

Subject: SB 105 / Legislation Allowing Alaskans to Build Recreational Cabin Sites

We already have a land office / land sale program.

[Alaska State Land Sales - Alaska](#)
[Division of Mining, Land, and Water](#)
dnr.alaska.gov



Over The Counter Purchase and Land Auction.

I meant to attach to my email last night.

Once again it appears to me that those responsible for SB 105 are interested in shredding conservation lands in Alaska.

Doug Hill

437 S Gulkana Street

Palmer, Alaska

kamishak [2014@gmail.com](mailto:kamishak2014@gmail.com)

Subject: SB105

Dear Senator Giessel,

I am writing objection to SB105. Alaska's wild places, critical habitat for birds and wildlife must be preserved. What makes Alaska such a special place is our wild lands and the creatures that depend upon them. Please preserve these wild places in perpetuity for all to enjoy and vote no on SB 105.

Respectfully,

Mary Ellen DeGange

Chugiak, Alaska

Sent from my iPhone

Subject: SB 105A

I oppose SB105A, disposal of public lands, particularly lands within designated parks, refuges, and other areas set aside for specific purposes. These are public lands for public enjoyment and the benefit of the environment. Furthermore, the cost of administering such a program outstrips any new revenue it might generate.

Thanks for your consideration.

Mel Langdon

Rogers Park

Anchorage

Subject: SB 105 Governor Introduces Legislation Allowing Alaskans to Build Recreational Cabin Sites

Senators,

I am sending an emphatic “No”! to Governor Dunleavy’s SB 105 (Legislation Allowing Alaskans to Build Recreational Cabin Sites).

Pease do not even consider placing existing conservation public lands (parks, refuge areas, critical habitat areas, state sanctuaries, preserves, special use areas, marine parks, etc.) into private hands.

I hardly know where to start. I retired as an ADFG refuge manager out of the Palmer office. As time passed more and more manager job was consumed by removing litter from the refuge areas.

The number of issues that such a cabin site program would create is very large. State Land Management programs are already understaffed.

Cabins at McNeil River? I was the onsite manger there for 4 years. Marine Parks? Selling parcels in KBay State Park? Selling parcels on Kasugi Ridge? Selling parcels I heavily visited Hatcher Pass? Blocking historic access? It appears to me that whoever drafted the bill just wants to get rid of conservation areas.

More land as anadromous streams trashed by ORV traffic?

People live here and visit here because of our public lands. Covid increased the use of public lands dramatically.

Public lands are open to everyone. I regularly hunt, fish, pick berries, mushrooms, hike, bike, paddle, ... on public lands.

Pease put this bill in the trash heap.

Thank you,

Doug Hill
437 S Gulkana Street
Palmer, AK
kamishak2024@gmail.com

Subject: Oppose SB105

Senator Giessel

Chair, Senate Resources Committee

I am writing to ask for your strong opposition to SB105. The bill would allow remote cabin sites in state parks, critical habitat areas, game sanctuaries, and other special use and protected areas.

That is outrageous. The legislature, after extensive public processes, established these state lands as protected areas to ensure that will remain special for all Alaskans in the future. Opening them to private ownership by a privileged few ignores the importance of these areas for ALL Alaskans and for the special public resources they protect. It tramples the work that the public, the agencies, and yes, the legislature, have put in over many years to establish these areas.

DO NOT move this bill out of the Senate Resources Committee.

Thank you,

Marty Freeman

Anchorage, Alaska

Subject: SB 105

As a member of the Senate Resources Committee, I am writing to you to voice my opposition to the lease/sale of remote cabin parcels within State Parks and Recreation Sites. These areas are set aside for all Alaskans' enjoyment, not for the few that can afford to purchase such parcels.

My concern is real estate people grabbing hold of prized acreage or 'outside' recreation developers taking advantage of such parcels. There are many situations that could occur that could impact the public's enjoyment of these areas.

