

## House Bill, NO. 93

### Oppose as Written

2/6/2026

HB 93 ignores the unique needs of Alaska's Senior Residents and denies many of them continued access to Fish and Game (F&G) and their way of life. I'm 74 and have been an Alaska resident for 53 years, in the early 70's I was 21, left Ohio, headed to Alaska with \$500, a Datsun pickup and never looked back. I made a life here, married here, raised a family here, owned multiple businesses and homes here, and have made substantial economic and social contributions to this state. Make no mistake, I am an Alaskan that has no desire to call any other place home.

However, apparently HB 93 doesn't think so. To my wife and I, as with most Alaskans, Alaska's way of life, freedoms, and resident access to fish and game (F&G) is by far the single most precious resource Alaska has to offer. Take it away and you're left with long, dark, frozen winters, and an expensive existence with no shortage of hardships.

Over the years my wife and I have saved and planned for the day we could retire, travel, live between Fairbanks and Wrangell, find warmer winters, and spend the remainder of our lives living as we please. No apologies, we earned it. We have invested a whole lot of money, both in Fairbanks and Wrangell, to have places to live and equipment to access our Alaskan way of life during retirement. Even in retirement we're spending about \$60,000 a year in state just to keep that lifestyle.

Sorry, I guess I'm starting to ramble, I better get to HB 93. I'm sort of a bottom-line kind of guy, so here it is. My wife and I are getting old, kind of very old, winters here are no longer safe or healthy for us, like it or not, we need to spend winters outside to maintain our health and wellbeing.

**There is not another state in our country that I know of which requires a resident to stay a minimum number of days in state or lose resident benefits.** In fact, most do the opposite, they make it as easy as they can to entice and keep residents, you're welcome to come and go all you want. Oh, but not Alaska and HB 93, it says, if you don't stay 180 days a year in-state willingly, we're going to force you to stay, or we are going to take away the very reason you're here in the first place.

And don't give me this; "Alaska has a 180 day in state mandate for the permanent fund (PFD), so it's okay to have it before allowing me to hunt and fish as a resident". If I don't qualify for a PFD it's going to cost me \$1,000. If I don't qualify for resident hunting and fishing it's going to cost me my very way of life, my consumptive use, my reason for being in Alaska. It's going to make my nearly one-million-dollar in-state investment to retire here of no real use to me, and it's going to take my soul.

All for what? What did I do wrong? What laws have I broken? What did I do to deserve to have my resident hunting and fishing taken away? NOTHING! Look, I am absolutely positive that if some people are violating fish and game residency laws it can be fixed without mandating that 740,000 Alaskan residents stay in-state 6 months or more annually or lose their resident hunting and fishing privileges. It's insane.

HB 93, will hit Alaska's seniors particularly hard, winters can be flat out dangerous for them. Many of them have spent a good portion of their life here. It's really caring of the state to now tell them if you don't stay in-state as long as we think you should; no more resident fishing or consumptive use activities for you. Jeez...Thanks.

**Ok, back to the bottom line, after having spent most of my life here if you would like me to remain a resident, contributing economic and social benefits to the state, then treat me like a resident! If you want to treat me like a non-resident then that is exactly what I'm going to be!**

### **Solution**

The solution is actually very easy, remove the needless 180-day in-state mandate. It adversely affects innocent residents, is the largest opposition to this bill, and **does not** stop non-residents from establishing resident fish and game access while only having spent a few days in state. (If you would like to understand why, then please read my other submitted testimony on HB 93).

Or, if that doesn't work for you, place a senior exemption in the bill; any resident 60 years or older does not have to meet the 180 day in-state mandate.

Thanks for reading our testimony,  
Ken and Anna Vorisek



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Gary Hollier [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 15, 2026 4:51 PM  
**To:** Senate Judiciary  
**Subject:** Fwd: HB 93

Hello Chairman and Members of Judiciary Committee

I am a 72 year life long resident of Alaska.  
I was born in Seward and raised in Kenai.  
I have received every PFD since its inception.  
My commercial fishing business of 56 years is in Kenai.  
My two Sub S Corporations are registered in the State of Alaska, and operate in the Kenai area.  
My two children and five grandchildren are residents of the State of Alaska.  
I am totally AGAINST HB 93, which requires PFD eligibility to receive a State of Alaska resident sport, hunting, and trapping license.  
I travel to other States in the United States of America.  
If I am gone for 180 days from the State I am eligible for resident hunting and fishing. If I am gone for 181 days I am not! I am still a resident of Alaska.

Under Article VIII of the Alaska constitution, section 2 it states .... General Authority -The legislature shall provide for the utilization, development, and conservation of all natural resources that belong to the State, including land and waters, for the maximum benefit of the people.

Section 3 Common Use-Wherever occurring in their natural state, fish, wildlife, and waters are reserved to the people for common use.

