



## Atom Hockey Proposal Spring Zone Meeting Survey

The following is a complete summary of all the feedback from all eight Zones to the Atom Hockey Proposal.

The following is a list of questions we wish your feedback on to assist the SHA in establishing one structure for Atom Hockey in the province.

1. Do you agree with the standard requirements from Hockey Canada that Provinces must have incorporated into Atom Hockey?

Yes  93 No  13

If No, please describe why;

- Too much variations in demographics, size, ice times, natural/artificial ice
- Tournament style playoffs will have an effect on our rink financials.
- Practices before tryouts is a great addition
- The Tournament issue becomes a problem. We run ball as well and it gets very difficult for teams and committees to step up.
- Dividing the skill level creating a divide between current level of skill.
- Range of skill is huge and hard to develop and after Christmas lots of weaker players drop off or lose interest.
- Don't like the mandated weekend for carded for a filled schedule, make it tough for League play.
- But will create some issues for medium centres like Moose Jaw for "carded teams". Us having Tier 1 and having to play in your own center.
- Do not agree with minimum four skates prior to formal evaluations. Some families will not want or be able to. Some Associations may not have the facilities that want to skate prior will find a way. Do not agree with tournament style. Elimination weeks is exciting.
- Support the proposal with respect to the development of players however as per our MOU presented, we do not agree with the closure of the AA centres removing Warman, Martensville, Delisle, Clavet, Prairie Storm, Lumsden, etc. who are currently interlocks. Let AA Centre make their own determinations.
- We believe Warman and Martensville should receive an exception and be allowed to interlock with Saskatoon as all three Associations agree to it. Please read document/MOU. We are unique and the objective data will show this.
- It creates an unfair situation for urban over rural. It will make a bigger disparity for skills and drive kids out of hockey.
- It does not show equal.
- Some don't understand all.
- No mandatory tiering.
- For the whole Atom proposal, the one thing that our Board is against is supplying 4 skates prior to evaluations. There are numerous options available in Regina for players to skate prior to evaluations if they wish to. We should not be in the "Hockey School" business.
- Because the requirements look strictly at the development of the player within the game of hockey. Many more kids than not love to play hockey for fun and to not have any games for 2.5 months after

school is starting is no fun. I feel these kids will choose other sports that play games earlier. I am all for more practices than games but to make the start of the season so boring for a young kid could cause some to quit.

- The four pre skates would force major centers to place that in all age groups, increased cost.
- 45 game cap doesn't include playoffs, some leagues don't have playoffs. Players on carded teams could play 20 more games than kids playing Tier 1. Carded weekends are disruptive to team continuity just like Spring hockey is.
- Believe limiting games till after November 16 is a deterrent to registration. 9- and 10-year old's want to "play" hockey. Who is benefitting from front loading practices? Those already committed to the sport.

2. Within the creation of a "Development Season" for Atom Hockey at the beginning of the season with the "front loading" of practices/skill development sessions to start the season and a greater emphasis on games later in the season do you agree with the November 15<sup>th</sup> date the SHA is proposing to start Exhibition, Tournament and League play?

Yes  97 No  12

If No, please describe why;