I'd rather see any money allocated to administer the sale of such parcels spent on maintaining and enhancing existing facilities (public use cabins, trails, outhouse facilities).

Thank you,

Bev Lewanski

Sent from my iPhone

Subject: SB 105

Hello Senator and thank you for your newsletters and work in the session.

I am writing concerning second 8d of SB 105 that offers 10 acre cabin sites:

" (d) All dispositions and uses under (a) of this section of lands that are part of a state

park, state forest, state game refuge, state wildlife refuge, state game sanctuary, state

recreational area, state recreational river, state wilderness park, state marine park, state special

management area, state public use area, critical habitat area, bald eagle preserve, bison range,

or moose range are confirmed and ratified."

I do not support this portion of the bill and would like it removed. Refuges, wilderness parks, and preserves lose the vary qualities being protected if personal use cabins and land are put in them.

Other sections of the bill defining the processes for acquiring leases or sales sound onerous and make me concerned that process for acquiring land is biased towards more wealthy Alaskans that have the resources, time, and access to track lands being made available and put in offers for them.

Thank you for considering these concerns.

Amy Holman

Subject: NO on SB 105

Dear Sen. Giessel,

I understand that our dear governor would like to open all of Alaska's parks, critical habitat areas, game sanctuaries and other special use or protected areas for lease or sale for 10-acre remote cabin sites.

I oppose this harebrained idea. The very idea of selling off protected public lands to the highest bidder makes me feel ill. That we have a governor who would do this makes me want to weep.

Thank you for being a voice of sanity during these crazy times.

Beth Adams

Subject: SB105

Hearing about this bill, I find myself very disappointed on every part of this bill. Protected state lands are for all people to visit along with managing wildlife. There is no reason to start homesteads on these lands. The state of Alaska (state land) not currently designated as in this bill, has plenty of land for 10 acre remote parcels.

Please don't vote for this bill.

Thank you,

Steve Johnson

Sent from my iPhone

Subject: Oppose SB 105!

Dear Senate Resources Committee,

I understand that you will be discussing and voting on SB105 tomorrow. I am totally opposed to leasing or selling 10 acre parcels to the public on state park lands, critical habitat areas, wildlife refuges, preserves, ranges, etc.

These are very special designated lands that are set aside for wildlife and recreation. We already have way too many conflicts with individual owners in these lands and this will create more management problems, lawsuits and issues. I hope you will be forward thinking about the complications of this bill vs the monetary benefits. It is totally NOT WORTH the headaches and degradation of these specially designated areas. As time marches on, these lands will become even more valuable and the cost to litigate to get them back or to mitigate damage from selling and or leasing these lands is immeasurable.

Do what's right for our premier resources and do not support this irresponsible bill.

I would like to hear back from you on your position regarding this bill.

Respectfully,

Barbara Johnson

Subject: SB 105A, Senate Resources

Dear Madam Chair and committee members,

I and many others have grave concerns about SB 105A, "An Act relating to the lease and sale of state land for recreational cabin sites; and providing for an effective date." It would, from what I understand in Section 8.2.d, potentially render all of OUR state parks, state forests, state game refuges, state wildlife refuges, state game sanctuaries, state recreational areas, state recreational rivers, state wilderness parks, state marine parks, state special management areas, state public use areas, critical habitat areas, bald eagle preserves, bison ranges, and/or moose range lands open for cabin site lease or purchase.

This is a BAD idea as all these "special areas" were only established AFTER careful research and thought by those who are experienced with and management of the lands. These areas provide ALL Alaskans with valuable services that would not be the same if private ownership is involved. Allowing some individuals to occupy small parcels scattered throughout these valuable lands would certainly degrade the values and purposes for which they have been established.

Besides the degradation that could occur, there are other problems within our state that need to be carefully considered. With the extreme financial problems that are rampant in our state and nation, e.g. the need for decent education funding, maintaining our roads and critical infrastructure, public safety and more. We struggle to just find the funding needed to operate our schools, public safety services, or adequately maintain roads and other infrastructure. Economists are warning that we may well see a recession in our state, if not across the whole nation.

