

---

## UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by DevilPuncher - 2008/03/19 14:22

---

Seeing as though non-conference games have been our bane, I found myself thinking (worrying) a lot about our games with UCLA and Washington. So much so that I did a little research that calmed my nerves a little. Here is what I found.\*\*

UCLA loses the following starters on Offense:

- Split end (backup has 2 games starting experience)
- Left guard (backup has no starting experience)
- Center (backup has no starting experience)
- Right Tackle (backup has no starting experience)
- Tailback (backup has 5 games starting experience)
- Flanker (backup has no starting experience)

UCLA loses the following starters on Defense:

- Defensive Tackle (backup has no starting experience)
- Right Defensive End (backup has no starting experience)
- Middle Linebacker (backup has no starting experience)
- Left Corner (backup has 1 game starting experience)
- Strong Safety (backup has no starting experience)
- Free Safety (backup has no starting experience)

Washington loses the following starters on Offense:

(I could not find the data for the backup's starting experience)

- Split End
- Flanker
- Center
- Right Guard
- Right Tackle
- Tight End
- Tailback

Washington loses the following starters on Defense:

- Right Defensive Tackle
- Left Defensive Tackle
- Right Defensive End
- Left Outside linebacker
- Left Inside Linbacker
- Free Safety
- Strong Safety
- Right Corner

\*\*Note: I got this off of the last game played for each team for the 2007 season (UCLA vs. BYU; Washington vs. Hawaii). I am assuming those are fairly accurate depth charts as they listed who was redshirting and injured etc.

There, don't you feel a little better? I do.

Finally, both teams begin spring practice April 3rd.

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by domanater - 2008/03/19 15:10

---

DevilPuncher wrote:

Seeing as though non-conference games have been our bane, I found myself thinking (worrying) a lot about our games with UCLA and Washington. So much so that I did a little research that calmed my nerves a little. Here is what I found.\*\*

UCLA loses the following starters on Offense:

---

Split end (backup has 2 games starting experience)  
Left guard (backup has no starting experience)  
Center (backup has no starting experience)  
Right Tackle (backup has no starting experience)  
Tailback (backup has 5 games starting experience)  
Flanker (backup has no starting experience)

UCLA loses the following starters on Defense:

Defensive Tackle (backup has no starting experience)  
Right Defensive End (backup has no starting experience)  
Middle Linebacker (backup has no starting experience)  
Left Corner (backup has 1 game starting experience)  
Strong Safety (backup has no starting experience)  
Free Safety (backup has no starting experience)

Washington loses the following starters on Offense:  
(I could not find the data for the backup's starting experience)

Split End  
Flanker  
Center  
Right Guard  
Right Tackle  
Tight End  
Tailback

Washington loses the following starters on Defense:

Right Defensive Tackle  
Left Defensive Tackle  
Right Defensive End  
Left Outside linebacker  
Left Inside Linbacker  
Free Safety  
Strong Safety  
Right Corner

\*\*Note: I got this off of the last game played for each team for the 2007 season (UCLA vs. BYU; Washington vs. Hawaii).  
I am assuming those are fairly accurate depth charts as they listed who was redshirting and injured etc.

There, don't you feel a little better? I do.

Finally, both teams begin spring practice April 3rd.

Washington's fate will revolve almost exclusively on their QB and the ability of BYu to play well on the road.

UCLAs fate rests on our ability to improve quickly on defense, (the guys like g pittman, howard, bradley, etc. etc.) The beauty is that our dline is very solid (Dulan isn't going on a mission so we're very deep) and Ben Olson is not mobile in the slightest. Jorgenson is going to have a big day. Bottom line vs UCLA, if we can run the ball against them and force Big Ben into long 3rd downs, I think we'll win by 25. If they can run and we see a lot of 3rd and shorts, Ben gets a little confidence, or Max finds ways to turn the ball over still, it will be tight.