- A lot of Tier 1 Atom teams have exhibition games as a final process of selecting their final roster. The November 15<sup>th</sup> date rids this process.
- Ice isn't in till middle of October.
- I like the November 15<sup>th</sup> start date. It isn't much different from our current start date which encourages skill development at the start of the season.
- However, extending the season is difficult for us as we do not have ice.
- Backloading the season with more games could create a problem for teams with natural ice. Our League starts beginning of November and natural ice teams in layoffs in March this year potentially couldn't play if the weather was too warm.
- December 1<sup>st</sup>
- Makes the bigger League tough to finish with travel, can't always play during the week.
- I'd like to see it start earlier for places that have ice in earlier. Example: South Sask.
- It doesn't leave a lot of weekends to get games played if we are taking weekends away for carded hockey.
- 15<sup>th</sup> is OK. I think Nov 1 would work as well.
- Its not far off what probably is but practice is still important later in season. Would be ok a week earlier than the 15<sup>th</sup>.
- I think we could be always focused on development. This needs to come back to coaching.
- I agree totally with this proposal.
- We did that this year. Trouble with model is practices will stop at the end of the year, way too many games!
- Hockey starts for most first week back from school. If we want to keep kids playing hockey later in life, we need to create some opportunity for games. 2 ½ months of practise with no games will be hard to keep kids interested.
- This is really no different than today as our league only starts November 1 each year.
- Could be pushed back to December 1 in my opinion
- Same as above - Because the requirements look strictly at the development of the player within the game of hockey. Many more kids than not love to play hockey for fun and to not have any games for 2.5 months after school is starting is no fun. I feel these kids will choose other sports that play games earlier. I am all for more practices than games but to make the start of the season so boring for a young kid could cause some to quit.

- Yes and No. don't go to the extreme on either end. When the team goes the last month of hockey without a practice is not a good thing. When teams go two plus months with no games ... kids will not have the same fun factor
- Further to # 1, kids could go pick up a ball, baton, etc. in every other sport and play the game. Limiting this will affect registration numbers

3. Do you agree with the Atom game cap of 45 games for Exhibition, Tournament and League Games?

Yes  90 No  7

If No, please describe why;

- 35 games
- Don't like the how it is same as Novice. Should focus a bit more on game play and progress. Would be OK with 55.
- 45 is plenty. We played 48 games and it was a lot.
- Not sure if it should be a hard number.
- Too many games. These kids are 9 and 10.
- Too many games.
- Its actually high at 45.
- There should be a cap of some sort but as to who should be penalized, I am not sure
- Maybe suspension into the following year
- Monetary fine?
- Recertification before coaching again?
- Should ne Minor Hockey Association and they should have policies as to discipline within their Association as games are scheduled by Managers in some and coaches in others.
- 1<sup>st</sup> Discipline to the Coach, suspension. 2<sup>nd</sup> discipline to the MAH, fine.
- For our Association we would suspend coach and they would come in front of our Discipline Committee and would affect their future coaching opportunities.
- SHA should discipline the coach. Take out of the hands of the Association. SHA does the discipline for other violations i.e.: misconducts so they should do it in this case also.
- Being the coaches are not the ones doing the scheduling in our Association, I think it has to fall on the shoulders of the MAH itself.
- I think its fair to discipline a Coach and maybe also the Association gets a fine, otherwise it might not happen again.
- Coach suspension and team fine of \$\_\_\_\_, \$500 maybe?
- There has to be consequences of some sort.
- Agree – 2
- Team should possibly be fined.
- Discipline the Coach
- We have a process in place to approve game/tournament sanction requests already. We would discipline coaches that exceed through discipline committee and it would affect future coaching opportunities.
- Tough for Associations to police this. Would support sanctions against the coach/team but not Association
- If short games at a tournament and do 3 tourneys, it likely burns up 1/3 of the allocation with not much playing time.
- There could be a logical issue if you head to a tournament with 41 games played and make the final which is a "bonus fifth game".
- Depends on the number of teams and how many league games and what it leaves you with.
- But what if your done your season early and all of a sudden everyone wants to play one more game.

- The 45-game cap will be hard to monitor. In tournaments teams can play 4 games or 6 depending on how well they do. Same goes for playoffs and the end of the season.
- But why the exception for some players that are playing on carded teams. Very unfair!
- It should be a recommended limit. What happens to the team who is having an amazing run and go into the last tournament with 42 games played? Sorry we can't play in the final we maxed out?!