While the fiscal note for this bill estimates a relatively modest cost up front, it projects hiring of 5 new full-time positions and annual costs of \$777,000 by 2028. Given the potential administrative, management, and legal demands this seems a drastic underestimate. Overseeing a bunch of newly created private inholdings scattered throughout parks, critical habitat areas, and other lands designated for specific public uses could turn out to be a managed nightmare. How many new staff positions would it really require? What would we end up spending on litigation? Enforcing hunting, trapping, and other existing regulations would not come cheap.

Please consider all this and at least amend this bill to EXCLUDE ALL of those lands listed in Section 8. Do we really need another "land disposal" program at all?

--

Cherie Northon

Anchorage, AK 99507

907.529.2368

Subject: SB 105

Senator Giessel,

Dunleavy is once again trying to take what belongs to all Alaskans for the benefit of a few. "The interests of the state will be best served" by killing this bill (SB 105) now.

Thank you,

Michelle Michaud

52421 Moonbeam Lane

Homer, Alaska 99603

Subject: Senate Bill 105

Dear Senators:

As a resident of Alaska, I implore you to oppose SB 105. This bill would open all Alaskan parks, critical habitat areas, game sanctuaries, and other protected areas to lease or sale for 10 acre sites.

These lands serve as buffers to protect our natural beauty and wildlife for ALL Alaskans. These cabins would disturb critical wildlife habitat, threaten conservation efforts, and disrupt fragile ecosystems.

Furthermore all Alaskan residents would lose public access to these lands. Restricting hunting, fishing, hiking, birding, and other recreational uses. Do not sell off Alaskan residents' lands.

Oppose SB 105!

Thank you,
Megan O'Neill
818 Smoky Bay Way #272
Homer, AK 99603
Sent from my iPhone

Subject: SB 105A opinion

Dear Madam Chair and committee members,

Let me begin by thanking you for your service to the public. Without people willing to serve as representatives of the people, Democracy would never work.

I am writing concerning SB 105A, "An Act relating to the lease and sale of state land for recreational cabin sites; and providing for an effective date.":

I am not going into a lengthy justification for my opposition to this Bill. I am just going to say that I am really tired of resources dedicated to public use being carved up and sold off and privatized for the use of the wealthy. The wealthy are welcome to visit under the same conditions as those who are not wealthy. In fact, their wealth allows them more access rather than less. Public lands and resources belong to the public, for the good of all , and not for privileged private citizens. Stop the stealing from us and future generations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Maryellen Lambert

907-230-0973

Subject: SB 105A

P.O. Box 2994

Homer, AK 99603

March 16, 2025

Members of Senate Finance Committee

Juneau AK

Dear Senators:

I oppose SB 105A, "An Act relating to the lease and sale of state land for recreational cabin sites; and providing for an effective date." Lands with special designations would allow cabin site lease or purchase under Section 8.2.d, including in all state parks, state forests, state game refuges, state wildlife refuges, state game sanctuaries, state recreational areas, state recreational rivers, state wilderness parks, state marine parks, state special management areas, state public use areas, critical habitat areas, bald eagle preserves, bison ranges, or moose ranges. Most of these areas have special regulations to protect them. With declining revenues, we should not be inviting potentially conflicting uses into these areas.

A great deal of planning by professional land managers along with public input goes into writing regulations to protect "special areas." Selling off scattered parcels throughout special use areas is a recipe for damage to these valuable lands and potentially a huge expense to the state to handle multiple conflicting land uses within these important areas. I do not want to see these lands be degraded by allowing uses that are not the same as the reasons the lands were set aside in the first place.

At this tenuous time where we may lose a lot of federal monies, we should not even consider something like this that could potentially cost the State over $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million dollars

for personnel to oversee the program. This is potentially a very expensive problem that we should not inflict on ourselves. Our “special areas” should remain protected with their special designations and not be overrun by a bunch of conflicting and unenforceable uses that may occur by having multiple “holes in the donut” of the protected areas. You would be potentially creating an expensive nightmare of enforcement and litigation.