Honestly, our toughest games this year will be Utah, Air Force, and TCU, if we can't beat washington or ucla, we'll probably drop one of those conference roadies too. Going undefeated will be a monumental task (which is why we've only done it once in our history) but we have the horses.

=====

**Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!**

Posted by wildeone - 2008/03/19 15:22

---

Karma for the research!:lol:

---

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by Pwride - 2008/03/19 15:25

---

Just for perspective:

BYU offense loses:

Center  
WR  
FB

BYU defense loses:

2 MLBs  
1 OLB  
2 CBs  
2 Safeties

---

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by lawman - 2008/03/19 16:22

---

wildeone wrote:

Karma for the research!:lol:

ditto!

---

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by CougarBandit - 2008/03/19 16:42

---

The bad news is - The UCLA "backup" tailback, Kahlil Bell, was actually their initial starter. He went down with an injury after the first 5 games. In his start vs BYU in the first game, he got 79 yards on 16 carries with one 26 yd TD run. he may struggle a bit more while the o-line rebuilds though. I don't think they'll control the line of scrimmage on either side as well as last year.

UCLA will still have a strong, aggressive defense under DeWayne Walker but they may not be quite as successful. With the exception of Al Verner at CB, I think they lost their best talent and will have a hard time equalling last year.

I think they'll likely pick Ben Olson to start at QB, which will be a mistake for them. I think he's more talented than Cowan but less of a leader and more prone to mistakes under pressure.

BYU will have the disadvantage of going against a "new" offense but will have have two games worth of film to work with. UCLA will likely need to go all out vs Tennessee so there won't be too many surprises.

This will be BYU's game to win.

---

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/03/19 16:49

---

Washington's defensive losses could be addition by subtraction. They were terrible last year. The new guys on the defense couldn't be any worse than the guys from last year.

---

---

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by DevilPuncher - 2008/03/19 16:58

---

mormonrasta wrote:

Washington's defensive losses could be addition by subtraction. They were terrible last year. The new guys on the defense couldn't be any worse than the guys from last year.

This is a very good point. A team (or unit) that is mediocre (Washington and UCLA's offense) may just need an influx of new blood and spirits to turn things around - perhaps the bigger question is can they get that good feeling that early in the season?

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by THEmmb - 2008/03/19 17:26

---

Pwride wrote:

Just for perspective:

BYU offense loses:

Center  
WR  
FB

BYU defense loses:

2 MLBs  
1 OLB  
2 CBs  
2 Safeties

I don't think "Touchdown Joe" was ever listed as a starter.

Also on D I thought that Fowler would be considered a starter coming back and we would only really be losing 1 starting safety.

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by penn cougar - 2008/03/19 17:42

---

Pwride wrote:

Just for perspective:

BYU offense loses:

Center  
WR  
FB

BYU defense loses:

2 MLBs  
1 OLB  
2 CBs  
2 Safeties

Just for Clarification, Was Matt Allen actually considered a starter. I assume that we had two wide receivers on the starting roster, Collie and Reed, and that Matt Allen was #3 and the backup. Also, I don't want to get nit picky, but was Semanoff actually the starter, or was Tonga the starter.

The only reason I'm picking this apart is that you could look at it through extreme blue goggles to say that we only lost one actual starter on Offense. Fowler could be considered a starter if you use the rational of Devil Puncher and look at the two deep of the last game to say that we only lose 6 starters on Defense instead of seven. This is a very glass half full mentality, but its true...:cheer: :cheer:

---

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/03/19 21:03

---

DevilPuncher wrote:

Seeing as though non-conference games have been our bane, I found myself thinking (worrying) a lot about our games with UCLA and Washington. So much so that I did a little research that calmed my nerves a little. Here is what I found.\*\*

UCLA loses the following starters on Offense:

Split end (backup has 2 games starting experience)  
Left guard (backup has no starting experience)  
Center (backup has no starting experience)  
Right Tackle (backup has no starting experience)  
Tailback (backup has 5 games starting experience)  
Flanker (backup has no starting experience)

