

From: Sen. Matt Claman
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2026 9:46 AM
To: Senate Judiciary
Subject: FW: HB 93 Violates Established Residency Standards Using PFD Rules and Denies Article VIII Constitutional Rights to Residents

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Karl Rodvik [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 4, 2026 2:10 PM
To: Senate Resources <SenateResources@akleg.gov>
Cc: Sen. Cathy Giessel <Sen.Cathy.Giessel@akleg.gov>; Sen. Bill Wielechowski <Sen.Bill.Wielechowski@akleg.gov>; Sen. Matt Claman <Sen.Matt.Claman@akleg.gov>; Sen. Forrest Dunbar <Sen.Forrest.Dunbar@akleg.gov>; Sen. Scott Kawasaki <Sen.Scott.Kawasaki@akleg.gov>; Sen. Robert Myers <Senator.Robert.Myers@akleg.gov>; Sen. George Rauscher <Sen.George.Rauscher@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 93 Violates Established Residency Standards Using PFD Rules and Denies Article VIII Constitutional Rights to Residents

Good Afternoon Senators,

I appreciate you taking the time to gather public feedback on HB 93. Senator Kawasaki directed me to send my concerns to the Senate Resource Committee as well.

Upon further research, I have identified fundamental statutory and constitutional issues with HB 93 that I believe warrant deep review by the Senate. Below is my simple summary of the issues at hand.

HB 93 creates a substantial constitutional concern under Article VIII of the Alaska Constitution by conditioning resident hunting, fishing, and trapping privileges on compliance with Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD) allowable absence rules. In effect, the bill converts a cash-benefit eligibility standard into a residency disqualification and uses that disqualification to deny Alaskans access to constitutionally protected fish and wildlife resources.

Put plainly, HB 93 treats Alaskans who are denied or forgo the PFD as nonresidents for hunting and fishing, even though Alaska law otherwise continues to recognize them as residents. This redefines residency by proxy, using dividend eligibility as the controlling test without amending Alaska's general residency law.

Alaska's established residency framework:

Residency in Alaska is defined by domicile and intent, not annual physical presence.

15 AAC 23.143 establishes residency through intent to remain indefinitely in Alaska, maintenance of Alaska ties, and the absence of residency claims elsewhere. Extended absences do not automatically terminate residency, and physical presence alone is not determinative. Alaska law expressly allows a person to remain a resident while being denied certain benefits.

PFD law is a separate and narrower standard:

The PFD statutes impose an additional and intentionally restrictive test for a single purpose only, determining eligibility for a cash dividend.

AS 43.23.008 and 15 AAC 23.163 govern allowable absences solely for PFD eligibility. Alaska law has long and deliberately allowed residents to lose the PFD without losing residency.

What HB 93 changes:

HB 93 amends AS 16.05.415(a)(3) to require that resident hunting and fishing eligibility comply with AS 43.23.008.

This collapses the two systems and effectively creates a new rule: failure to meet PFD allowable-absence requirements results in nonresident status for hunting and fishing.

This is not an individualized hardship issue. It is a class-wide reclassification of residents. Those affected include rotational workers, pilots, maritime officers (like myself), healthcare professionals, frequent travelers, and long-time Alaskans who knowingly exceed PFD absence limits while maintaining Alaska as their domicile.

Constitutional implications under Article VIII:

Article VIII guarantees common use and equal access to fish and wildlife resources for all Alaskans, subject only to uniform and reasonable regulation.

By altering the residency gateway without revising Article VIII standards or providing a uniform access rationale, HB 93 risks denying Article VIII rights to individuals Alaska law otherwise recognizes as residents, creating non-uniform classifications among residents, and conditioning constitutional resource access on eligibility for an unrelated cash benefit.

Core issue for review:

Alaska law allows residents to lose PFD eligibility without losing residency. HB 93 erases that distinction by using dividend eligibility as a proxy for residency, with direct constitutional implications for Article VIII hunting and fishing rights.

I greatly appreciate your time and consideration and hope this analysis is helpful as the Senate continues its review of HB 93.

I will do my best to continue to raise awareness.

Respectfully,

Karl Rodvik
Dynamic Positioning Operator - Transocean
U.S.C.G. Second Mate Unlimited

[REDACTED]

From: David Mason [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 16, 2026 2:28 PM
To: Senate Judiciary
Subject: HB93 must be stopped or amended!

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To my representatives, HB93 must be stopped or amended!

I am ACTIVELY serving in the AK ANG at the 168th ANG in Fairbanks. As such, I'm regularly called to duty as a pilot on 24/7 homeland defense, PACAF deployments and also provided presidential support overhead for PRESIDENT TRUMP AND PUTIN's Anchorage negotiations.

SECONDLY, I am a commercial pilot that provides goods and infrastructure to the state of Alaska. You are forcing me to choose between making money and my right to procure food and entertainment as an Alaskan resident under the 180 day limit. An My approximate pilot out-of-state schedule is 15 days a month (180 days a year) which gives me no ability to be extended for work by my employer, pick up any additional work if needed or go see family in the lower 48.

My primary residence is in Wasilla and I am a tax paying citizen of multiple properties in the state of Alaska and no where else in the world.