#### What are your thoughts of the SHA discipline in the event a Coach exceeds the limit?

- Suspension is appropriate. There should be consequences.
- Minor Hockey Association should be disciplined too.
- MHA Pee Wee team – No Provincials.
- Good put emphasis on coach to make sure they stay in line. Maybe coach and managers since managers book games.
- I think the MHA as well as coach would need to be disciplined in order for majority of people to listen and abide.
- 30-day suspension – no coaching.
- Disciplined will be required as here are “passionate” coaches out there.
- Totally agree. If not have the MHA discipline the coach
- Should be something. First coach fine, manager.
- Yes, there has to be something in place, so they don't exceed the numbers.
- Coach suspension.
- MHA – Fine. (2)
- Shouldn't have.
- Do not allow Association to sanction tournaments or enter Provincials.
- At the home rink stop the ice time. Executives must confront the coach and possibly suspend.
- I agree. I believe that coaches need to learn to adhere to SHA Standards. In too many cases Regulations are ignored or minimalized. I strongly believe the coach mentor program should not only be promoted but expanded all the way to Bantam? Midget?
- Agree that there has to be a deterrent or people will keep down, as there is no consequence.
- It depends on how much a team goes over the allotted number, you may run up against that number in playoffs. Its still hard for an Association to police – as you always can't keep tabs on all teams.
- MHA's mandatory to hold coaches accountable.
- I think it should be handled. Why did this happen? Given a one-time warning unless he went 20 game over.
- Should be team official not Association. Only thing to figure out is if you are over before league is done how do you continually discipline or is it a one-time discipline.
- Coach suspension and fines.
- Should discipline coach for exceeding limit.
- I believe the coach suspended/fined.
- Fine to MHA and meeting with Association and SHA. Three strike system resulting in team suspension.
- If they are playing that many games the kids are missing out on development – time punishment complete.
- One-month suspension.
- The team's season is over at the 45<sup>th</sup> game. No tournaments, playoffs, etc.
- Minor Hockey Board decides what the fine shall be.
- Coach should receive a 1-month suspension and the Association should be fined. This will discourage coaches from pushing the limit.
- The Association be fined at the end of the season based on how many games over the limit they are (for the first year or two) then following year suspension if trend continues with same coach in subsequent seasons.

- Absolutely! I believe it is the Associations responsibility to educate coaches but coaches responsibility to follow. This is no different than playing ineligible players or missing coach certifications. Discipline should fall to the team so that all teams in an Association are not penalized.
- I think the coach should be penalized, not the team or the Association.
- Possible suspension/warning to Association if a second violation not allowed to enter Provincials.
- Should be a fine.
- First offence – warning; second offense – suspension.
- Hold both coach and MHA accountable suspensions/provincial suspended for MHA.
- I agree coaches/manager should be disciplined.
- Coaches need to follow rules and regulations that are in place. 45 games is realistic.
- If it needs to be done but 45 seems reasonable.
- To the coach.
- Fine to the coach and paid by the coach.
- Deal with each case individually.
- Every situation different. Tough to say what to do.
- Supportive, the coach should know the amount of games.
- The Association should have control over the coaches and managers and their schedule. The Associations should be held responsible.
- Fine the Association. – 2
- Rules/limits should be provided at the start of the year to coaches, Said Minor Sports should then fine or punish coach.
- Warning followed by suspension.
- Take away all provincial teams.
- Coach is to be suspended. - 2
- 14-day suspension to the coach.
- 30-day suspension.
- Coach and Manager should be disciplined. – 2
- I am not sure who should be disciplined. Our Association leaves a lot of exhibition games, tournaments to team discretion. And sometimes managers arrange games not coaches. Whoever has control or should have control over game count should face discipline.
- I would not want the MHA responsible. Has too much effect on the facility.
- Punish MHA so they help control coaches.
- I prefer discipline that impacts the person who broke the rule; but understand that discipline against the MHA may be the necessary evil!
- Like the idea of the Association being sanctioned.
- Mixed.
- 45 games is a pretty big season for atom, but sometimes there is always that one more.
- MHA Sanction is appropriate.
- It should be on a case by case basis.
- No provincials for the Association.
- No provincials and suspend coach.
- Warning and then stern sanction to the Association would police it quickly.
- Must be a harsh discipline, otherwise it is useless.
- Suspension, if excessive.
- Would hate to see a coach get suspended because his team was more successful in tournaments. Would a tournament cap make more sense??
- Ban from coaching for one calendar year and any associated players are suspended for three months of the next season (ie: until Christmas). Point of reference we don't want kids to sit but in our zone the threat of player suspension hits home and is effective.

