas?**

Question 5 was a multiple-choice question, with an option for write-in response. Of the 501 respondents, 390 wrote a comment or selected one of the choices and 111 abstained from answering the question.

Of the four multiple options, the most popular response was four-wheel drive obstacle course (88), followed by bike trails area (61), motocross tracks (51), and vehicle specific challenge course (43). Some respondents (7) elected to write "all" for all of the options.

*Table 5. Question 5 Responses – Multiple Choice Options Including "All"*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Dept.</b>
Motorcross Tracks	51
Four Wheel Drive Obstacle Course	88
Bike Trails Area	61
Vehicle Specific Challenge Course	43
All	7
<b>Total</b>	250

The survey also received 28 comments that were related to OHV activities but weren't one of the four options elected. A sample of such comments include the desire for adventurous routes with scenic/historic features, mud and sand obstacles/areas, practice tracks for beginners, snowmobile trails, overlanding areas, non-motor bikes only trail, enduro obstacle courses, and single track motorcycle trails. The comments included the following:

- Practice areas are great. However: longer, more adventurous routes are needed that run several miles, with scenic/historic features.
- Mud and sand obstacles/areas.
- Gentle long multi-use (both ohv and regular trails for responsible riding). I like to ride long gravel roads to go see areas I otherwise could not see.

- Practice tracks - for beginners
- Snowmobiles
- Snowmobile riding
- Motorcycle single track trails
- Off-road trails for dispersed camping
- Overlanding areas
- Mountain biking
- Non-motor bikes only
- Single track moto
- Trail riding
- Enduro single track trails
- Endurocross/hard Enduro obstacles. And trials please!
- A bigger area in general more trails all around
- Single track motorcycle trails that are long
- Longer trails.
- Multi-use with camping available (like Carnegie)
- Hard Enduro, Black Diamond Trails
- Single Track motorcycle
- Technical single track sections
- Sirt bike trails - one way
- Easy non-challenging off road trails with camping options, casual overlanding
- Fire roads to get better access to remote nature.
- Single track motorcycle trails with 4 wheel truck trails like corral canyon
- Snowmobiling rec areas
- Off road motorcycle trails.

There were 62 comments that didn't support OHV, OHV in state parks, or OHV in Henry Coe. An additional 23 comments wrote "None"; however, this response is an ambiguous, since it's not clear if the respondents meant no more OHV facilities, no comment, none of the options above, or other meanings. Lastly, there 17 comments that addressed a variety of topics. These are listed below:

- Not unless they are on private degraded land and electric vehicles only
- Urban areas need more opportunities for bike and skate activities.
- Hiking/equestrian
- No interest in seeing development of such areas. BLM and Forest Service lands are already available for OHV use.
- In the proper areas
- Controlled Trail Riding for OHV and On-Road Vehicles. Henry Coe would be great, but we don't want it to turn into a race track like Hollister Hills. Imposing speed limits and confining more aggressive OHV use to certain areas would be great.
- Unmotorized vehicles (bikes, etc.) should take precedence
- These should be limited to damaged areas; dumps, brownfields, private lands where you pay to play.

- Demolish existing OHV areas and stop polluting public lands
- If expansion is necessary it should be on private property's
- None of the above
- None of the above
- UTV need to be away from separated from the dirt bike areas someone is going to get hurt
- Private tracts
- This survey reads like it was designed to promote OHV use.
- On private land where a fee can be charged for the damage done.
- Leave this to private property not lands important for hikers and wildlife.

111 surveys left this answer blank.

**Question 6: We can also lease property or co-manage with another organization like BLM and the US Forest Service. Do you have ideas on locations or property that might work under this scenario?**

Respondents had the opportunity to write in responses, and responses were categorized in specific and broad groups. The most common answers were Henry Coe State Park (18) and Clear Creek BLM (16). There were many other specific responses listed four or fewer times which often were located in the northern part of the Central Valley or along the central and southern coastal areas. The most common regional responses included parks or areas in Santa Cruz County (3), Santa Clara County (3), and San Mateo County (3). There were many other regional responses listed 2 or fewer times.