UCLA loses the following starters on Defense:

Defensive Tackle (backup has no starting experience)  
Right Defensive End (backup has no starting experience)  
Middle Linebacker (backup has no starting experience)  
Left Corner (backup has 1 game starting experience)  
Strong Safety (backup has no starting experience)  
Free Safety (backup has no starting experience)

Washington loses the following starters on Offense:

(I could not find the data for the backup's starting experience)

Split End  
Flanker  
Center  
Right Guard  
Right Tackle  
Tight End  
Tailback

Washington loses the following starters on Defense:

Right Defensive Tackle  
Left Defensive Tackle  
Right Defensive End  
Left Outside linebacker  
Left Inside Linbacker  
Free Safety  
Strong Safety  
Right Corner

\*\*Note: I got this off of the last game played for each team for the 2007 season (UCLA vs. BYU; Washington vs. Hawaii). I am assuming those are fairly accurate depth charts as they listed who was redshirting and injured etc.

There, don't you feel a little better? I do.

Finally, both teams begin spring practice April 3rd.

I appreciate the research effort but personally I'm much less interested in how many games the backup started than whether the backup had a significant amount of playing time during those games he didn't start.

---

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by DevilPuncher - 2008/03/19 21:19

---

Conosticator wrote:

DevilPuncher wrote:

Seeing as though non-conference games have been our bane, I found myself thinking (worrying) a lot about our games with UCLA and Washington. So much so that I did a little research that calmed my nerves a little. Here is what I found.\*\*

UCLA loses the following starters on Offense:

Split end (backup has 2 games starting experience)

Left guard (backup has no starting experience)

Center (backup has no starting experience)

Right Tackle (backup has no starting experience)

Tailback (backup has 5 games starting experience)

Flanker (backup has no starting experience)

UCLA loses the following starters on Defense:

Defensive Tackle (backup has no starting experience)

Right Defensive End (backup has no starting experience)

Middle Linebacker (backup has no starting experience)

Left Corner (backup has 1 game starting experience)

Strong Safety (backup has no starting experience)

Free Safety (backup has no starting experience)

Washington loses the following starters on Offense:

(I could not find the data for the backup's starting experience)

Split End

Flanker

Center

Right Guard

Right Tackle

Tight End

Tailback

Washington loses the following starters on Defense:

Right Defensive Tackle

Left Defensive Tackle

Right Defensive End

Left Outside linebacker

Left Inside Linbacker

Free Safety

Strong Safety

Right Corner

\*\*Note: I got this off of the last game played for each team for the 2007 season (UCLA vs. BYU; Washington vs. Hawaii).

I am assuming those are fairly accurate depth charts as they listed who was redshirting and injured etc.

There, don't you feel a little better? I do.

Finally, both teams begin spring practice April 3rd.

I appreciate the research effort but personally I'm much less interested in how many games the backup started than whether the backup had a significant amount of playing time during those games he didn't start.

This is a valid interest. However, I did notice that many of those listed as second string were also seniors, if I recall that was especially true with UCLA. Nevertheless, I did not intend my post to be a slanted insight as to why Washington and UCLA were going to suck. On the contrary, I think that outside of Utah they will be our two toughest games. The information you seek I could not find or I would have posted it (Washington didn't even list any type of "experience" information). You are welcome to find that out and contribute.

=====

---

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by DevilPuncher - 2008/03/19 21:24

---

penncougar wrote:

Pwride wrote:

Just for perspective:

BYU offense loses:

Center

WR

FB

BYU defense loses:

2 MLBs

1 OLB

2 CBs

2 Safeties

Just for Clarification, Was Matt Allen actually considered a starter. I assume that we had two wide receivers on the starting roster, Collie and Reed, and that Matt Allen was #3 and the backup. Also, I don't want to get nit picky, but was Semanoff actually the starter, or was Tonga the starter.