The Solution for this and the PFD is to provide pilots a waiver out LIKE YOU, THE POLITICIANS get for work or cancel this bill.

Feel free to call but I may be airborne for you, your family, your constituents or in service of this state and country.

LTCOL DAVID MASON
[REDACTED]

As a long time resident of Alaska I would like to register my opposition to HB93, which is currently being considered in the Alaska State Senate. I believe that it addresses a problem that doesn't really exist and discriminates against long term loyal Alaskan Residents.

Please allow me to explain: the problem that the Bill supposedly solves is that of individuals who do not actually live in Alaska buying resident hunting and fishing licenses and thereby cheating the state out of some revenue while also harvesting excess amounts of our fish and game resources. While there is certainly anecdotal evidence that this is a problem, to my knowledge, there is no documentation of the magnitude of the problem. How many prosecutions have there been under our current laws? How much money is the State losing through this mechanism? How much more will the State make under this new law? We are in a situation where the number of hunters is in general declining and there are nation-wide efforts through R3 (Recruitment, Retention, Reactivation) programs to increase the number of hunters. Current mechanisms are in place and through computer technology it is becoming easier to identify and prosecute any individuals who are claiming residency in more than one state. AI technology could easily be used to compare lists of different States hunting licenses, driving licenses or voter registrations to seek duplicates.

The proposed "solution" is apparently to apply the stricter definition of the requirement to be eligible for and/or actually apply for and receive a PFD to be allowed to buy a resident hunting and fishing license in Alaska. This represents egregious discrimination against older Alaskans many of whom have devoted their entire productive lives to Alaska but who as they are becoming older may spend more time in the lesser 48 States due to health reasons or family reasons or who are just retired and after a long productive life would like to see other parts of the world while maintaining their Alaskan Residency. This is a slap in the face and demonstrates complete lack of appreciation for their lifelong commitment to Alaska.

I will use myself as an example:

- I originally came to Anchorage in 1973 when I was stationed here in the US Air Force.
- My first year in Alaska I purchased and hunted on a non-resident hunting license.
- I also purchased for my primary residence a house in Anchorage and never lived on Base.
- My primary residence has been continuously in Anchorage since 1973
- I met and married my wife while in Alaska and we have been married 51years.
- After honorable discharge from the Air Force I established a orthopedic surgery practice in Anchorage, which I continued until retirement in 2019 at age 73. During my 45 year career in Anchorage I cared for over 23,000 patients

- My wife and I have raised 4 daughters in Anchorage and all have attended public schools in Anchorage
- Two of those four daughters remain Alaskan residents, one daughter owns a business with offices in Anchorage and Wasilla and employs over 100 individuals, while the other daughter who has remained an Alaskan resident is an airline pilot.
- I am a private pilot with over 10,000 logged hours flying in Alaska.
- Although, certainly not a superstar athlete, I have completed the Mount Marathon Race in Seward 23 times and the Crow Pass Crossing Race 11 times.
- I have **voted** in Alaska as an Alaskan Resident every year for the last 50
- I have a “REAL ID” showing an Alaskan Residence Address.
- I am an avid Alaskan Bowhunter, who has also hunted in all 50 States, always buying a non-resident license in those other 49 states.
- I am one of the longest serving volunteer Bowhunter Education Instructors for ADF&G. My volunteer hours increase the amount of funding, which the State of Alaska receives from the federal government through PR funds.

Now I am 80 years of age. I consider myself an Alaskan Resident and am committed to remain so through the foreseeable future. I believe that I have qualified for and indeed earned and deserve an Alaskan Resident Hunting and Fishing license until such time as I claim residency elsewhere, regardless of how many days I actually spend in Alaska. I may wish to take a 6 month World Cruise, spend time with Grand kids in the lesser 48, play golf or pickleball in Arizona in January or whatever. What I do with my time should be my rights under both the Alaska and the United States Constitutions.

After years of commitment, dedication and residency in Alaska the concept of being required to buy a non-resident license to hunt and fish in this great State is seriously obnoxious to me. I will be required to apply for drawing permits with poorer odds of being drawn; I will need to hire a guide if I wish to hunt sheep, goats or brown/grizzly bear. I will have reduced limits and opportunity to harvest the wildlife resources on which I raised my family.

Everybody must live somewhere. I believe that I am an Alaskan Resident regardless of the exact number of days that I spend in the State. I would agree that as soon as I claim or establish residency in another State that I should no longer enjoy the benefits of Alaskan Residency. But even if I no longer am eligible for a PFD or possibly choose to not apply for one, The burden of proof should be on the State of Alaska that I am no longer a bona fide resident of Alaska by defining what other State of which I am a resident.

If this law is to be passed there should certainly be an amendment for an exclusion allowing continued ability to hold resident hunting, fishing and trapping licenses for individuals (like me) who have a lifelong commitment to Alaska and **who do not claim residency elsewhere**. There is no magic in the number 180 days that is required to qualify

for the PFD. For example, what if I only spend 175 days, physically in Alaska but spend no more than 45 days in any other location and do not seek any of the benefits of residency in any other location?

Thank you for considering my Objections to HB93 as it is currently written.