*Table 6. Question 6 Responses*

Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency
Henry Coe State Park	19	Henry Coes State Park	1	Cleveland National Forest	1
Henry Coe State Park	19	La Honda Creek Open Space Preserve	1	Camp Pendleton	1
Clear Creek BLM	16	Knoxville Creek, CA	1	Little Rock OHV	1
Mendocino National Forest	4	Indian Valley Reservoir	1	Victorville BLM	1
Knoxville, CA	4	Morgan Hill, CA	1	Big Bear Mountains	1
Santa Cruz County	4	Hull Creek	1	Otay Mesa	1
Santa Clara County	4	Cache Creek	1	Federal land	1
Stanislaus National Forest	3	Snow Mountain	1	Santa Clara County Fairgrounds	1
San Mateo County	3	Crandall Peak	1	San Mateo County land	1

Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency
Henry Cowell	2	Hollister, CA	1	San Benito County BLM	1
Panoche Hills	2	Copperopolis, CA	1	Yolo County	1
Los Padres National Forest	2	Carnegie OHV	1	Colusa County	1
Sierra Foothills BLM	2	Paicines, CA	1	Glenn County	1
Santa Cruz Mountains	2	South Cow Mountain OHV	1	Shasta County	1
Orange County	2	East Bay Regional Park	1	Cotoni-Coast Dairies	1
Fout's Spring Mendocino National Forest	1	Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest	1	Tahoe Area	1
Angeles National Forest	1	Altamont Hills	1	Tesla property by Carnegie	1
Carnegie	1	Paradise, CA	1	Nevada County	1
Frank Raines Park	1	Oakley, CA	1	El Dorado County	1
Williams Hill Monterey County	1	Brentwood, CA	1	Placer County	1
Tumey Hills	1	Martinez Hills	1	Sonoma County	1
Livermore, CA	1	Marsh Creek	1	Monterey County	1
Condon Peak	1	Mt Diablo	1	Trinity County	1
Union Valley Reservoir	1	Hungry Valley	1	Sierra Foothills	1
Carrizo Plains BLM	1	Hollister Ranch	1	Contra Costa County	1
Alameda Point	1	Santa Clarita, CA	1	Norther California	1
Palm Springs windmill area	1	Bureau of Indian Affairs	1	SF East Bay	1
Altamont Pass wind farm	1	Palomar Mountain State Park	1	Mojave Desert BLM	1
Willow Creek Road, Sonoma County	1	Observatory Caltech	1	Landfills	1
Harvey Bear Trail	1	Palomar Ranger District USFS	1	Coachella Valley	1

Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency	Answer	Frequency
Fort Ord	1	San Bernardino National Forest	1	Los Angeles County	1
Panoche BLM	1	Lakeside, CA	1	San Diego County	1
Eldorado National Forest	1	Palomar Divide Rd	1	Riverside County	1
Tahoe National Forest	1	Saddleback Mountains	1	Tuolumne County	1

### Question 7: What other ideas would you like to share about expanding OHV recreation in the State?

This was the last question in the survey, which was open-ended and allowed survey respondents to provide write-in responses. A total of 376 participants shared their comments, with 125 that abstained. Comments were grouped into six broad categories:

- Support of/opposition to OHVs
- Henry Coe State Park
- Operation and Maintenance
- Location-specific responses (for new OHV facilities)
- Ideas for expansion
- Other

The category with the most comments was “Support/oppose to OHVs” with 138 responses. Of the comments in this category, 93 were in opposition to any OHV at State Parks, while 44 comments showed support for OHV, with many that discussed the benefits of having OHV facilities.

*Table 7. Question 7 Responses - Support/Oppose to OHVs*

Topic	Count
No to OHV	93
Support OHV	17
More OHV Access/ Positive Comments about OHV Access	27
No Expansion/ Maintain Current	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>

Many people used this question to express their opposition to having OHV facilities at Henry Coe State Park. Of the 81 responses that pertained to the State Park, 71 (or 87%) shared their opposition to the idea, with 11 comments in support.