The only reason I'm picking this apart is that you could look at it through extreme blue goggles to say that we only lost one actual starter on Offense. Fowler could be considered a starter if you use the rational of Devil Puncher and look at the two deep of the last game to say that we only lose 6 starters on Defense instead of seven. This is a very glass half full mentality, but its true....cheer: :cheer:

I think we will really miss Matt Allen. He had great hands and was a solid possession reciever. We wil miss him and his 3rd down conversions. And as clarification, I don't know if my original post had any "rationale" behind it other than to relay the only information I could find in terms of the players UCLA and Washington would be losing. It just happened that the only places I could find it were from the depth charts of those teams final game. I did not intend it to be a tricky way of making UCLA and Washington seem like they were losing more than they were.

---

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/03/19 22:20

---

DevilPuncher wrote:

Conosticator wrote:

DevilPuncher wrote:

Seeing as though non-conference games have been our bane, I found myself thinking (worrying) a lot about our games with UCLA and Washington. So much so that I did a little research that calmed my nerves a little. Here is what I found.\*\*

UCLA loses the following starters on Offense:

Split end (backup has 2 games starting experience)

Left guard (backup has no starting experience)

Center (backup has no starting experience)

Right Tackle (backup has no starting experience)

Tailback (backup has 5 games starting experience)

Flanker (backup has no starting experience)

UCLA loses the following starters on Defense:

Defensive Tackle (backup has no starting experience)

Right Defensive End (backup has no starting experience)

Middle Linebacker (backup has no starting experience)

Left Corner (backup has 1 game starting experience)

Strong Safety (backup has no starting experience)

Free Safety (backup has no starting experience)

Washington loses the following starters on Offense:

---

(I could not find the data for the backup's starting experience)

Split End  
Flanker  
Center  
Right Guard  
Right Tackle  
Tight End  
Tailback

Washington loses the following starters on Defense:

Right Defensive Tackle  
Left Defensive Tackle  
Right Defensive End  
Left Outside linebacker  
Left Inside Linbacker  
Free Safety  
Strong Safety  
Right Corner

\*\*Note: I got this off of the last game played for each team for the 2007 season (UCLA vs. BYU; Washington vs. Hawaii). I am assuming those are fairly accurate depth charts as they listed who was redshirting and injured etc.

There, don't you feel a little better? I do.

Finally, both teams begin spring practice April 3rd.

I appreciate the research effort but personally I'm much less interested in how many games the backup started than whether the backup had a significant amount of playing time during those games he didn't start.

This is a valid interest. However, I did notice that many of those listed as second string were also seniors, if I recall that was especially true with UCLA. Nevertheless, I did not intend my post to be a slanted insight as to why Washington and UCLA were going to suck. On the contrary, I think that outside of Utah they will be our two toughest games. The information you seek I could not find or I would have posted it (Washington didn't even list any type of "experience" information). You are welcome to find that out and contribute.

Please don't misunderstand me. I appreciate the effort you made to obtain that info. I also understand how difficult it is to find the info I would hope to obtain. I can imagine the coaches like to keep that a little closer to the vest. When I lived in Washington I used to have sources at both u-dub and wazoo but they have all moved on to other things now. Darn it.

My biggest worry about UW is how do we slow down Locker's running game? He had 100+ yard rushing games last year (as a Frosh) against UA, Ohio State, and Wazoo, plus putting up some decent but not great passing numbers. He's the top returning rusher in the Pac-10 even though he's the QB.

I'm hoping that his running ability doesn't translate into coverage errors for our inexperienced DBs. Our offense better be clicking early or it could be a long game.

He comes from a football family - dad and three uncles all played FB at WWU.

His QB rating was 105 last year with a 47% completion rate. Interestingly he also had four unassisted tackles (I'm assuming after interceptions or fumbles). He also played CB in high school so he knows how to make the open field tackle.

In another year, this kid could be a legit Heisman candidate. Here's hoping that we don't provide him his first big headline of the season.