This is one if the core principles of Section 3, resources of Alaska belong to the people collectively.  
I am a permanent resident of Alaska.

I get ZERO benefits from another State!

In the PDF application that ask certain questions.  
That I answer NO to all of them.  
I do not vote in another State.  
I vote in Alaska!

I do not file taxes in another State.  
I file taxes in Alaska!

I do not have a vehicle registered in another State.  
All my vehicles are registered in Alaska!

I do not apply for any sport or hunting licenses as a resident in another State.  
I qualify for a permanent State hunting and fishing and trapping licenses in Alaska!

I do not work in another State.  
I still commercial fish in Alaska!

I do not apply for any benefits of any type from another State.

Where should I be eligible to receive resident sport hunting and fishing licenses, if I am not eligible in Alaska?

Yes I vacation to other States, but my full time primary residence is 36045 Reef Dr Kenai, Ak.

Many legislators “campaign “ as fiscal conservatives, it I feel that HB 93 adds another layer of government that is all ready covered under State statues.

Please do not pass HB 93

Thank you,  
Gary L Hollier  
Kenai, Ak



Stacee F. Kleinsmith, MBA  
BOW Instructor – AK Dept. F&G  
Past President – AK SCI

Residence: [REDACTED]

Mailing: [REDACTED]

Owned Office Building: [REDACTED]

February 9, 2026

Senate Judiciary Committee  
Senators Claman, Kiehl, Stevens, Tobin, & Tilton  
Alaska State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99801

Re: HB 93 "An Act changing the residency requirements for hunting, trapping, and sport fishing privileges; and providing for an effective date."

Dear Honorable Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee –

Please oppose HB 93. It has passed the House and has now been referred to Senate Judiciary and to Resources.

While my nature is to presume the best and imagine this bill was well intended in origination – someone somewhere believes that somebody else is getting something they haven't earned. However, from the original sponsor statement (this session or even previous attempts) to any supporting testimony - there have been no reference to facts or data that support that a real or actual problem is being solved by this bill.

There is no indication of how big the problem is – not even any guesstimate of how large (if any) fiscal problem this is for the state or how many perpetrators there are. Some may speculate that law enforcement is unable to enforce current law – rhetorically, I am unsure this bill would correct that issue. Also, I have not seen an actual Alaska LEO make that attestation. I have seen a retired wildlife trooper from Outside pose support – but one is wise to note that his testimony is as a resident not as LEO.

The issue lies in the fact that this bill has unintended consequences that have real and actual impact on good upstanding longtime residents, like myself. I am just one of many, but this is my own testimony:

Born and raised in Anchorage, I am now 50. Economics and logic dictated that I move to PA for 12 years to go to school (bachelor's and master's degrees) and to care for my medically frail but not initially terminally ill grandparents. Upon my return home to Alaska, I bought a home, started a business, bought an office building. I own no other property elsewhere; all of my vehicles are registered in Alaska. I have no intention of living anywhere other than Alaska. Apart from where I live and work, most people who know me would define me as a hunter. This is part of my very fabric – so much so that I am an instructor with the Department of Fish & Game Becoming an Outdoors

Woman program, that I am a Past President of the Alaska Chapter of Safari Club. Being able to fly and hunt is why I stay.

But if HB 93 were adopted, I would have fallen out of residency 2 of the last 3 years each for a different reason:

In 2023 I was diagnosed with Breast Cancer – and while I initially sought care in Alaska, I thought it prudent to get a second opinion. I opted to receive surgery and recovery treatments in Nebraska where my mother could be my caregiver. I did fight for the medical exemption but because the combination of non-exempt travel put me over 180 days, I was denied.

And this past year when the tables have been turned and I can provide care for my mother – I would again fall out of compliance because caring for a frailing, but not terminally ill parent is not a qualifiable exemption. Yet, I am still maintaining my home, my business, my employees in Alaska and would not be considered a resident.

If I am not a resident in Alaska, where am I resident?

I have added economic value to our community – I have remodeled homes and a commercial building each increasing the tax base. Over the past 20 years I have created a new company that was not here before and has employed over 1,300 people. I have been an active member of multiple organizations that support our Department of Fish & Game and having taken only 1 each of 6 big game species yet actively hunting every year and supporting all segments of the industry – I'm hard pressed to imagine that anybody could claim that I or the likes of me are abusing the system or even being a drain on it.

This bill is effectively trying to draw a line in the sand asking if I am Alaskan Enough to be considered a resident. It will not stop bad actors, but it will hamper honest long-time residents. It puts restrictions on freedom of movement and disincentivizes staying in Alaska.

I urge opposition of HB 93 as it creates more harm than good in trying to solve an undefined problem. If outright opposition is not prudent, I would propose removing Sec 2 (a)(3) line 1-3 on page 2 and Sec.3(e)(3) lines 14-16 on page 2.