4. Please provide your opinion of the Four Geographic Sub-divisions being closed for Novice and Atom League Play?

- Agreed – This allows the league and player numbers to grow each season
- Works for our Association.
- Perfect.
- Agree with it. (3)
- It will work fine for my area.
- I think it is fair and benefits players and communities that are involved.
- The #'s should support them being able to play games within those sub-divisions. Don't need outside centers play league games there.
- Doesn't matter to me being from a small centre.
- It is good to close, develops rural players.
- I love it. It will be a great opportunity for a much-needed culture shift and more towards our own leagues.
- They should have enough area on their own to play.
- Yes, I agree with them being closed. Numbers are to strong in centers to open it up.
- Absolutely. Supports grassroots development and focus.
- I believe that each associations number fluctuate year over year. If an association has nowhere to play, then options are always better than none. I believe this should be handled case by case and hard boundaries and rules rid the options if certain associations numbers change.
- I disagree as from our point of view it forces a lot of travel for our young families. I understand the rationale, but our location creates a challenge.
- Doesn't really affect us.
- Lots of kids don't get the opportunity to play "AA" Atom because they are close to closed areas.
- Agree
- It may create problems if carded players leave their teams and remaining players who wish to play and will not have an option.
- Thinking a good idea but leave the option for teams with missing players to still play exhibition, league and tourney.
- I think it is a good idea. – 6
- Doesn't affect us much. - 2
- Don't allow for Atom "AA" to pull kids from outside Associations.
- If these sub-divisions are closed, they should maybe get a chance at a carded team.
- Absolutely against. Hockey Regina allows out of center teams. They don't need to make their league work but every year teams ask to join wherever by best fit. HRI assesses. We pay a league fee. None of Regina teams or outside or outside mind going to each others' arenas. Also, the outside centres are all communities usually under 45-minute drive to those centres. Joining a farther rural league makes no sense.
- I think it is just discrimination against other regions.
- The only thing is the tiering vs rural especially when comes to tournaments. We have to register as "A" but we may be a "B" or equal to.
- I disagree. I think exceptions should be made. Kids should not be prevented from having a chance to play tiered hockey based on the geographic locations of their hometown.
- Its hard to say. It depends on team availability and distance, but I think all in all it will encourage an increase in local teams.
- That's fine – but it will make it that those teams will not be allowed into our local tournament.
- No concerns.
- Helps our small Associations keep kids playing home and playing longer.
- I think this should work - 1
- Centers have enough kids, so I agree.
- No effect on us - 3
- Yes, they have enough kids - 2