Edit: I forgot to mention that Locker was also the WA Class 3A high school football player of the year and Class 3A baseball player of the year (pitcher & outfielder). This off season he's playing for the Bellingham Bells western collegiate baseball league team.

Let's hope he skips spring practice. ;)

=====

---

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by raidingtombs - 2008/03/19 22:34

---

DevilPuncher wrote:

mormonrasta wrote:

Washington's defensive losses could be addition by subtraction. They were terrible last year. The new guys on the defense couldn't be any worse than the guys from last year.

This is a very good point. A team (or unit) that is mediocre (Washington and UCLA's offense) may just need an influx of new blood and spirits to turn things around - perhaps the bigger question is can they get that good feeling that early in the season?

Except they have the same coach. they'll likely be either equal or likely in their first game worst.

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by cougarfan144 - 2008/03/19 23:36

---

A bright side to facing Locker is that our coaches will have plenty of film to go on and can break down his strengths/weaknesses. If he were to come in and they had nothing to go on, I'd expect more trouble with him. I'm not discounting his ability or talent but I expect we'll be ready for the challenges he'll present and the defense will be adequately prepped as to how to maintain him in their overall goal of "managing points".

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by raidingtombs - 2008/03/20 15:16

---

cougarfan144 wrote:

A bright side to facing Locker is that our coaches will have plenty of film to go on and can break down his strengths/weaknesses. If he were to come in and they had nothing to go on, I'd expect more trouble with him. I'm not discounting his ability or talent but I expect we'll be ready for the challenges he'll present and the defense will be adequately prepped as to how to maintain him in their overall goal of "managing points".

Locker is good but all you have to do is put a man on him. He runs nearly most of the time and when he throws it is usually not a very good throw and is likely not to be caught. The guy is a run first throw maybe type of QB. He has an average arm and poor accuracy but is a great runner. I don't think he looks any farther then his first progression maybe his second if he is given time. New O-line and Jorgensen and Dulan coming in, not to mention Nixon he'll have little time to look past his 1st and he'll run. Personally I think he'll be surprised to find out how fast our LB's are.

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by craigocarson - 2008/03/20 16:03

---

DevilPuncher wrote:

penncougar wrote:

Pwride wrote:

Just for perspective:

BYU offense loses:

Center

WR

FB

BYU defense loses:

2 MLBs

1 OLB

2 CBs

2 Safeties

---

Just for Clarification, Was Matt Allen actually considered a starter. I assume that we had two wide receivers on the starting roster, Collie and Reed, and that Matt Allen was #3 and the backup. Also, I don't want to get nit picky, but was Semanoff actually the starter, or was Tonga the starter.

The only reason I'm picking this apart is that you could look at it through extreme blue goggles to say that we only lost one actual starter on Offense. Fowler could be considered a starter if you use the rational of Devil Puncher and look at the two deep of the last game to say that we only lose 6 starters on Defense instead of seven. This is a very glass half full mentality, but its true...:cheer: :cheer:

I think we will really miss Matt Allen. He had great hands and was a solid possession reciever. We wil miss him and his 3rd down conversions. And as clarification, I don't know if my original post had any "rationale" behind it other than to relay the only information I could find in terms of the players UCLA and Washington would be losing. It just happened that the only places I could find it were from the depth charts of those teams final game. I did not intend it to be a tricky way of making UCLA and Washington seem like they were losing more than they were.

Unless we have a future all conference receiver in the pack of eligible guys competing for Allens spot (Ashworth, Hafoka, Chambers????) I think we'll get about the same that we got from Mattl even if it's a combination of receivers providing it. Allen disappeared part of this year to be honest (1-2 catches a game with a couple exceptions). With Collie a year back from his mission, Reed wanting more touches, Pitta and George with serious experience, Unga, Tonga, and DiLuigi all able to catch the ball out of the backfield, all we really need to do is find a few sure handed guys to stretch the defense a little more. We have a lot of guys that could fit that bill. Now, Chambers could be an x-factor guy, but who knows? Point is, we're not going to have a hard time finding other places for 31-40 touches. (I'll bet Collie, Reed, and Pitta just as much prefer to split them for themselves).