Should you have any questions – I may be reached directly at (907) 242-3800 or [stacee.frost@homeinstead.com](mailto:stacee.frost@homeinstead.com).

Kindly,

*Stacee Kleinsmith*

Stacee F. Kleinsmith, MBA  
BOW Instructor – AK Dept. F&G  
Past President – AK SCI  
Franchise Owner – Home Instead

## House Bill HB 93

2/6/26

HB93, Oppose as written: It places economic and personal hardships on long standing Alaska residents, and will negatively impact the state's economy.

Let's be honest, Alaska's fish and game (F&G) is one of Alaska's most valuable and desirable resources. We are not talking about chopped liver here; we are talking about something vitally important to most every Alaska resident and why most of us came here and remain here.

Now introduce HB 93, it comes along and decides it's going to establish a criteria (hierarchy) to determine which residents can have residential access to hunt and fish; and which cannot. It says that the sole criteria to determine that access is how many days a resident is physically in-state, no other considerations. If a resident is in-state 180 days they get to hunt and fish as residents; 179 days, nope, you are stripped of your residential access and get to hunt and fish as non-resident.

HB 93 gives zero consideration to a person who has demonstrated lifelong residency and benefit to the state. A person may have lived 50 years in Alaska being a productive resident, providing significant economic and social benefits to the state, but that won't matter. There can be many legitimate reasons why a person might be out of state for more than 180 days, but with few exceptions, HB 93 simply doesn't care. No resident hunting or fishing for you. **The sad part is HB 93 can largely solve its F&G access concerns without a 180-day in-state mandate.**

Do not underestimate the potential negative social and economic impact HB93 will have on the state of Alaska and its people. Currently the state's population is about 740,000 people, last year about 140,000 of them **did not** apply for a Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD), the primary reason was they didn't meet the residential requirements. Now let's apply those same requirements to hunting and fishing residency, HB93 will potentially strip 140,000 Alaskans from their residential access to F&G. A portion of those residents will leave the state, does Alaska really think there will not be a negative social and economic impact on the state?

The proponents of HB93 argue the bill will stop non-residents from masquerading as residents and unfairly deplete Alaska's fish and game. Yet I have seen little concrete evidence to support those claims, most claims are simply unsupported talk. E.g. "Just look at all the fish boxes leaving airports in Southeast Alaska", yet most of those boxes are from non-residents paying for non-resident licenses and hiring in state charter services.

The punitive effect of HB 93 is simply unnecessary. The overwhelming majority of opposition to HB93 centers around the 180-day mandate. How exactly does a resident being out of state for more than 180 days harm the resource? **Does Alaska really want to place additional use restriction on Alaska Residents while leaving non-residents and commercial users alone?** There will always be some abuse of the system and room for improvement, but placing regulations that strip good law-abiding people from their residency benefits is not the answer.

I agree that the Statute that determines hunting and fishing residency can use improvement (AS 16.05.415). Currently a non-resident can come to Alaska, establish and maintain a “domicile” for 12 months, meet a few other conditions, and they have established F&G residency without having been in the state for more than a few days. This brings into question whether that non-resident truly wants to become an Alaskan resident and bring benefit to the state, or simply wants to gain resident hunting and fishing privileges. That potential abuse can be resolved by HB 93 without placing a 180-day in-state mandate on existing legal residents.

HB 93 adds language to the current Statute (AS 16.05.415) that says a person must be **“physically present in the state at all times during the (preceding) 12 consecutive months....”** before gaining resident access to F&G. I believe that language alone will largely eliminate those non-residents who wish to abuse the system. The twelve months of in-state requirement certainly ups the current stake for establishing F&G residency and demonstrates a person’s desire to make Alaska their home.

**Adding the 12 month in-state mandate to those non-residents seeking to establish residency will largely resolve F&G access concerns. It places the responsibility to prove good intent on the non-resident, without placing a 180-day in-state mandate on existing residents.**

PFD requirements are fine for the PFD but should not become Alaska’s standard to remain a state or a fish and game resident. It’s one thing to not qualify for a PFD, and quite another thing to lose resident F&G and consumptive use access; to lose a way of life, food on the table, and possibly the very reason you’re in Alaska.

There are many who believe the impetus for HB 93 comes from a mentality that says, “if you don’t spend as much time in Alaska as I do, you should not get the same benefits”, in short, “you’re not entitled to the same fish and game as me”. This discriminates between legitimate Alaska residents, prevents equal access, and is a very poor reason to strip 140,000 Alaskan residents of their F&G residency. F&G resources are under increasing pressure throughout the state, in some cases resulting in decreased bag limits and opportunity, I am quite sure that HB 93’s 180-day requirement is not going to move that needle.