- I believe Atom Tier one centers should all have equal radius to level development for best ever end results years down the road for the SHA.
- League play is overrated.
- Does not affect me. I can see both sides.
- Its fine
- Need to consult our Board and Coaches - 2
- That should help the smaller centers with lower #'s keep the players
- They are far away from us that it wouldn't affect us directly, may actually increase the number of teams in our leagues. At one time we were in a league in one of the centers with mixed results.
- I understand, due to the numbers of the idea. But if it is due to just travel time that doesn't make sense (for the surrounding areas and suburbs). The rest of the province has to travel to play so to say they don't isn't really fair.
- Don't know enough to form an opinion now.
- Closing the four Geographic subdivisions will disadvantage those bedroom communities near Saskatoon/Regina/Moose Jaw and PA. Creating your own league when close to those centers is problematic as well as creates hardships for the players.
- I don't agree. It should be left up to the centres to work this out and decide. Not sure why SHA would need to involve itself here. If Saskatoon or Regina support their interlocks, why would SHA care.
- Warman Minor Hockey does not agree with this due to our unique situation, WMHA/MMHA/SMHA. Wat to remain together in League.
- Do not support. Let centres make these decisions.
- I understand the reasoning as it affects communities with smaller populations throughout the province. However, there are exceptions to every rule and some situations need specific attention to review. If the centre supports the interlock, and there is reasonable argument, then it should be allowed.
- I do not agree with closing borders in regard to Atom. I feel those centers should be given to option to keep their borders open and decide who they will allow into their MHA. Example Lumsden/Prairie Storm are close almost suburb type communities, this would create an increase in travel/logistics considering Pee Wee and higher continue to play in these centers.
- This has no effect on our clubs, but I do agree with having borders
- I like
- Think it is a great idea.
- I agree as there are more than enough players in those regions, although this doesn't affect my area at all.
- No concerns
- For some Associations they may need to play in one of these regions based upon location and travel.
- I disagree with closing the division for my situation we benefit from playing in Prince Albert rather than travelling more for less games.
- Agree. Should be enough for Female Pee Wee as well.
- Should be for all divisions (Male and Female)
- Its good unless the kids have to drive through division to play hockey.
- I am fine with it as long as rural leagues will not be stopped @ tier level.
- Do not like it. Works well for us in Shellbrook to play in the PA League.
- Great for the city. We need to keep it how it is. Things are going great.
- Not sure yet.
- Creates an unfair situation for SHA in the Province.
- Based upon demographics makes sense.
- I like it, it will work in PA as with our three-tier system it has worked for our kids' enjoyment and competition level.
- HRI is indifferent on the border closing in Atom. If the outside teams can only have 2 tiers, then they will not line up with our programs (A, B, C). Therefore, they would not be allowed in. If they can have 3 Tiers, we would not object to them playing in HRI.

- Border closure is always an issue when going in the opposite direction of geo economic flow of society. Eventually it will catch up. People are moving out of rural areas and into more urbanized surroundings and SHA is trying to push them back.
- Playing within the closest center should not be restricted. Development of all players should be priority.
- In Saskatoon, Martensville and Warman are as big as some of our zones. Makes no sense to lock them out.
- None

5. Do you agree with the Proposal around the “Tiering” of Novice and Atom teams within the Geographic Sub-divisions and outside of them?

Yes  71 No  25

If No, please describe why;

- I agree with tiering within the four centres but not outside of them
- Only major centers should tier – Moose Jaw; PA; Regina; and Saskatoon
- Makes sense to align with the rest of the Province if the geographic regions are created.
- Why does the sub-division get special treatment from other centres based on population? It puts high end players in small centres at a disadvantage.
- Two tiers is lots, no need for 3.
- Two is lots.
- I just say no to Tier 1 in smaller centers.
- I agree with tiering if an Association numbers make sense. We’ve found when similar skills mindset are together its more successful.
- I really think we shouldn’t punish children and their families for where they reside. Parents should be allowed to choose, and Associations shouldn’t be allowed to force kids/families to stay.
- Yes, but I believe you should be permitted to leave an Association to play Novice/Atom Tier 1. You shouldn’t restrict a player from playing Tier 1.
- As long as it is done fairly.
- I don’t like the idea of not letting Atom Tier1 draw kids from these in the 80 km radius. But letting carded draw, kids that are high skilled should play with there own regardless.
- Retains talented athletes from smaller centers from excelling with similarly talented players. As well, impacts your carded hockey.
- What shall a kid want to play tiered hockey and organization agrees they should be allowed a release.
- Should still have the 80 km radius at atom.
- If a child’s skill set is developed to be on a tiered team, they should be able to because if not, they will be bored and quit hockey.
- Kids in some locations won’t get the chance to play with their skill level.
- There should be a drawing area of some kind with a minimum number of players from our center.
- Smaller centers will not be able to have Tiered teams because of numbers. Why do kids in Regina get to play Atom Tier 1 and small town kids don’t?
- Rural
- Not enough players outside the main centers. Could end up with very uneven tiering between towns. One town will tier, lower tier plays in a league with towns that don’t tier. Could end up in a tough season.
- Disagree with the different tiering options for a closed versus not closed centre. Should be the same however shouldn’t be closed to begin with.
- I don’t see how a centre like Moose Jaw with their numbers could have 3 tiers but a larger centre like Warman or Martensville would have 2 tiers. Should be the same.
- Allow up to three for all if tiering. Allows for more province wide consistency.