Sincerely,

John D Frost MD

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Karsten Rodvik [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 16, 2026 1:05 PM
To: Senate Judiciary
Cc: Sen. Matt Claman; Sen. Jesse Kiehl; Sen. Gary Stevens; Sen. Löki Tobin; Sen. Cathy Tilton
Subject: Letter of Opposition to HB 93

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Members of the Alaska State Senate Judiciary Committee,

I write to express my intense opposition to HB 93. I am deeply concerned and frankly shaken by HB 93 and the devastating consequences it would have not only on my lifelong Alaskan son, Karl, and his very family, but on the many other Alaska residents who also stand to have their cherished Resident hunting and fishing rights unconstitutionally stripped from them by this misguided legislation.

Karl is a highly educated, highly skilled Maritime professional working a regular rotational schedule. He not only lives in Alaska, owns property and pays taxes in Alaska, but is a very talented, responsible, dedicated, devoted Alaska outdoorsman who loves his great state, and who hunts and fishes passionately throughout Alaska every year with family and friends, as he has done as an Alaska Resident ALL HIS LIFE.

Karl is an Alaskan through and through since the moment of his birth, and every year his dedicated Alaska Resident hunting and fishing activities play a key role in helping provide his family with the fish and game on which we depend. One simple look at my freezer, or a look at treasured memories of Karl's Resident Alaska hunting and fishing experiences with family, lovingly and proudly displayed on the walls of his boyhood home, clearly illustrate what Karl Rodvik's Alaska Resident hunting and fishing license rights mean to him. HB 93 would destroy all of that - the opportunity for continued pursuit of an entire family's treasured heritage wiped out, obliterated, gone.

Further, there are very serious statutory and constitutional issues with this bill, and extremely harmful consequences that would be inflicted on the many Alaskans who in no way deserve this kind of treatment as their Resident hunting and fishing rights come under such grave attack, and their deeply held concerns are so callously dismissed by some in Juneau and elsewhere.

In closing, it is unthinkable and shocking in the extreme that such a wonderful and loyal Alaskan as my son Karl, along with so many other true Alaskans like him, should be facing this kind of life-altering threat to the precious right that is at the very core of Alaska life.

I respectfully ask that this bill be killed.

Sincerely,
Karsten Rodvik

Two-Minute Testimony – Opposed to HB 93 as Written

Madam Chair and Members of the Committee,

For the record, my name is Michele Stevens, Vice President of the Southcentral Region of the Alaska Outdoor Council. I am here in opposition to HB 93 as currently written.

Alaska's Constitution is clear: fish and wildlife are reserved to the people for common use. Any change to resident hunting, trapping, and sport fishing eligibility should be carefully tailored so that it does not unintentionally exclude lawful Alaska residents.

HB 93 establishes a 180-day physical presence requirement for resident license eligibility. While I understand the intent is to address individuals who claim residency while primarily living elsewhere, this approach risks capturing legitimate residents who maintain Alaska as their true home.

Many Alaskans—particularly seniors, snowbirds, seasonal workers, maritime employees, rotational oilfield workers, and individuals receiving extended medical treatment—may spend significant time out of state but still maintain domicile in Alaska. They own property here, vote here, pay taxes here, and fully intend to remain Alaskans. Under this bill, those individuals could lose eligibility for resident license status based primarily on the number of days they are physically present, even though their legal residency has not changed.

This also raises concerns for permanent license holders who established residency decades ago and relied on that status when purchasing lifetime privileges.

If the concern is fraudulent claims of residency, there are narrower enforcement mechanisms available. A strict 180-day physical presence test risks penalizing lawful residents rather than targeting bad actors.

I respectfully ask the committee to reconsider the 180-day provision and pursue a solution that protects true Alaska residents while addressing legitimate enforcement concerns.

Thank you for your time.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michele Stevens", with a long, sweeping horizontal flourish extending to the right.

[REDACTED]

From: Clif Passmore [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 16, 2026 4:15 PM
To: Senate Judiciary
Subject: HB 93

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Judiciary Committee:

I am writing to express my concerns with the bill that changes residency requirements for hunting and fishing licenses. I agree that the requirements need to be tightened, but the bill as written will be a disaster for those of us whose work takes us Outside.

Using myself as an example, I would not have been a resident for most of the early 2020's because I worked on large government vessels and was rarely on articles, which is a requirement for sailors' absences to be considered allowable. I was not on articles most of the time because we don't sign articles during maintenance periods and other times I was captain, and the captain doesn't sign on articles.

I worked as an Ocean Ranger in 2019 monitoring compliance with Alaskan environmental laws on cruise ships. The State of Alaska ends 3 miles offshore, and when I was more than 3 miles offshore, my absences were not allowable, even though my job protecting the environment in Alaska is what took me there.

My father passed away in Oregon in December of 2024. I retired from sailing in early 2024 and had enough time in Alaska that I was able to visit my family twice in December and not exceed my allowable absences to be eligible for a PFD, but what if I was close to the limit? Would I have to make a decision whether to spend time with my family or not be a resident for a year or more? Why would the legislature consider putting people in this situation?

In 2024 and 2025 I made a handful of 10-day to 2-week trips down to Oregon to see my parents and help them get their house ready for sale. For many people who work remotely, an extra month or 2 Outside will push them past 180 days. Again, why is the legislature considering putting Alaskans that don't live anywhere else in the position of making hard decisions between working or helping their family and being a resident for hunting and fishing purposes?