Table 8. Question 7 Responses – Henry Coe State Park

Topic	Count
No to OHV at Henry Coe State Park	71
Yes to OHV at Henry Coe State Park	10
<b>Total</b>	81

The next category with the highest number of comments was “Ideas for expansion” with 92 comments. Survey respondents shared many ideas, of which there were few repeated ones. A selection of the ideas includes more camping/lodging/ overlanding options; having OHV facilities at private parks instead of State Parks; using disturbed land instead of wilderness/ natural areas; using fire roads; having smaller OHV areas in urbanized areas; offering areas for younger users to practice and learn; using a reservation system or contractor to manage OHV usage at SVRAs; and conducting outreach campaigns to teach people about the benefits of OHV. The complete list is available below.

- There are vast networks of private dirt roads that could be leased seasonally for ADV bike routes. For example, from San Juan Road west of Hollister there is a locked dirt road that could provide a nice ADV loop around Hollister Hills also lots of locked up dirt roads between Hollister and San Luis Obispo.. how about a paid permit process with the landlords to ride these routes?
- Electric Only Urban MX tracks/jump parks would be cool.
- Individual parks or national forests don't have a public submission process to suggest areas or maps of where they would like trails. So the land managers don't officially know that there is an intense interest in managed OHV and OSV access.
- Add camping and day use infrastructure
- Combine riding and overnight camping
- I would also like to see a kids electric bike track as that is the beginning to kids riding dirt bikes. They make small ones for 2-3 year olds which can't normally ride even a pw50.
- Red sticker program for new dirt bikes
- More motocross tracks
- Camping along with offroad use
- More riding areas open to red sticker and competition only categorized vehicles, year round.
- Open up snowmobiling please
- ATV tracks
- Please open more dirt roads for dual sport use
- I like the idea of more trails suitable for 4WD vehicles.
- A multi use route to run the length of the Sierra open to ohv and over the snow exploring
- Let us ride the beaches
- The above suggestion on leasing or co-managing with BLM and US Forest Service sounds really promising with respect adding more accessible OHV opportunities.
- Having a place to camp and ride dirt bikes in Santa Clara county would be an excellent opportunity for all its residents! Thank you

- Off-roading of any kind is a great sport, but if someone lives in the bay area they have to drive over an hour to find any courses. Carnegie and Metcalf are the only parks nearby. It is a huge waste of gas and time to get there. Would be nice to use some of the Water Department lands closer to the upper peninsula area... but anything, even a small obstacle park would be a great addition!
- There are very few ohv areas that allow night riding and many close friends including myself would love to do some rock crawling at night without having to drive hours away from home
- Permit process to limit access so lands don't over used.
- Open access to land-locked public lands! So many parcels managed by BLM, etc, have no access, or access only via private roads with "NO TRESPASSING" signs etc.
- Allow hunting opportunities
- Allow hunting opportunities
- Would like camping sites that have good amount of space between them. So your group of friends can camp in one compound and feel secluded
- I would like it to be in areas that people do not go to for peace, quiet, and retreat from the noise and congestion in our lives
- In evaluating potential sites, please include criteria for each impact category covered by CEQA as well as cumulative impacts. Also please analyze impact on wildlife movement for mountain lions, newts, and other species of concern. Potential opposition including risk of lawsuits should also be included as a criteria.
- Please ensure a well done plan that included Environmental analysis with completed biological surveys and with specific layout routes that include the protections for biological resources have been addressed! I would have no comment on this until I can review the NEPA/SEQA scoping and final analysis.
- It is important to protect current PARKS from vehicle access, which scares of and reduces wildlife, and also destroys the quiet that is a critical part of wilderness access for hikers. PLEASE do NOT allow vehicle access to Henry Coe and other existing parks, but find new land areas that are not currently used by hikers so you don't destroy the wilderness experience for those of use who currently use our parks.
- The corporations that sell OHVs should be responsible for providing sites for this type of recreation. I don't want my tax dollars going to building OHV recreations sites.
- No more public lands should be destroyed by motor-vehicles. My taxes shouldn't go to the destruction of public lands. Corporations that profit from the sale of these vehicles should be responsible for providing sites for this type of recreation.
- Utilize areas that have already had the habitat destroyed like abandon golf courses, shopping centers, parking lots or stadiums
- I am strongly against the expansion of OHV recreation in CA anywhere other than on already highly disturbed lands. Noise and human presence are very disruptive to wildlife. Just one case in point: <https://www.newtimeslo.com/sanluisobispo/vehicles-temporarily-banned-in-oceano-dunes-to-protect-plovers/Content?oid=9899318>
- Companies that sell vehicles, e-bikes, bicycles should use private land to benefit their customers. I don't pay taxes to destroy our fragile open spaces.
- Please consider working with Calfire to have multi use fire roads/trails.