<http://sports.espn.go.com/ncf/player/profile?playerId=148064>

(as poorly as Sete played at times (Sorenson could be an upgrade), honestly the only contribution that I think we'll miss at all on offense, would be some of what Joe Semanoff provided (again Fui and Manase as seniors oughta be able to provide what Joe did)

#### Receiving Statistics

NAME	REC	YDS	YPR	LONG	TD
Austin Collie	56	946	16.9	66	7
Dennis Pitta	59	813	13.8	45	5
Harvey Unga	44	655	14.9	53	4
Michael Reed	41	449	11.0	36	(TD) 4
Matt Allen	31	358	11.5	22	3
Manase Tonga	27	248	9.2	25	0
Andrew George	17	200	11.8	28	0
Vic So'oto	12	124	10.3	21	1
Joe Semanoff	11	70	6.4	14	2
Bryce Mahuika	1	12	12.0	12	0
Fui Vakapuna	1	4	4.0	4	0
Totals	300	3879	12.9	66	26

---

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by Hipsdamann - 2008/03/20 16:10

Good research. I would have to admit that I am a little worried for next season. The expectations are so high and BYU is on the "Persuit of Perfection". I just hope that BYU can deliver next year. They have the talent and coaching too, I hope they meet demand

---

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/03/20 16:26

Hipsdamann wrote:

Good research. I would have to admit that I am a little worried for next season. The expectations are so high and BYU is on the "Persuit of Perfection". I just hope that BYU can deliver next year. They have the talent and coaching too, I

---

hope they meet demand

If they don't meet expectations, it won't be for lack of effort. One thing I love about Bronco's teams thus far is that they've been competitors and are hard working-much more so than under Crowton and maybe more than under Edwards (from my limited knowledge, anyway).

=====

### Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by SeattleCougar - 2008/03/20 21:39

---

Actually putting a man on Locker isn't a great idea seeing BYU doesn't have anyone as fast as him. He runs somewhere between a 4.4 and 4.5 40 depending on where you get your information.

=====

### Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by splitbamboo - 2008/03/21 10:00

BYUtx wrote:

If they don't meet expectations, it won't be for lack of effort. One thing I love about Bronco's teams thus far is that they've been competitors and are hard working-much more so than under Crowton and maybe more than under Edwards (from my limited knowledge, anyway).

Isn't effort the definition of the "pursuit of perfection?" I'm not sure that the theme is to attain perfection, rather to pursue it. Thus with what I hear about the effort these guys are putting out, I'd think they are reaching the goal...

=====

### Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by TimO - 2008/03/21 11:51

---

i know how bad u-dub has been-but it's still very loud to play in, and i hope we have enough fans up there. I know about 8 kids from seattle area here at byu and none of them like football...they are all mostly into b-ball, the east coast, and other crap. I just hope we have enough fans with the high LDS up there to keep the Cougs in gear!

UCLA scares me-they lost a lot of guys especially that muppet Davis-bad man. But they take on a coach who we've beat before-the old u-dub guy. And they want revenge. This is our most important non-conference game by far. it's time to play! I'd like to see us beat the yewts by 40+, but out of teams that are non-conference i want to beat ucla more than anyone...badly

=====

### Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by MajorCougar - 2008/03/21 14:17

raidingtombs wrote:

cougarfan144 wrote:

A bright side to facing Locker is that our coaches will have plenty of film to go on and can break down his strengths/weaknesses. If he were to come in and they had nothing to go on, I'd expect more trouble with him. I'm not discounting his ability or talent but I expect we'll be ready for the challenges he'll present and the defense will be adequately prepped as to how to maintain him in their overall goal of "managing points".