Much of the time I was working for Transoceanic Cable Ship Company from 2008-2019 I would not have been a resident under the proposed legislation because some of the vessels I worked on were Marshal Island flagged. Even though the Marshal Islands are a US territory and I was sailing on my US License, the PFD folks didn't consider it as being signed on articles of a US merchant vessel. I am not sure the PFD folks got this decision correct, but I wasn't going to fight it for a few thousand dollars. If my hunting and fishing licenses were on the line, I probably would have. How would this have worked when I was waiting for a determination? Would I have been in hunting and fishing limbo waiting for a decision?

When I was working as a marine mammal observer on Shell's arctic exploration project in the late 00's and early teens, much of my time offshore was not considered allowable because I was more than 3 miles offshore or in port in Inuvik. I had at least one year when I only worked a few months as a merchant sailor but my time working as a marine mammal observer pushed me just past 180 days, and once again it was my job protecting Alaskan natural resources that took me Outside.

How many folks know the state ends 3 miles offshore? How many fishermen, ferry passengers, or even aircraft pilots and passengers are accurately tracking when they leave the state? How is this going to be enforced? If the State decides to enforce this with the PFD, if the mistakes are honest, I would only expect dividends to be withheld. If someone hunts or fishes on an invalid license, I don't think ignorance will be an excuse, and boats, planes and even careers will be on the line because of the criminal charges.

Some of my extensive training that took me Outside may have been considered allowable under the proposed legislation, but some of it wouldn't have been, and in order for my training to be exempt, I would have needed approval from the State. Once again, would this put me in hunting and fishing limbo while the state makes a decision?

In the early 00's I did some work as a mate on freighters on the Great Lakes because that was where the work was with my union. This wasn't considered an allowable absence because I wasn't signed on coastwise or foreign articles. Under the proposed residency requirements, I would have only been a resident for a few years out of the last 25, even though my only residence has been in Alaska since 1999.

Several years that I was eligible for a PFD, the state sent letters I was required to respond to within 30 days. I got lucky I was home and was able to respond and eventually prove my eligibility, but what would have happened if I was at sea and a determination was made that I was not eligible? Would the assumption have been made that I was not a resident, putting me in the position of proving that I was? And if I had gone hunting or fishing, would the assumption have been made that I was committing a crime? The folks that sent me the letters didn't seem to have a firm grasp on the requirements and even sent me the same form multiple times. I am not comfortable with having to prove to someone who doesn't understand remote work and requests the same information multiple times that I am a resident. The burden of proof should not be on me.

I have friends in different occupations that would have been in similar situations. My roommate for a while was a federal fisheries observer, and much of his work was more than 3 miles offshore. Another friend is an ag inspector for CBP. His training Outside would had to have been approved by the state, and when he is sent Outside for work, his absences are not allowable. Another friend repairs and installs electric power lines and related equipment. He spent many months in Hawaii repairing damage caused by storms. He was born and raised in Alaska, but if HB 93 passes, will he have to make a choice between dipnetting and helping restore power grids Outside?

Many Alaskans work for companies or agencies that also work Outside. It is a regular occurrence for oil field workers, heavy equipment operators, engineers, biologists and forest fire fighters, just as a few examples that I am familiar with, to be sent temporarily to another location Outside to fill in or put out fires, sometime literally putting out fires. Are these Alaskans going to have to refuse work or quit if their cumulative absences get close to 180 days? Are Alaska-based wildfire fighting crews going to have to quit and go home if they have a big year Outside? They would also have to make tough decisions about when to quit. Work 5 months in case something happens later in the year that takes them Outside, or work close to 6 and hope no emergencies take them out of the state for the rest of the year? The proposed legislation will put a lot of people in bad situations.

Has it been considered to change the requirements to a person maintaining their primary residence in Alaska or exempting all temporary absences due to employment? My guess is that most people who support the bill assume if someone isn't spending 180 days in Alaska every year, they are living somewhere else. This is certainly not the case. A hotel room or a room on a ship is not a residence. I don't want someone who spends 9 months a year in a second residence in Arizona to be considered an Alaska resident, but severely limiting the employment options of Alaskans that do not live anywhere else is not the answer. Creating 2 classes of Alaskans based on our employment is not the answer. And as my examples show, the legislature is only exempting a small fraction of the reasons a person might be Outside but not residing elsewhere.

Thanks for your consideration

Captain John Clifton Passmore MM

Eagle River Alaska

907 360-0212

[REDACTED]

From: joe holden7.com [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2026 5:33 AM
To: Senate Judiciary
Subject: HB93