Leave well enough alone! Vote this one down, please.

Respectfully,

Nina Faust

Dear Senate Resource Committee members,

I am writing to ask you to veto SB 105, back country cabins.

1. Currently there is very little infrastructure to support more people in the park: roads, communication, etc. it would involve great cost to improve and maintain the McCarthy road.

2. I worry about the effects on the park. I would hate to see it become like areas in or near other national parks: too much traffic, too many shops, too many helicopters, etc. it would certainly detract from the experience for tourists and locals.

3. I am concerned about Dunleavy's motivation for selling off state land. Is this going to be a land grab for the wealthy?

Charlotte Henson: P.O. Box MXY **85**, Glennallen, AK. 99588 406-449-2993.

Senators Giessel, Wielechowski, Claman, Dunbar, Kawasaki, Hughes, Myers,

Thank you for taking comment on this proposed legislation. I am a life-long Alaska Resident and I oppose this bill, urging you not to waste more time and funding on it.

All around our state we see examples of well-planned communities and we also see examples of haphazard community development. Surely by 2025, we have learned enough to know better than proceeding with the latter.

I am pro-development, pro-access, pro-public use of public assets. However, all state land are assets of each and every Alaskan, and as such, should be managed in a thoughtful and planned manner, benefiting the larger public and not just a few individuals. Whether they are designated as public forests, wildlife sanctuary or determined suitable for public recreation/development, these processes should be thoughtful and planned.

Any parcels the state would like to dispose of should be turned into subdivisions with designated public access. Such subdivisions should have forward-thinking designs and allow opportunity for local and state-wide communities to provide specific public-feedback. Blanket-bills on land development are a terrible idea. There is no such thing as one-size-fits-all legislation in thoughtful land development.

Please reject this bill and any other bills that do not involve a thoughtful public process and consider the best interest of all Alaskans when disposing of OUR resources.

Thank you again for your time.

Michelle Raven

907-715-1540

Hello Committee Members:

I am in favor of getting as much land into private hands as possible.

Thanks, Jim

--

James H Johnson

Empire Realty, LLC

907-378-6169, jim@empirealaska.com

I am reaching out today to encourage you to vote against SB 105. This bill could create opportunities for individuals with money and means to obtain land, build their own recreation cabins and own parcels on State land.

As a person who hunts and recreates on public lands, this bill would further limit my ability to enjoy these areas for my outdoor passions and pursuits. This bill represents a loss of opportunity for public lands access and would only create new opportunities for people with the money and means to purchase or buy parcels, and would limit the vast majority of Alaskans.

Thank you

Lang Van Dommelen

1061 E 17th Ave, Anchorage, AK 99501

The If I remember correctly this kind of legislation was thrown out in the early 1970's due to the fact, it was going to cause numerous problems for Akaska residents to access public lands. If anything, the problem will be worse today due to the fact that people, in general, believe they are entitled to anything they want. Access for the people will be blocked, or trespass will be an every day occurrence with little opportunity for law enforcement to keep up with the demands! You think not; think again with speed limits being exceeded not only on our highway, but throughout neighborhoods more than ever.

You might think this will make you popular in the near future, but it's a poor idea waiting to grow into a disaster.

Dave Wallingford

dew338blast@yahoo.com

From my iPad

Dear Senators,

My name is Nicole Schmitt, I reside in east Anchorage and have family in Soldotna. My family and friends are avid users of public cabins through south central and southeast. I've rented cabins in every season, and have always been proud of our state for providing these experiences at an affordable price for all Alaskans.

I was very discouraged to see SB105, and the Governor's letter of support. While some Alaskans are in a financial position to own their own homes, many cannot, and certainly most of us cannot own, build or maintain cabins for recreation. One of the most beautiful aspects of Alaska life, and I believe what drives people to stay in Alaska, is access to *public* lands and facilities. These places truly serve all Alaskans, not just the ones who can afford auxiliary personal recreation cabins.