- Mountain bike and dirt bike Shared areas
- It would be ideal to provide more opportunities to minimize these activities in neighborhoods. My property in Gilroy is constantly being impacted by dirt bikes and ATVs on neighboring properties. It's incredibly disruptive. Would be better to provide more options that are regulated/safe/less disruptive to the community but it needs to be done very carefully so that it doesn't impact other park visitors and wildlife.
- Working with private land owners with large tracks of land in Santa Clara County
- Look at smaller areas to hold events , circle track 1/8 mile oval type stuff
- I would like to see a program to sign up for restricted areas for HOV that can hold individuals accountable for being responsible for their actions in taking care of the environment that we wish to visit.
- DIRT BIKES!!
- Disappointing how some ruin it for all. Would even enjoy access to fire roads to see more of nature without tearing up additional land.
- A beginner class on proper trail use for first time UTV/side by side buyers
- It'd be great to have motorcycle riding trails that seem like they go on forever. Hollister has some good examples. Metcalf feels exactly the opposite.
- Single tracks need to remain for dirtbikers. SXS need access in a way that doesn't put bikers in danger. Most lack simple trail etiquette and will go on quad/dirtbike trails. They are considered a jeep but they don't know that.
- There should have reservations so it won't get too packed with vehicles. Open up a campground with in.
- Create more 4x4 trails that are located closer to the bay area.
- Beach driving
- Smaller urban sites with restricted daily use to prevent overcrowding could be a good alternative for single day riders in urban areas.
- Campsite
- Visit the overland expo, engage with Instagram/YouTube channels that promote the 'Overlanding' phenomenon to get more awareness/engagement with this kind of recreation.
- It would be nice to have a beginner friendly park in the Sacramento foothills area. A place like Hollister Hills. Prairie city is the worst OHV riding area I've ever been to. This opinion is shared by pretty much everyone.
- I would like more access to backcountry camping spots.
- You can do smaller ventures within city's to help decrease illegal abuse of OHV's on public roads
- Full Hook up RV sites.
- More public mx tracks
- Would love to see more 4x4 trails.
- There is a large portion of fire roads on Mount Diablo away from regularly used hiking and horseback riding trails that could be made into multipurpose trails.
- I think trails type areas would be great. Something as small as 2 acres can provide great riding and practice. Trials bikes are quiet, don't have knobby tires and don't need large area
- Closer mixed-use areas save on pollution.



- I think providing street legal ohv access is a great way to provide more opportunities to the off-road community. It doesn't have the added challenge of opening a new SRVA. The adv community likes to use trails to get from point to point and travel across the land. It would be nice if some of these trails could take us through the park from one end to another so we can use it as a section of multi day trips.
- I think future SVRAs should be adjacent to or inclusive of USFS and/or BLM lands to provide high-quality, managed campgrounds, concession facilities, and other OHV amenities (tracks, obstacles courses, etc.) that are adjacent large areas with existing trail systems to help disperse the recreation activities. It would provide a greater alignment of state/federal resources and provide a high-quality experience for the OHV recreating public.
- More Overlanding trails in Northern California would be great
- Marketing campaign feasibility showcasing OHV recreation as a family & friend activity; RV and Overland camping, etc.
- More opportunities near denser populated areas to reduce impact of needing to drive to remote places
- We need more riding areas close to major population.
- More access to single tracks that make loops and complete without having to go on roads
- Build more trails at existing trail systems and ohv areas. you could easily build more trails and if they were one way it would be safer. much smarter than trying to find and build an entire new ohv area.
- More trails like the Rubicon where it's a long trail/road that is not an out and back
- I would like to see private, low-cost, guided expeditions through certified vendors.
- Getting 4x4 clubs and social media clubs involved
- Need more resources for beginners, and finding trails
- As a side by side owner I love taking my family of five on trips. We pack out what we pack in take care of the areas, but we live in Rio Vista so roughly we have prairie city an hour away everything else is over 2 hours with a trailer would love more areas.
- Expand to urban areas only please. Keep our open spaces free from the pollution and destruction of OHV use.
- In good faith for all, do not take Henry Coe land which is so close to Hollister Hills. If anything, there are often ranches for sale south of HH SVRA or around there and Pinnacles that could be acquired and designated.
- Build a motor cross track for electric bikes near population centers. These could be in a city park since there's no noise pollution
- Every year we lose single track to closures and more fences. After a fire comes through an area install Single Track should be a priority. (Ex. Mendocino NF)
- Make any and all trail one way!
- Remove Henry W. Coe state park from any consideration for off-road vehicular activities.
- Find some degraded land and upgrade it but leave pristine Coe State Park out.
- Buy new lands don't use current state parks.
- We need some forested single track in San Diego County. Most of what's available around here is more open type of riding. dual sport bikes are now getting VERY popular with the CARB

