

Letter(s) of Support

Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 9:55 AM

To: House Fisheries <HouseFisheries@akleg.gov>; Rep. Rebecca Himschoot
<Rep.Rebecca.Himschoot@akleg.gov>

Subject: Public Testimony HB 93

To House Fisheries Committee Chair Representative Stutes, Vice Chair Edgmon and Committee members,

Thank you for this opportunity to testify on HB93. I urge you to support this bill as presented. I am a 47+ year resident of the state and a person who values highly our fisheries and game resources. I have seen my share of people who have “stretched” the definition of resident for the purpose of harvesting as much as they can in season and then leaving Alaska in order to fill their freezers in the Lower 48.

With the pressures on our resources and the importance of food security for Alaska residents who have truly made this their home, this bill is needed without delay.

Please do support its passage out of committee and on the House Floor.

Thank you for your work and crafting this bill.

Sincerely,
Mary Corcoran
Delta Junction
Ellamar

Letter(s) of Opposition

Dear Madame Chair and Members of the House Fisheries Committee,

My name is Gary Hollier. I testified Tuesday at your committee in opposition to HB 93.

I am not a real good speaker, so would like to put my thoughts in an email.

I am a 71 year life long Alaskan resident. I was born in Seward and live in Kenai permanently.

My Father came to Alaska in 1938 and my Mother in 1945.

My parent homesteaded in 1949, in Kenai.

My Father slipped on the ice at the age of 71. He broke his hip and elbow. He passed away 6 weeks later from complications from the fall.

I have hunted on the homestead, most of my life. The homestead is close to the Kenai River, where I spent considerable time sport fishing.

I have had an Alaskan Drivers license, since 1969.

I have only voted in Alaska. My mail is in Alaska. My primary residence is in Alaska. My business is in Alaska. I file taxes in Alaska. My vehicles, boats, etc are all registered in Alaska. I intend to be an Alaskan resident till I die

I have received all my PFD's.

I get get NO benefits from another State or country.

In in the future, If I would like to spend more time, in a warmer climate, so I would not follow my Father's foot steps, fall on the ice and then pass away 6 weeks later, I would like to be able to do that.

Under HB 93, if I was gone from the State of Alaska 25 or 176 days, I could retain my resident hunting and sport fish license.

If I was absent for 187 days, I would still be a resident of Alaska, but would not be eligible for a resident hunting and sport fishing license. I believe this is wrong. I would get ZERO benefits from another State in the Union.

If I was absent for more than 180 days, would not qualify for the PFD, but I shouldn't lose

my resident hunting and fishing license.

Where does legislation like this stop?

If you don't qualify for the PFD, you have to turn in your Alaskan Drivers license, you can't vote in Alaska.....

I am being facetious.

Where should I be able to hunt and fish as a resident?

Listening to the Committee on Tuesday, it seems that this is mostly a SE Alaska issue. Representative Vance stated, in her district, that this is not a real big issue.

I can't believe that many individuals are jumping thru all the hoops needed to qualify to be an Alaskan resident to fish grayling in the Tanana River.

Yet I don't think that an Elder or Senior Citizen should be denied resident hunting and fishing rights, that they have been entitled to for decades, for not qualifying for the PFD, as long as they don't get a benefit from another State.

If they did get a benefit, I. E. primary residence, drivers license, vote, resident hunting and fishing license, etc, then under Alaskan statue they would not be an Alaskan resident. Therefore not be eligible for resident hunting and fishing rights.

Individuals will always try to "game" the system, I don't see how HB 93 really helps enforcement.

There is a provision in the PFD statue called the Five Year Rule. It states something to the effect that if an individual is gone for more than 180 days each of the five preceding years, that individual would be presumed not to be a Resident.

It would appear that this ruling, would be the equivalent to what HB 93 is trying to do.

Alaska has been very good to me, my children, and grandchildren, who are all life long Alaskan residents.

Please to don't pass HB 93.

Thank you for your time and commitment to serve in the Alaskan legislature

Gary L Hollier
Kenai, Ak