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Sirs, I respectfully oppose HB 93. You already have strict rules in place regarding residency they simply need to be enforced. If the people on Prince of Wales Island are so concerned about this, they should notify the fish and game with the names of people in question. Those people would then need to provide evidence that they pay utilities, a mortgage or a lease prove that they do not have a benefit from another state such as a homestead exemption, do not receive resident hunting and fishing benefits in another state or have a drivers license in another state. Prove they insure and license their vehicles in the state of Alaska. As you can see the airline pilots the merchant mariners, and the people that work in Antarctica and go outside to care for their families do qualify as residents as they should. I came to Alaska in March of 1974, 52 years ago. I first worked on a crab boat out of Seldovia and since have worked from Gambell to Ketchikan. I have lived in Big Lake, Wasilla, Fairbanks, Delta Junction, Petersburg, and now Wrangell. I am now 77 years of age. I have voted in Alaska for 52 years, now people are attempting to make me a nonresident. My question is, because I am retired and I'm able to travel and spend time in a warmer climate. HB 93 is going to punish me for being a successful Alaskan. Simply because I choose to spend five months of the year in the state instead of the required six months. In closing simply enforce the existing laws don't create new ones and don't disenfranchise a bunch of old long time Alaskans. Joe Holden, Wrangell Alaska, 907 204 8662

House Bill 93

OPPOSE

2/17/26

Dear Senators and Judicial Committee Members,

I got sick after listening to proponents' testimony in yesterday's Judicial hearing on HB 93:

- **I am sick** of hearing about this huge problem that **nobody can quantify, nobody can present any hard fact or evidence to support the anecdotal claims, or even attempt to place a number on the size of the alleged problem.** How convenient. If it's quantified, supporters won't be able to anecdotally exaggerate the issue.
- **I am sick** of no one talking about the adverse impact HB 93 is going to have on the majority of Alaskan residents. Those that have dedicated most of their lives here, those who have built this state, those that pay taxes, own homes, own business, have raised families here, who have supported their communities and continue to be an asset to this State; **But Simply No Longer Qualify for a PFD. Ignore it if you will,** but, if PFD requirements are applied to hunting and fishing it will potentially strip over 100,000 good law-abiding residents of their hunting and fishing privileges and way of life.
- **I am sick** of hearing from outfitter after outfitter, and sport commercial interests after sport commercial interests of an anecdotal residency problem when they only stand to gain from the passage of HB 93. **Alaska's wildlife belongs to all 740,000 residents and not just commercial uses and non-resident users.**
- **I am sick** of hearing about enforcement issues that have nothing to do with HB 93. **Those enforcement issues are about NON-RESIDENTS hunting and fishing as residents.** They are non-residents illegally claiming to be residents when they are not. Those issues are not affected by HB 93 and it will not fix that issue, but enforcing current laws will. HB 93 will only further restrict 230,000 current legal residents who are hunting and fishing legally.
- **I am sick** of hearing about how HB 93 will help the resource when it will have no measurable impact on it, period. At best, it will stop a handful of resident people from hunting and fishing **while allowing 371,000 non-residents to continue hauling fish out of state.**

- **I am sick** of hearing that HB 93 will help Subsistence people when it has absolutely nothing to do with it, it only impacts sport and personal use users. Subsistence is already federally protected; Subsistence already has priority use over **all** other uses.
- **I am sick** of the comparison between the permanent fund, and hunting and fishing residency. **They are not the same, not even in the same ballpark.** Public Trust Wildlife is a resource that is protected by the State Constitution and reserved for all 740,000 Alaska residents. It must be allocated under “Equal Access” and “Common Use” principles. On the other hand, The Permanent Fund was created by the Legislature to convert a Public Trust Resource (oil and gas) into money, that money is no longer a Public Trust Resource, and the State can allocate it as it wishes. To say: If the Permanent Fund requirements are okay for the PFD then their okay for Public Trust Wildlife allocations is **Blatantly False and does not justify HB 93.**
- **And lastly, I am sick** that after 53 years of being a resident and asset to this State I have to spend what little time I have remaining on this planet fighting just to keep my Alaska residency, its benefits, and way of life. **Somebody needs to understand that HB 93 is about to harm a whole lot of good Alaskan residents.**

Sincerely,

Ken Vorisek,
Me Again



From: Sen. Matt Claman
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2026 12:55 PM
To: Senate Judiciary
Subject: FW: House bill 93 referred to the Senate disqualifies solid Alaska residents

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Dana Seagars [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2026 12:28 PM
To: Sen. James Kaufman <Sen.James.Kaufman@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Julie Coulombe <Rep.Julie.Coulombe@akleg.gov>; Rep. Rebecca Himschoot <Rep.Rebecca.Himschoot@akleg.gov>; Rep. Kevin McCabe <Rep.Kevin.McCabe@akleg.gov>; Sen. Matt Claman <Sen.Matt.Claman@akleg.gov>; Sen. Cathy Giessel <Sen.Cathy.Giessel@akleg.gov>; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson <Sen.Elvi.Gray-Jackson@akleg.gov>; Sen. Forrest Dunbar <Sen.Forrest.Dunbar@akleg.gov>; Sen. Scott Kawasaki <Sen.Scott.Kawasaki@akleg.gov>; Sen. Donny Olson <Sen.Donny.Olson@akleg.gov>; Sen. Löki Tobin <Sen.Loki.Tobin@akleg.gov>; Sen. Bill Wielechowski <Sen.Bill.Wielechowski@akleg.gov>; Sen. Jesse Kiehl <Sen.Jesse.Kiehl@akleg.gov>; Sen. Lyman Hoffman <Sen.Lyman.Hoffman@akleg.gov>; Sen. Jesse Bjorkman <Sen.Jesse.Bjorkman@akleg.gov>; info@chitinadipnetters.com
Subject: House bill 93 referred to the Senate disqualifies solid Alaska residents

Senator Kaufman and all:

Now comes HB 93 which threatens our status of residency and the ability to access our State's fish and game resources upon which we partially subsist and depend. That this bill is clearly flawed was shown by Rep McCabe's concerns "that it would disqualify 'solid Alaska residents' from resident harvesting privileges."