restrictions making more dirt-oriented bikes unregistrable. It would be nice to connect the trails together so that we could navigate all over the county with little street riding.

- Make it street legal for sxs
- More one-way trails. And more trails for bikes and quads only. So riders don't have to worry about sxs hitting them head on.
- Motorcycle riding area/track in Southern California that is not all sand.
- Working with city leaders and motorcycle clubs would help. What about sponsorship from private sector?
- Please explore the idea of implementing a long-distance trail loop much like Arizona's Peace Trail (it need not be THAT long). It would bring tourism to many rural areas and would encourage everyone to stick to the trails. Crucially, it MUST be ALL OHV legal for the whole distance. Any part that requires a Street Legal vehicle or a size/width requirement would limit the effectiveness of this trail system.
- Motorcycle or ATV areas
- Recognize that dirt bikes have a smaller footprint than quads and side by sides so creating a single track trail for only dirt bikes should be easier to create than 4 track trails since there impact is much smaller.
- More bikes and more bicycle lanes
- Please use land that has been degraded (for example, by agriculture) for OHV recreation.
- To be fair, Sate Parks does not operate other concessions such as ski areas. My suggestion is to look into farming out OHV parks to Concessioners and then focusing on monitoring them instead on administration.
- I have grave concerns about expanding OHV recreation in our state parks. The wilderness nature of parks such as Henry Coe would be changed forever, affecting biodiversity, wildlife corridors, possible recovery from wildfire damage, etc. I hope that non-wilderness areas will be considered for expanded OHV use. I would like to see Henry Coe and other such areas continue to be preserved as part of the state's commitment to the 30 x 30 program, and that recreational opportunities will be limited to low-impact ones (non-OHV).

A large number of comments (76) were related to the operation and maintenance of the OHV facilities. The most popular topics were limiting the destruction/ protection of natural resources with 34 responses, followed by the use of electric vehicles (9 responses) and enforcement of behaviors (7 responses).

Table 9. Question 7 Responses – Operation & Maintenance

Name	Count
Limit Emissions	4
Electric Vehicles	9
Limit Destruction/Protection for Natural Resources	34
Funding	4
Enforcement of Behaviors	7
Maintenance	1
Limit Overuse	6
Sticker Law	6
Programs	5
<b>Total</b>	76

A sizable number of comments (49) provided specific locations where new OHV facilities should be located. The most popular responses were the Bay Area (10 comments); and Alameda-Tesla Property/ Carnegie SVRA, Other State Park Units, and Clear Creek each with 5 comments. The table shows the most popular responses, while the list below shows other suggested locations/comments with locational suggestions.

Table 10. Question 7 Responses – Specific Locations

Name	Count
Bay Area	10
Alameda-Tesla Property/ Carnegie SVRA	5
Other State Park Units	5
Clear Creek	5
<b>Total</b>	25

Other than the support for Henry Coe State Park as discussed in the previous section, other state Park units mentioned include Oceano Dunes and Red Rock Canyon State Park.

