



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

May 11, 2026

To: Senate Resources Committee

Re: HB 93 – Residency requirement for hunt/fish/trap license (*Oppose as Written*)

Dear Chair Giessel, Vice Chair Wielechowski, and members of the Resources 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.

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 as this bill moved through the House but did not pass. However, some of those proposed amendments, like the one (HB 295) to exempt airline pilots and flight crew from this new residency requirement as it pertains to a hunt/fish/trap license, are now separate legislation that would modify the PFD eligibility requirements. And it looks like more bills may be in the works for other exemptions. This is what worried us initially about this bill, that it would have negative effects on some Alaskans who really live here but don't comply with the PFD eligibility requirements.

So, we find ourselves in a catch-22. We certainly 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 way of defining who is and isn't a resident of the state as it pertains to a hunt/fish/trap license that won't disenfranchise so many and lead to a slew of separate legislation to modify the PFD eligibility requirements.

Sincerely,

Mark Richards

Executive Director Resident Hunters of Alaska (RHAK)

From: [Bret Bradford](#)
To: [Senate Resources](#)
Subject: Do not approve HB93
Date: Sunday, May 10, 2026 6:46:39 PM

Dear members of the Senate Resources Committee,
I am writing to you to urge you NOT to pass HB93. Aside from being unconstitutional, this bill does nothing good for the citizens of the state of Alaska. It penalizes residents hunting and fishing rights who for various reasons are unable to meet the same residency requirements as the PFD. The residency requirements for hunting and fishing licenses should remain as they are currently.

HB93 Testimony - this legislation violates state and federal laws

1. Article 8, Section 3 of the Alaska Constitution states “Whenever occurring in their natural state, fish, wildlife, and waters are reserved to the people for common use.”
2. Article 8, Section 17 of the Alaska Constitution states “Laws and regulations governing the use or disposal of natural resources shall apply equally to all persons similarly situated”. This means all residents shall have equal laws and regulations applied equally for fish and game purposes, not just residents that meet criteria for PFD eligibility.
3. Alaska’s Common Use Doctrine is a key legal principal that clearly applies and the courts have upheld that “Fish and wildlife belong to all Alaskans collectively.”
4. Residency is defined in AS 01.10.055 and in particular I quote sub paragraph (c): A person who establishes residency in the state remains a resident during an absence from the state unless during the absence the person establishes or claims residency in another state, territory, or country, or is absent under circumstances that are inconsistent with the intent required under (a) of this section to remain a resident of this state. The law does not establish time limits for absences. Further section (a) of this statute states “A person establishes residency in the state by being physically present in the state with the intent to remain in the state indefinitely and to make a home in the state.”
5. HB93 is discriminatory and is trying to illegally create 2 classes of residents. HB93 as written violates AS 01.10.055 Residency, Article 8 of the Alaska Constitution, and the Equal Protection Clause of the US Constitution’s 14th Amendment. (The Equal Protection Clause requires equal treatment of all residents.)
6. To summarize, HB93 should not be allowed to proceed to a vote of the Alaska Senate as it violates state law, the Alaska Constitution, and the US Constitution.

Bret Bradford
111 Williwaw Way
Cordova, Alaska

Sent from my iPad

From: [Gary Hollier](#)
To: [Senate Resources](#)
Cc: [Sen. Jesse Bjorkman](#); [Sen. Bert Stedman](#); [Sen. Donny Olson](#); [Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson](#); [Sen. Jesse Kiehl](#); [Sen. Löki Tobin](#); [Sen. Lyman Hoffman](#); [Sen. Mike Cronk](#); [Sen. Robert Yundt](#); [Sen. Cathy Giessel](#); senator.bill.wieiechowski@akleg.gov; [Sen. Forrest Dunbar](#); [Sen. Robert Myers](#); [Senate Finance Committee](#); [Senate Judiciary](#)
Subject: Opposition to HB 93
Date: Sunday, May 10, 2026 8:40:53 AM

>

> Dear Chair Giessel and Members of the Senate Resources Committee, and esteemed Senators

My name is Gary Hollier, I am a 72-year-old lifelong resident. I was born in Seward and raised in Kenai. I have received every PFD since the inception of the program. I am deeply concerned about HB 93 and the proposal to strip resident hunting, fishing, and trapping privileges from Alaskans who are outside the State for more than 180 days.

This bill unfairly targets older Alaskans like me who have spent a lifetime building Alaska, paying taxes, voting, raising families, and contributing to our communities. Many Seniors spend longer periods outside Alaska for medical care, to visit family, or simply to escape harsh winter conditions. That does not mean that Alaska is no longer my home.