Please vote in opposition of SB105. I implore you not to sell off the 20% of Alaska that belongs to and is managed by the Alaskan People. The bill concerns me for the following reasons:

1. Loss of Public Access: Both in loss of land and loss of recreational quality of existing cabins for solitude, exploration, hunting and fishing.
2. Impacts to conservation and wildlife: Privatization can threaten conservation efforts and disrupt ecosystems, and fragment and degrade habitat.
3. Economic Impacts: Public land supports tourism and local economies. Privatization might prioritize industrial or commercial development over sustainable practices. This model would also favor the wealthiest of Alaskans (or non-residents and the expense of others).
4. Long-term Sustainability: Public lands managed by state authorities aim for balanced use and protection. Privatization may prioritize short-term profits over long-term sustainability, and reduce the efficacy of state management.

I know the state is facing a difficult budget this year, but I would prefer to see a tax proposal than see our public lands be auctioned off. Living in Alaska is hard - it's expensive, the schools are suffering, we must go outside for most medical care and higher education, and I really love fresh fruit. BUT, I live here because of the character of our public lands and

waters; it's a lifestyle that I don't believe should be compromised, but it's often chipped away by proposals such as this.

Thank you for all your hard work and for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Nicole Schmitt

Anchorage

I am writing in opposition of SB105 that is set for hearing tomorrow. The State of Alaska Constitution secured and guaranteed access to Alaska's land for the people and privatizing these lands limits that access. Amending the State of Alaska Constitution to take away guaranteed access is not in the best interest of the people.

Thank you

Debbie Speakman

Homer, AK

Hello,

Im writing to you today to express my opposition to SB105. By allowing the sale open sale and staking of land will reduce the overall state public land the state has. By doing so, disproportionately help wealthy individuals who have the means to buy, build, and access these lands to gather and maintain more wealth. The everyday Alaskan will only loose access and opportunity on the lands we all have stake in. If this bill is allowed to pass it will provide access to few and restrict the many.

Thank you for your time,

Shay Rosser



**BACKCOUNTRY
HUNTERS & ANGLERS**
ALASKA

February 28th, 2025

Senate Resources Committee
Alaska State Legislature
Senator Click Bishop, Co-Chair
Senator Cathy Giessel, CO-Chair
Juneau, AK 99801

Re: SB 105

The Alaska Chapter of Backcountry Hunters & Anglers (BHA) thanks you for the opportunity to comment on SB 105: "An Act relating to the lease and sale of state land for recreational cabin sites; and providing for an effective date."

Alaska BHA opposes SB 105: "An Act relating to the lease and sale of state land for recreational cabin sites; and providing for an effective date." SB 105 presents as an opportunity to obtain land and put lands in Alaskans hands, so they build their own recreation cabins and own their own parcels. This bill further limits Alaskan's ability to enjoy these areas for our outdoor passions and pursuits as hunters, anglers, trappers, and foragers.

Passing this bill will mean loss of opportunity for public lands access that creates further limitation of resources that are the currently available to all Alaskans, on state public lands. Furthermore, the Remote Recreational Cabin Sites Staking Program through the Alaska DNR, already delineates areas open to staking through a detailed process. SB 105 does not recognize areas of proposed staking of up to 10 acres. Public lands are a legacy of our nation, and Alaskans enjoy bountiful and unique outdoor opportunities because of public lands.

Removing public lands from public hands is not in the best interest of the public. Alaska BHA urges the Senate Resources Committee to reject this bill as well as consider the precedents set by these types of bills, for all Alaskans.

On behalf of the Alaska Chapter of BHA,

Mary Graves
Alaska Chapter Coordinator



WWW.BACKCOUNTRYHUNTERS.ORG/ALASKA_BHA
ALASKA@BACKCOUNTRYHUNTERS.ORG