I am a 37 yr Alaska resident. I have owned a Hillside home in this great State since shortly after arriving in October 1988. Now 74, I fully retired in 2015. Freed of the restrictions imposed by full employment, my wife and I have been enjoying freedom to pursue lifelong adventures and time with family (now scattered across the country). I'm a dedicated Alaskan who designed and built a beautiful new home on the Hillside in 2016. In the Spring through early Fall, my wife (a certified Alaska Master Gardener) and I grow food and flowers in our backyard, hike, bike, and kayak throughout southcentral, volunteer on GoAK beach clean ups in Prince William Sound, and dipnet on the Kenai for our year's supply of reds. We are grateful to have the health and the means to be able to live our dream of a blessed retirement as Alaska residents.

Retirement has been described to us as having three stages: the go-go years, the slow-go years, and the no-go years. Stage one involves lots of physically demanding activities and travel, stage two more cushy and observational ones, and stage three lots of time of sitting around to enjoy more contemplative times, hopefully within the comforts of our Hillside home.

Being somewhere between stages 1 and 2, we have been traveling the USA and the world as possible. Our three children and two grandchildren have chosen to move out of state, now living in South Carolina and Oregon. We love to travel to their states to spend time while we are able. With investment property in California and Hawaii, we also often travel to work on those properties. And

so beginning with our frequent travels out of state in 2022 we no longer qualified nor claimed the Permanent Fund Dividend. And we have not claimed it since. That doesn't mean we are not still Alaska *residents*. We are both registered AK voters, licensed AK drivers, have vehicles and a small boat licensed in Alaska, and pay our Anchorage property taxes. We are listed as AK residents on our Federal tax returns, and we pay *non-resident* income and property taxes in both HI and CA. There is no question in our minds that we are Alaska residents for now and the future. There is no question that we value ***our right as Alaska residents to subsistence fish for red salmon on the Kenai every year. We should not be penalized for living a fulfilling retirement!***

The language as proposed in HB 93 appears to ***negate the determination of residency as defined in AS§ 01.10.055*** in so far as hunting and fishing are concerned; furthermore, it ***sidesteps the clear process for determining residency*** as outlined in AS§43.23.008 (d) and specifically (e) (1)-(4) et seq.

As Alaska residents we strongly object to the elimination of our rights to hunt or fish in our state of residency. And we furthermore object to the nightmare potential for becoming "Stateless" by virtue of no longer being considered a resident even though we have done nothing to claim any sort of residency in any other state.

These are serious inconsistencies that must be clarified by thorough judicial review and by amendment. This is a seriously flawed bill and must be defeated in the Senate unless it is amended substantially. We strongly recommend that no further action should be taken on this bill until both of these steps are taken.

One alternative would be to amend the bill to provide an exception to HB93 (Sec. 2. (a)(3)) that **will allow** for those seniors who have demonstrated loyalty to State residency by (1) a documented residency of 10 years or longer (via voter registration or driver's license records) and/or by (2) holding a Senior (over 60) permanent fishing or hunting license and/or who hold a Senior (over 65) property tax exemption.

As a 37 year resident of this great state, I urge you in the strongest terms of collaboration and bi-partisanship to consider alternative ways to avoid disenfranchising the rights of all Alaska retirees to fish and hunt in the golden years of our retirement. ***To do so will only hasten the departure of many seniors from this State.***

We're retired Alaskans who like to travel & who love living here – should that eliminate our right to dipnet or hunt?

Thank you for your time and consideration of this request. Please feel free to reach out to us to discuss these concerns and to possibly brainstorm avenues to resolve this serious issue.

Sincerely,

Dana J Seagars and Claudette Yesmant

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Sen. Matt Claman
Sent: Friday, February 27, 2026 8:16 AM
To: Senate Judiciary
Subject: FW: HB 93

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: daniel sherwood [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 27, 2026 2:02 AM
To: Sen. Matt Claman <Sen.Matt.Claman@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 93

Senator Claman,

I am writing in concern of HB 93. I am not certain what the answer is to the problem but this would exclude me from alot of residency opportunities that I feel I am entitled to. I am abnormal in that I work in Oil and Gas. My wife and son live in ER and do not often leave the state but work unfortunately does take me out of the state alot. I am sure this will effect numerous oilfield employees and pilots if they answer truthfully. I have sacrificed the pdf for years and answered truthfully but this really excludes me in particular. If you remove my ability to hunt and fish as an Alaskan suddenly the appeal of being Alaskan is not there. I would also bring to light the remainder of my family could still purchase in state licenses and participate in subsistence personal use activities but I legally cannot. I know this is abused and I am an absolute firm believer in reducing the opportunities of non resident hunters for years and have been a member of RHAK since it's inception. I know you can't make a law for one person but at least provide a means of appeal or a board to prove you are indeed Alaskan. There has to be some middle ground on this otherwise numerous people will be put in compromising position to just lie or consider their career options.