The Permanent Fund Dividend Division already has strict residency requirements. They examine whether a person maintains Alaska as their true and permanent home through driver's licenses, voter registration, property ownership, vehicle registration, and ask questions if an individual gets any benefits from another State. Residency is already carefully defined. A simple day count does not tell the full story of where someone's real home is.

HB 93 would create a second class of Alaskans - particularly retirees and senior citizens - by punishing people for their age and lifestyle, despite maintaining every other legal tie to Alaska. Younger working Alaskans may be able to stay year - round because of employment, while retirees have more flexing. That flexibility should not cost them rights they have earned through decades of residency.

Alaska has always valued independence and individual circumstances. This bill ignores those values and replaces them with an arbitrary number. A lifelong Alaskan should not lose resident privileges simply because they spend more time, caring for their health, their grandchildren, or their quality of life outside Alaska during part of the year.

As per the PFD application: I have an Alaskan Drivers License, my vehicles are registered in Alaska, I vote in Alaska, my business and two corporations are in Alaska, my principal home is in Alaska. I AM a resident of Alaska. I still hunt on my families homestead (granted in 1948), as an Alaskan resident.

I have never, nor will I ever sport fish or hunt in another State.

I get ZERO benefits from another State, but under HB 93 I lose valuable benefits from the State of Alaska, that I have had since Statehood.

If HB 93 passes, I ask members of the Alaska State Senate, if you or your parents, were affected by HB 93, do you think this is a good bill?

I urge you to oppose HB 93 to protect the rights of all Alaskans, including seniors who still proudly call Alaska home.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary L. Hollier
Kenai, Ak.

From: [Rep. Rebecca Himschoot](#)
To: [Senate Resources](#)
Subject: FW: HB 93
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2026 1:35:28 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Senate Resources Committee Members,
Thank you for hearing HB 93 on residency for fishing and hunting yesterday afternoon. Due to the poor quality phone line we asked Paul Johnson to submit his invited testimony by email, which is forwarded here.
I am grateful for your time and consideration.
Rebecca

Representative Rebecca Himschoot
Alaska House of Representatives
House District 2
907-465-3732



[Sign up for my newsletter - Southeast Swell](#)

From: Paul Johnson <gull.cove@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 5:20 PM
To: Rep. Rebecca Himschoot <Rep.Rebecca.Himschoot@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 93

Chair and members of the committee,

My name is Paul Johnson. I was born in Juneau when Alaska was still a territory, and I have spent my life connected to Alaska's fish and game resources. I raised my family in Alaska, and my children still live in Juneau today. Hunting and fishing helped sustain my young family when my children were growing up, and those same resources continue to support my grown children today.

I have lived most of my life in Southeast Alaska, though I also attended the University of Alaska Fairbanks and spent time living in the Interior in fact sit on a Fairbanks Foundation. Throughout my life,

I have remained deeply involved in Alaska fish and wildlife management issues. I have participated in both Board of Fish and Board of Game processes, chaired the Big Game Commercial Services Board, participated in workgroups responsible for developing wildlife management plans, and worked through complex state and federal fish and wildlife management systems. I have seen firsthand how important Alaska's resident priority is, and how difficult it can be to protect without clear standards.

HB 93 is long overdue.

This bill addresses a statewide issue that has steadily grown over the years. Alaska has seen increased utilization of resident-only personal use fisheries, increased demand for resident-only subsistence hunting opportunities, and rapidly increasing values associated with Alaska's fish and game resources. Alongside that growth, stories of abuse of residency requirements have also increased, particularly within fisheries.

Alaska's fish and game resources have always been valuable and important to the people who live here. Since statehood, the Legislature has consistently worked to prioritize residents' access to those resources. It simply does not make sense that Alaska still lacks a clear and enforceable residency standard tied to hunting and fishing privileges.

I have also seen the realities of chronic fish and game enforcement shortages throughout my lifetime. Enforcement officers already face significant challenges across a massive state with limited manpower. Creating a clear residency standard would help ease enforcement burdens and improve consistency statewide. I have participated in many difficult discussions over the years about how

to close loopholes that allow abuse and exploitation of Alaska's fish and game resources, and one thing has always been clear: enforceability depends on having a straightforward and understandable standard.

HB 93 is also well thought out.