- I feel if numbers warrant outside MHA to be able to have more than two tiered systems they should be allowed if other similar MAH's can also provide numbers to support this.
- Rural communities should be able to play Tier 1 and play on carded teams
- I think it will allow us all to tier or not tier whether your city or not city
- Rural – can't see it working
- Should be up to MHA and Leagues if they want to tier or not and not be mandatory
- We need to have open centers for tiering in order to keep kids regardless of skills playing against similar skill sets
- Large Associations like Saskatoon and Regina should have the option for three or four levels.
- The rural associations know nothing about administering hockey to the massive numbers that the larger centers have, and vice versa. Frankly SHA is out of touch with administering hockey on the ground level as well. Saskatoon needs 4 tiers because our leagues are massive. Maybe Regina can handle 3 but only they know that.
- Organizing 50+ teams per division is a logistical nightmare. Players need to play with players of similar skill set! Why else is there carded teams! If no tiering no carded teams! Since we added a fourth division, I have heard nothing but positives.
- No opinion.

6. Do you agree with the proposal surrounding the creation of "carded" novice and Atom teams?

Yes  77 No  24

If No, please describe why and be specific about which areas of the proposal surrounding "carded" teams you have concerns with or disagree with.

- The proposed carded weekends utilize a lot of Association ice that can't be used for those other teams. We have 14 teams in these two divisions. That would not be able to play.
- Would be tough to take away in-season weekends away from some teams.
- Don't agree with the no play weekends for carded weekends. This adds a lot of complexity. We would already be back loading games to the second half of season which taxes our ice availability for older teams come provincials and playoffs.
- Don't like how league can't continue to play during those weekends. Carded hockey should only start end of March.
- Dependent on specified weekends. Good – makes more room in March for playoffs which is suggested.
- I think carded teams while League play throughout Dec and Jan will cause controversy. Allow carded games in later Feb and March when the season is winding down.
- Other players don't get to play.
- Make it the first weekend of January.
- Carded should be left till the end of the season.
- Leave till the end of year and let them play then. Have Leagues end around start of March. It gets costly for some small towns to keep ice in later than that.
- I don't agree with setting 4 weekends aside for carded hockey. In small towns some Atom and Novice teams only have 7 – 10 players. If you take a few of them to a carded team, the others want to get a chance to play on those weekends.
- I understand the hard feelings that can be created between "elite" parents and "average" parents but not everyone wants to play every weekend. I am a big proponent of the odd game throughout the week.
- If seasons are later spreading out during the year might be better than the end of the year fight that currently have.
- I don't agree with the weekends throughout the winter. The kids on the carded teams. Do the carded teams get to practice together prior? Where do loyalties lie? I think if the carded option sticks it