Locker is good but all you have to do is put a man on him. He runs nearly most of the time and when he throws it is usually not a very good throw and is likely not to be caught. The guy is a run first throw maybe type of QB. He has an average arm and poor accuracy but is a great runner. I don't think he looks any farther then his first progression maybe his second if he is given time. New O-line and Jorgensen and Dulan coming in, not to mention Nixon he'll have little time to look past his 1st and he'll run. Personally I think he'll be surprised to find out how fast our LB's are.

Sounds like we just need to play him, like we play Brian Johnson. Force him to beat you with his arm, and not his legs... :)

---

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by CougarBandit - 2008/03/21 16:57

---

TimO wrote:

i know how bad u-dub has been-but it's still very loud to play in, and i hope we have enough fans up there. I know about 8 kids from seattle area here at byu and none of them like football...they are all mostly into b-ball, the east coast, and other crap. I just hope we have enough fans with the high LDS up there to keep the Cougs in gear!

UCLA scares me-they lost a lot of guys especially that muppet Davis-bad man. But they take on a coach who we've beat before-the old u-dub guy. And they want revenge. This is our most important non-conference game by far. it's time to play! I'd like to see us beat the yewts by 40+, but out of teams that are non-conference i want to beat ucla more than anyone...badly

If your looking at coaching hostility, I think you'll find more motivation at the OC position. I don't, however think that Norm Chow will gear-up a huge part of his preseason preparing special tricks to use vs BYU as some conference teams have done (AFA and TCU). I'm more concerned about what their DC will do, seeing as this will be the third time within a year that he gets to prepare for BYU, all vs almost the same offense and players.

More than anything, they want to win and they'll prepare well for it. But they can only go as far their players will take them. I think that maybe more than the loss of starts, talent and experience, the biggest uncertainty for UCLA may be leadership.

Last year, they were a senior dominated team with high expectations before injuries derailed them. This year the heart of their on-field leadership is gone, especially on defense. Their top leaders on the D-line, LBs, and secondary are all graduated, and probably their o-line and receivers as well. Cohesion and effective teamwork may be an issue for them.

Although the returning defensive players will be highly motivated, the offense may still be getting familiar with their new coaches and a new scheme.

---

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/03/21 19:00

---

MajorCougar wrote:

raidingtombs wrote:

cougarfan144 wrote:

A bright side to facing Locker is that our coaches will have plenty of film to go on and can break down his strengths/weaknesses. If he were to come in and they had nothing to go on, I'd expect more trouble with him.

I'm not discounting his ability or talent but I expect we'll be ready for the challenges he'll present and the defense will be adequately prepped as to how to maintain him in their overall goal of "managing points".

Locker is good but all you have to do is put a man on him. He runs nearly most of the time and when he throws it is usually not a very good throw and is likely not to be caught. The guy is a run first throw maybe type of QB. He has an average arm and poor accuracy but is a great runner. I don't think he looks any farther then his first progression maybe his second if he is given time. New O-line and Jorgensen and Dulan coming in, not to mention Nixon he'll have little time to look past his 1st and he'll run. Personally I think he'll be surprised to find out how fast our LB's are.

Sounds like we just need to play him, like we play Brian Johnson. Force him to beat you with his arm, and not his legs... :)

I wish Locker had BJ's speed. We could just have Rick Wolfley or one of the reserve linemen shadow him.

---

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/03/21 23:13

---

BYUtx wrote:

MajorCougar wrote:

raidingtombs wrote:

cougarfan144 wrote:

A bright side to facing Locker is that our coaches will have plenty of film to go on and can break down his strengths/weaknesses. If he were to come in and they had nothing to go on, I'd expect more trouble with him. I'm not discounting his ability or talent but I expect we'll be ready for the challenges he'll present and the defense will be adequately prepped as to how to maintain him in their overall goal of "managing points".

Locker is good but all you have to do is put a man on him. He runs nearly most of the time and when he throws it is usually not a very good throw and is likely not to be caught. The guy is a run first throw maybe type of QB. He has an average arm and poor accuracy but is a great runner. I don't think he looks any farther then his first progression maybe his second if he is given time. New O-line and Jorgensen and Dulan coming in, not to mention Nixon he'll have little time to look past his 1st and he'll run. Personally I think he'll be surprised to find out how fast our LB's are.