Resident-only hunting and fishing opportunities are especially important for poorer Alaskans and rural residents who rely heavily on these resources. Since statehood, Alaska's management system has prioritized residents, while nonresident license and tag fees have helped fund management programs that ultimately benefit Alaska residents. That balance has worked because the resident preference has remained meaningful.

The residency standards used for the Permanent Fund Dividend are among the most thoroughly developed and legally robust residency standards anywhere in Alaska law. Using that framework for hunting and fishing residency makes sense. Under current law, a person can maintain hunting and fishing residency without physically setting foot in Alaska for even a single day each year. Most Alaskans would agree that this does not reflect what it means to truly live here.

Being a resident of Alaska should require a person to be physically present in the state for some period of time every year. Resident hunting and fishing privileges are worth far more in practical dollar value than a Permanent Fund Dividend check. Setting a clear standard for hunting and fishing residency is consistent with the long-held views many Alaskans have about access to fish and game resources and about protecting those resources for the people who truly live here.

Thank you for your consideration of HB 93.

My best,

Paul Johnson

From: [mark.keller](#)
To: [Senate Resources](#)
Subject: HB93
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 2:28:23 PM

To Senate Resource Committee,

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
(907) 306-5200
Mkelleralaska@gmail.com
Sent from my iPad

From: [Rod Arno](#)
To: [Senate Resources](#)
Cc: [AOC Board](#)
Subject: HB93 opposition
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 11:38:20 AM

Chair Giessel and Senate Resource Committee,

I've never asked the sponsor of House Bill 93 why she didn't just ask state wildlife enforcement what changes they would need to AS 16.05.940 (28) "resident" means (A through E) to address this user conflict as opposed to tying it into state qualifications for residents to acquire PFD funds.

The Alaska Outdoor Council does not support HB93 as the solution to user conflicts among licensed anglers and hunters.

Appreciate your consideration,
Rod Arno
Public Policy Director
Alaska Outdoor Council

Sent from Rod Arno's iPhone.

From: [Sen. Cathy Giessel](#)
To: [Senate Resources](#)
Subject: FW: HB93
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 10:34:16 AM

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

From: GCI <sbradford@gei.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 9:23 AM
To: 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: HB93

In today's hearing on HB93, it would be good to get some actual data from the proponents vs. how many long-term snowbird seniors are going to be adversely impacted by this legislation. There were about 100,000 residents who didn't apply for the PFD last year, how many of them are going to be adversely impacted?

Steve Bradford - 51 year resident, property owner, retiree, and snowbird.

Sent from Steve's iPhone

From: [Sen. Cathy Giessel](#)
To: [Senate Resources](#)
Subject: FW: Hb 93
Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 10:15:49 AM

From: Matt Snyder <akhunting@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 3:37 AM
To: Sen. Cathy Giessel <Sen.Cathy.Giessel@akleg.gov>
Subject: Hb 93

Dear Senator Cathy Giessel,

I support House Bill 93. It is unfortunate that people who don't live in Alaska year around can take advantage of having a resident hunting and fishing license and qualify subsistence seasons and bag limits. The residents that live here and spend money here year around should come 1st. Some my thoughts for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Matt Snyder

From: [Sean O'Brien](#)
To: [Senate Resources](#)
Cc: [Rep. Andi Story](#)
Subject: HB 93
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2026 10:17:09 PM

Dear Senate Resources Committee,

I along with many other life-long senior Ak residents, strongly feel this bill should be voted down as written. We feel the 180 day requirement that would result is excessive and disregards our current and life long contributions as senior citizens to this state. Most, like my wife and I, still pay significant property and sales taxes now and have throughout our lives. We've worked hard and contributed a lot to our Alaskan community over many decades and deserve the current level of access to our Alaska hunting and fishing licenses. We currently maintain our primary Alaskan residence and home and have our entire lives including raising 5 children here in Juneau. We've dedicated our entire professional careers and countless community hours to our Alaskan community including 9 years on the Juneau School Board. Our hope is that level of appreciation and respect is translated to defeating this bill and honoring so many of us who have earned a more open and just criteria as is currently written rather than the severe restrictions currently proposed to limit that access. For approximately 8 years, we've owned a second home and snow-bird in Arizona for about 7 months while spending the balance in Juneau. We willingly gave up our PFD's but are very much opposed to giving up our hunting and fishing licenses as well. I hope you agree that is an excessive penalty for many of us who've given so much to this state.

Thanks!
Sean OBrien
Susan Reishus-OBrien
9332 Stephen Richards Dr.
Juneau Ak 99801