Other location-related comments received:

- There are 15,000,000 acres of BLM land in California. All this land should be considered. There's only one Henry Coe park, please do not destroy this beautiful piece of land with any kind of mother vehicles. Please.
- The roads are worse than trails, please open city to OHV.
- Buzzard Lagoon near Corralitos CA is a trail that is not an OHV has potential SC Mountains
- Open deer creek and Crandall peak to year around as it used to be.
- USFS and BLM has many areas that would benefit from better management. OHV Grant funding is a tremendous help to the feds, but the OHV community needs to step up and take a more active role in maintaining these OHV areas. The federal agencies lack the manpower and resources to manage such an intensive form of recreation. Opening Henry Coe to highway legal access for the public is a really good idea, as long as it's properly managed.

The season of use will end up being very limited due to conditions there, so it might not be that much of a gain.

- Expand them into the Salton wastelands.
- Marsh Preserve in the Redwood City, Menlo Park area
- Consider expanding OHV recreation around the new Sites reservoir in Colusa county
- Cleaning up the ones we currently have. Stonyford, white pines, Forrest hill, Georgetown etc. Trails are overgrown with bushes and there is a lot of dead standing trees that fall during storms that subsequently cause the forest service to close parks during the best time to enjoy ohv. Also expanding on them integrating more trails. And we need more coordination on volunteer clean up rides. They seem to be very short notice which makes them hard to attend.
- Please explore the possibilities around Hunter Valley Mountain, Dog Town, (both, near Lake McClure) LaGrange MX Park expansion? Henry Coe State Park, near Morgan Hill, private properties off of Mines Rd. (A. Lehr family may be aware of)
- Cache creek
- It would be nice to have a beginner friendly park in the Sacramento foothills area. A place like Hollister Hills. Prairie city is the worst OHV riding area I've ever been to. This opinion is shared by pretty much everyone.
- More area to ride closer to coast
- Foothills near Alburn
- Expand access to Cow Mountain from HWY 175
- More Overlanding trails in Northern California would be great
- The Santa Cruz Mountains are overdue for a OHV area. Buzzard Lagoon Rd seems like a prime candidate for that. People already use it as an OHV area, might as well make it official.
- Open the Gorman mx track, it's already to ride as is , you don't need a well to open it!
- We need some forested single track in San Diego County. Most of what's available around here is more open type of riding. Dual sport bikes are now getting VERY popular with the CARB restrictions making more dirt oriented bikes unregistrable. It would be nice to connect the trails together so that we could navigate all over the county with little street riding.
- Some reasonable OHV areas in Acton & Agua Dulce to discourage illegal riding on private roads
- More OHV trails south of San Bernardino
- San Diego County
- There is a place in Vallejo near Highway 37 and Highway 80
- My suggestion is to re-open Dowdy entrance on weekends from May-September. There is plenty access to the park from Headquarters and Hunting Hollow. These parking areas are more than suitable for seniors and people with disabilities. It was mentioned easier access to fishing holes. Really! These few fishing holes are ponds! Not very big. It is fine for the occasional hiker or backpacker, but to open it up to more public fishing pressure would be detrimental! It WOULD NOT be in the best interest of the fish in their natural environment and would result in trauma and fish kill. It wouldn't take long to ruin the landscape and treasure of these quiet little ponds. Thank you for listening to my heartfelt concerns, Paul Butler

Lastly, there were seven comments didn't fit into any of the topics discussed, with another six that noted "not sure" or "none". The seven comments are listed below:

- I am very familiar with all State OHV areas in state as I was a permanent California State Parks employee. Traffic Engineer and Facility Safety person for 16 years.
- OHV enthusiasts are not enemies of naturalists, they in fact strive to keep nature wild too.
- How to reduce OHV recreation with healthier forms of recreation.
- The various users can coexist, there is plenty of land if managed properly.
- Fresno state off road survey information
- CARB regulations are not realistic. They need to be reeled in. They make laws that can wipe out people's livelihoods, and recreation for many. People in CA are buying bikes from other states now.
- OHV use should be limited, not expanded. Backcountry non-motorized use should be the priority. Also, this survey is highly biased. It is ONLY asking where to expand. It is NOT asking the general public if they WANT to expand OHV use. Your result will thus be biased to answers on where to expand. So, this should not be used as a gauge to the public need, or desire for more OHV use.