Regards

Daniel Sherwood

Sent from my iPhone

Breanna Kakaruk

From: Sen. Matt Claman
Sent: Friday, February 27, 2026 8:11 AM
To: Senate Judiciary
Subject: FW: Concerning HB 93

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

-----Original Message-----

From: Paul and Victoria Bach <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, February 27, 2026 7:03 AM
To: Sen. Matt Claman <Sen.Matt.Claman@akleg.gov>
Subject: Concerning HB 93

Greetings Senator Claman,

I hope this letter finds you well. I appreciate your work I'm helping keep Alaska free, prosperous, and the wonderful place it is to call home.

My name is Paul Bach. I'm hoping to encourage you to oppose or change HB 93, the bill currently being considered to change the residency requirements for purposes of hunting and fishing licenses.

I am in agreement that something needs to be done. People who live out of state and fraudulently claim to be residence to take advantage of cheaper licenses as well as the lessened restrictions available to residence only.

My concern is it takes away rights and privileges connected with being an Alaska resident from regular folks like me who are legitimate residence of Alaska.

I've been an Alaskan resident for 20 years. I've grown up here and have lived here since I was 15 years old. I own property and a small home in Hyder Alaska where I grew up and that is my only home. My wife and I built this home ourselves and so enjoy the time we are same to live here. Due to financial considerations and my work obligations, I am only able to spend a few months out of the year Hyder. I am a pilot and work for a non profit Christian ministry. This work keeps me and my family traveling for much of the year, much of that time spent in remote parts of Canada working in needy and underprivileged towns and villages. We travel in an RV but Alaska is home, our only home. We have no residency rights or claims anywhere else. And I don't make a lot of money, and so often am not able to hunt or fish where I am traveling due to the expense and restrictions on non residents. But I sure appreciate when I am back in Hyder being able to procure food for my family in a legal and cost effective manner. My wife and children are also all Alaska residence and we so appreciate the opportunity to enjoy the outdoors together, in a way that is cost effective and affordable.

This bill threatens to take away from us one of the wonderful privileges of being a resident in this great state. If I can't claim to be a resident of Alaska, then I have no residency. What other rights or privileges might be denied to me in the future because of the precedent of this bill?

I kindly ask you to work to oppose or modify this bill in a way that would guarantee and protect the rights and privileges of all Alaskans, not just the ones that can offered to stay full time in this great state.

Thanks so much for your consideration!

Sincerely,
Paul Bach
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Gary Hollier [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 14, 2026 8:11 AM
To: Senate Judiciary
Cc: Sen. Jesse Bjorkman; Sen. Lyman Hoffman; Sen. Mike Cronk; Sen. Kelly Merrick; Sen. Donny Olson; Sen. Forrest Dunbar; Sen. Matt Claman; Sen. Bert Stedman; Sen. Robert Myers; Sen. Robert Yundt; Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson; Sen. Cathy Giessel; Sen. Löki Tobin; senator.bill.wieiechowski@akleg.gov; Sen. Jesse Kiehl
Subject: Re: HB 93 - updated Gary hollier comments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 14, 2026, at 9:57 AM, Gary Hollier [REDACTED] wrote:

Chair and members of the committee,

My name is Gary Hollier. I am 72 years old and a lifelong Alaskan.

I appreciate the intent behind HB 93, but I respectfully ask you to reconsider tying resident hunting and fishing eligibility to Permanent Fund Dividend standards.

I was born and raised in Alaska. I worked my entire career here, raised my family here, and I vote here. Alaska is my permanent home. Like many seniors, I spend part of the winter in Arizona for health and climate reasons, but I do not claim residency or benefits anywhere else.

Under current law — Alaska Statute 16.05.415 — residency for hunting and fishing is based on domicile and intent to remain, not simply the number of days absent. The Permanent Fund Dividend statute — Alaska Statute 43.23 — was designed for dividend eligibility, not to define constitutional access to natural resources.

Article VIII of the Alaska Constitution guarantees common use and sustained yield of our fish and wildlife for the people of Alaska. That constitutional framework has guided resource management since statehood.

HB 93 would effectively use the 180-day PFD rule to redefine who counts as a resident for purposes of hunting and fishing. I respectfully suggest that this is a significant policy shift that deserves careful consideration.

This change would impact seniors, retirees, military families, and others who maintain Alaska as their home but spend part of the year outside. These individuals remain committed Alaskans. They vote here, pay taxes here, and return here.

If the goal of this bill is fairness or clarity, I would encourage the committee to consider alternatives that protect long-term residents without unintentionally narrowing access in a way that could conflict with the spirit of Article VIII.