- should be toward the end of the season and those who want to continue to play can make the carded teams. I do not agree would the date of registering too early.
- I like most of the ideas.
  - For those kids that don't make Tier 1, give them that opportunity. The weekend idea could work.
  - I don't like the idea of taking out 4 weekends, from league play.
  - The proposal allows more players the chance to join carded teams which will increase the satisfaction, desire and want for more competitive hockey. For the few players from an 80 km radius that don't have the opportunity to join the Tier 1 one team. They can still join larger centers carded teams.
  - I like the idea of games throughout the year and extending league to the end of March.
  - Kids are burned out; carded hockey should not begin until League play is over! Start carded tournaments in April.
  - I agree partially. I don't agree with restricting the Atom AA teams to home center only.
  - I like the layout of weekends, but it drums our kids.
  - Like this idea, only problem is house teams may cease practice.
  - Allows kids a chance to play at a higher level while still playing in hometown
  - I feel it may be difficult for teams to have to schedule around four weekends. I feel it will leave the kids not playing carded sitting at home.
  - Losing a player or two from the program and team a person is coaching to another team during the season is not a good idea. Coaches. Teams play different. Leave "carded" till after the season is over.
  - I don't see the need for carded teams. If other provinces don't have what is the argument for Sask. If development comes from practices, what is need to put kids (some kids) on one extra team to play extra games.
  - I like the either/or related to tiering or carding to allow kids to play with like skill
  - If our focus is on player development, then all novice hockey should be ½ ice. Don't think there should be any Novice carded teams.
  - I'm happy with current carding if teams are required to be tiered that would be very detrimental to Rural teams and carded teams (especially rural where not all communities may not be able to tier in that league)
  - I like carded teams. I just think without allowing Tier Hockey we run the risk of a lot of fighting between associations.
  - Tier 1 players should still be able to play on carded teams.
  - Not allowing Tier I to play on carded teams, again it puts rural at a disadvantage.
  - Fine with it as long as the kids playing carded teams do not have an advantage in number of games they are allowed to play.
  - Development of all kids should be priority, not who's the best!
  - Weekends start too early. Those players can play extra games over Tier 1 players. Make it fair for all players!
  - No opinion

## 7. Any other Comments?

- Would like to see populated centre over 10,000 people have the opportunity to host (2) carded Atom teams. Allow them to enter blacked out weekends issued by SHA. Then also allow carded hockey to run thru to the end of April.
- Not sure if these weekends are the best.
- Ensure that the system for tiering/carding works for all players not just the elite. Keep players playing beyond March 1<sup>st</sup>. Ice plants cost a fortune to run, the player should benefit not just the last teams left.
- I disagree with the idea of carded weekends in the heart of the season. Shutting down the Novice and Atom regular schedules to cater to this small minority of players doesn't make sense. Maybe they don't need four weekends, has SHA considered giving them fewer weekends?

- If a player wants to play on a carded team and within the 80 km radius, they should not have to get releases from neighbouring centres within that distance (some Associations do not release kids in Atom and Novice for any reason.
- The carded teams that play designated weekends would be a good thing if league play runs longer.
- Good plan for this age group.
- I really want to see things improve. I would like the SHA to be ahead of the curve!
- Like I said and it is kinda a double edge sword if you won't let Tier 1 draw from the same radius.
- I believe there should be a Tier 1, carded and house. It gives a roundabout way of having a 3-tier system. This way the Tier 1 players do not soak up carded Hockey spots. I don't think we should pint the whole province with the same brush. I understand the city tiers but being from a small town I feel we are punished and prevented from playing tiered hockey because of it. Bottom line is that I believe SHA should support the Tier One hockey league in Sask as well as the proposed carded Hockey changes.
- Need help making a Novice team in LeRoy. Only have five players moving up in age.
- Tournament style playoffs will not work. We need games in small town rink to support rink, booth and community.
- Once again read info package including; MOU between MMHA/WMHA and supported by SMHA; rationale for our request for an exception based on numbers and development and we have zero impact on rural associations; letters from MMHA/WMHA/SMHA
- I do not agree with kids leaving if there is a team due to tiering. Example; Southey to Lumsden, essentially creating no minor hockey in some towns
- We need to continue allowing Tier 1 to pick from an 80 km radius to keep kids challenged and playing along similar skill set. Having a kid forced in rural to play "B" or house hockey because SHA has changed carded rules does not benefit kids starting hockey especially if it is a weaker player. They need to touch the puck to improve.
- There needs to be a better way. Keep it how it is.
- Need more time to consider 5 & 6 and impact in Northeast.
- Don't know enough – too new and learning.
- As we have always heard "easier for all Associations if it is driven by the SHA". We are already experiencing this, and it takes the decision making out of the hands of the local volunteers.
- I wish the SHA and Hockey Canada would consult with its members more on topics like this.
- The proposal is taking the "fun" out of hockey especially with lower calibre, new to hockey players. Our opinion is players will be lost and/or practices won't be attended.