One more point, it's been said that HB 93 is necessary for enforcement purposes. There are current laws that provide various residency requirements, those laws are clear and can be enforced. Most of all enforcement becomes easier by adding additional restrictions and conditions on the public. Must we give up our resident F&G access to simply make enforcement easier?

### **Proposed Solution**

**I propose that HB 93 remove the requirements of AS 43.23.008, specifically the requirement to be in state 180 days annually or lose F&G residency.** Retain the language that requires a non-resident person to be physically in state for 12 consecutive months to establish resident F&G access.

By doing so it will ensure that only people who demonstrate their intent to make Alaska their home gain access to residential F&G use. And eliminate the negative financial and personal impact it will have on those long-standing Alaska people who have already proven themselves to be Alaskans!

Sincerely, Ken Vorisek.  
Alaskan Resident.

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Ken Vorisek.

**HOUSE BILL 93**  
OPPOSE As Written  
2/16/26

Dear Senate Judiciary Committee,

I believe this bill has legitimate legal problems.

I sent an email to the sponsor asking if they had any evidence or data that quantified or supported the alleged residency abuse.

I received a 2/13/26 response from Representative Himschoots office that said, in part **“we do not have the ability to quantify how many people are taking advantage of this loophole because that data simply does not exist.”**

Instead, as justification for HB 93 I received anecdotal letters in support, most of those letters are from **outfitters, sport commercial interests and government entities.**

The Bills Sponsor Statement says:

- “Importantly, this bill does not change the bag and possession limits for out-of-state hunters or fishermen” and “the important guided hunting and fishing industries will not be impacted by this bill.”

We are talking about Public Trust Wildlife here, which belongs to all 740,000 Alaskan residents; not non-residents, or a select few sports commercial and governmental interests.

**HB 93 intent is clearly to restrict only resident access to Public Trust Wildlife, while supporting current levels of Non-Resident and Sport Commercial Access.**

Of the 740,000 Alaska residents, about 140,000 did not receive a permanent fund last year; the primary reason is they did not qualify. Apply those same permanent fund requirements to resident hunting and fishing and you have just taken fish and game privileges away from over 100,000 Alaskan residents.

In 2024 there were 230,000 resident hunting and fishing licenses sold, about 32,000 license holders will now lose their current hunting and fishing privileges if HB 93 Passes.

**“Equal Access” is protected by the Alaskan constitution.**

A Bill violates “Equal Access” principles when it:

- Cannot support or quantify a need.
- Places such burdensome and restrictive regulations on residents with the intent to effectively excludes a significant number of those residents from Public Trust Wildlife “Equal Access”.
- Goes against “Comon Use” principles by excluding a significant number of its residents from access without justifiable cause or demonstrating a need.
- To restrict 100,000 Alaskan residents for allegations of a small local concern.
- Does not curtail Non-Resident and Sport Commercial uses.

**Please do not pass out of committee Bills that have legitimate legal implications, or that passes the burden to challenge those implications onto Alaskan residents.**

Sincerely,  
Ken Vorisek  
53 Year Public Trust Wildlife User.



Sources are available upon request.



## RESIDENT HUNTERS OF ALASKA

unapologetically **FOR ALASKAN RESIDENTS**

Working hard to ensure our wildlife is managed sustainably with an emphasis on protecting and enhancing resident hunting opportunities!

[www.residenthuntersofalaska.org](http://www.residenthuntersofalaska.org)

February 12, 2026

To: Senate Judiciary Committee

Re: HB 93 – Residency requirement for hunt/fish/trap license

Dear Chair Claman, Vice-chair Kiehl, and members of the Judiciary Committee,

Resident Hunters of Alaska (RHAK) is on record supporting the intent of HB 93 to ensure that people who don't really live here cannot hunt, fish, or trap under a resident license and resident seasons and bag limits.

However, as previously stated, we have concerns about how this legislation will affect certain Alaskans who may need to travel out of state for work, or for other reasons, that don't fall under the current PFD exemptions. These are real Alaskans with homes and family here in the state. These same concerns are what led 17 House members to vote no on the bill.

We have tried to work with the sponsor and Alaska Wildlife Troopers on potential amendments or exemptions that would not complicate enforcement. Some such amendments have been offered during the course of this legislation but have not passed.

So, we find ourselves in a catch-22. We want to support keeping nonresidents from hunting or fishing under a resident license, but the way we would now define who is a resident or nonresident is going to hurt real Alaskans who don't fall under the PFD exemptions. That includes some of our members.

For these reasons, we **oppose** HB 93 as written.

There must be a better, simpler way of defining who is and isn't a resident of the state that won't disenfranchise so many.

Sincerely,

Mark Richards

Executive Director Resident Hunters of Alaska (RHAK)