I respectfully ask that you either remove the PFD linkage from this bill or provide clear protections for lifelong residents who maintain Alaska as their domicile.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Gary Hollier
Kenai, Ak

[REDACTED]

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

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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



[REDACTED]

From: mark keller [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 12:21 PM
To: Senate Judiciary
Subject: To Whom It May Concern,

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Mark Keller. I have been a resident of Alaska since 2008. During this time, I have been a resident in the Anchorage Community. I have maintained a home in Anchorage (my only home) for the entirety of this time. For many years, I practiced as a pediatric dentist in Alaska. I served by helping many children throughout the state. As an Alaskan resident, I have enjoyed many of the great things Alaska has to offer. I enjoy hunting and fishing. As a retired person, I rely on game meat as a healthy staple in my diet. I am writing this letter in opposition to Alaska Bill HB93, which would change the residency requirements for hunting, trapping, and fishing privileges. It's reported that these changes would likely mirror the current requirements for the Permanent Dividend Fund. If this bill becomes law, it will take away my rights as a resident. Let me explain: currently, I must provide care for my aging parents who live in Minnesota. I am a durable power of attorney for my father, and I must care for him as needed. It is not possible for my father to move to Alaska. His condition will not allow it, and Alaska does not offer the interdisciplinary, specialty, and expert medical care he requires. As a result, I may for a time need to be absent from Alaska more than the proposed HB93 requirement of 180 days. I believe that the current version of HB93 should be either rejected or revised. I would at the very least recommend that Alaska allow a meritorious exemption process for residents with special circumstances. This exemption should allow residents with special circumstances to be exempt from the 180-day requirement that has been set forth in HB93. This exemption already exists for members of the military, individuals serving as member of the United States Congress and their staff, employees of the state in a field office or other location, individuals serving as a volunteer of the federal Peace Corps program, and individuals training or competing as a member of the United States Olympic Team.

I've been in contact with the Alaska Permanent Divided Fund Office. There is no meritorious exemption that allows a resident to be absent from Alaska more than 180 days while providing care for an elderly parent that resides out of state.

I would add that there's a large number of individuals that move to Alaska from the lower 48 with family members that reside out of state. This bill has the potential to affect many Alaska residents in a negative and unintended way.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this important matter. Please feel free to call me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Mark Keller



Sent from my iPad

Opposition to House Bill 93

February 16, 2026

Dear Members of the Alaska State Senate Judiciary Committee,

I am writing to respectfully express my strong opposition to House Bill 93, which would tie eligibility for Alaska resident hunting and fishing licenses to Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD) residency standards.

While I am currently a nonresident, this legislation would directly and negatively impact my family — specifically my brother, who is a lifelong Alaska resident and a merchant mariner. Due to his rotational work schedule, he would likely be treated as a nonresident under this bill despite being an Alaska resident under current state law.

I was born and raised in Alaska and lived in the state for 31 years before recently moving out of state. Alaska remains deeply important to me, and my family, history, and traditions are rooted there.

Under current regulations, as a nonresident I am still able to hunt certain Alaska species with my resident brother. House Bill 93 would effectively remove that opportunity by reclassifying him as a nonresident due to PFD eligibility rules tied to allowable absences. If that occurs, I would lose the ability to hunt with my own brother for species that currently require a resident relative or guide structure for nonresident hunters, including brown bear, Dall sheep, and mountain goat.

Last year, I was fortunate enough to draw a highly coveted caribou tag in the Alaska Range. This specific tag allocation allowed nonresidents to hunt the herd when accompanied by an Alaska resident family member. If House Bill 93 had been in place last year, I would not have been able to participate in what became a once-in-a-lifetime hunt.

I was successful on that hunt and harvested a beautiful bull caribou alongside my brother. It was one of the most meaningful and memorable experiences of our lives. House Bill 93 threatens these types of deeply cherished activities and risks uprooting family hunting traditions that in many Alaska families go back generations.

My brother works in the maritime industry on a rotational schedule that keeps him physically outside Alaska for extended periods each year. Like many maritime professionals, oil and gas rotational workers, and other Alaska-based professionals whose work takes them outside the state, he may not qualify for a PFD under the restrictive allowable absence rules in AS 43.23.008. However, that does not change the reality that Alaska is his home, where he maintains property, family ties, financial investment, and long-term residency intent.

HB 93 would take an already restrictive PFD eligibility framework — one never designed to determine natural resource access — and use it to deny lawful Alaska residents access to resident hunting, fishing, and trapping licenses.

Beyond the personal impacts, this bill raises serious constitutional concerns. The Alaska Constitution requires that natural resources be managed for the maximum benefit of the people and under principles of common use and equal access. Conditioning access to fish and wildlife resources on PFD eligibility risks creating an artificial classification system that could undermine these constitutional protections.

The Alaska Constitution does not condition access to fish and wildlife on dividend eligibility, nor should it. Tying these two systems together risks excluding legitimate Alaska residents based on employment structure rather than true residency or connection to the state.

This bill would disproportionately impact maritime workers, rotational oil and gas employees, seasonal infrastructure workers, military support contractors, and others whose careers require extended absences but whose lives and identities remain rooted in Alaska.

I understand the policy goals behind HB 93. However, I strongly urge you to oppose the bill as written or pursue amendments that explicitly protect resident Alaskans whose employment requires extended time outside the state, including merchant mariners and rotational workers.

In reality, a more appropriate policy discussion would involve modernizing PFD allowable absence statutes to reflect the realities of Alaska's workforce, rather than using PFD eligibility as a gatekeeper for constitutional natural resource access.

Thank you for your time, your service to Alaska, and your consideration of how this legislation would impact real Alaska families.

Respectfully,

Hans Rodvik

Eaton, CO

██████████

████████████████████