Sounds like we just need to play him, like we play Brian Johnson. Force him to beat you with his arm, and not his legs... :)

I wish Locker had BJ's speed. We could just have Rick Wolfley or one of the reserve linemen shadow him.

My fear is that Locker may show considerable improvement as a passer in his second year of D-1 competition. That would make him extremely dangerous.

Of course, maybe he'll be pretty beat up after their season opener against the ducks.

I'm glad we don't open the season with a conference game. That would really suck.

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by Ball4 - 2008/03/28 16:27

domanater wrote:

UCLAs fate rests on our ability to improve quickly on defense, (the guys like g pittman, howard, bradley, etc. etc.) The beauty is that our dline is very solid (Dulan isn't going on a mission so we're very deep) and Ben Olson is not mobile in the slightest. Jorgenson is going to have a big day. Bottom line vs UCLA, if we can run the ball against them and force Big Ben into long 3rd downs, I think we'll win by 25. If they can run and we see a lot of 3rd and shorts, Ben gets a little confidence, or Max finds ways to turn the ball over still, it will be tight.

Honestly, our toughest games this year will be Utah, Air Force, and TCU, if we can't beat washington or ucla, we'll probably drop one of those conference roadies too. Going undefeated will be a monumental task (which is why we've only done it once in our history) but we have the horses.

Dominator...will you clarify the Dulan situation? I hadn't heard about his not going on a mission.

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by Cougarbib2 - 2008/03/28 22:01

Keep in mind that at least 5 PAC 10 Teams were in the top 10 at some time last year and UW played all of them plus a Notre Dame type OOC schedule. The easy games for UW were Boise State and Hawaii at Hawaii. In other words, they had no easy games. They were not great last year, but they were not a bad team. IMHO there are few teams in college football that could have played that schedule and gone over 500. Do not take UW lightly. They have a similar schedule in 2008 and may again struggle to go much over 500, but at home they will be a formidable opponent.

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by decloucog - 2008/03/28 22:07

Cougarbib2 wrote:

---

Keep in mind that at least 5 PAC 10 Teams were in the top 10 at some time last year and UW played all of them plus a Notre Dame type OOC schedule. The easy games for UW were Boise State and Hawaii at Hawaii. In other words, they had no easy games. They were not great last year, but they were not a bad team. IMHO there are few teams in college football that could have played that schedule and gone over 500. Do not take UW lightly. They have a similar schedule in 2008 and may again struggle to go much over 500, but at home they will be a formidable opponent.

This is a great point. UW will not be a pushover (I hope that statement is wrong). I remember USC getting all they could handle from UW team that was supposed to be rotten.

---

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by raidingtombs - 2008/03/29 03:14

Cougarbib2 wrote:

Keep in mind that at least 5 PAC 10 Teams were in the top 10 at some time last year and UW played all of them plus a Notre Dame type OOC schedule. The easy games for UW were Boise State and Hawaii at Hawaii. In other words, they had no easy games. They were not great last year, but they were not a bad team. IMHO there are few teams in college football that could have played that schedule and gone over 500. Do not take UW lightly. They have a similar schedule in 2008 and may again struggle to go much over 500, but at home they will be a formidable opponent.

while i agree that UW will not be a pushover, I disagree that BSU and Hawaii were tough games. They had great records but both played extremely weak OOC games and in the WAC which for a majority of their conference is really like playing in a FCS league.

---

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by domanater - 2008/03/29 09:49

Ball4 wrote:

domanater wrote:

UCLAs fate rests on our ability to improve quickly on defense, (the guys like g pittman, howard, bradley, etc. etc.) The beauty is that our dline is very solid (Dulan isn't going on a mission so we're very deep) and Ben Olson is not mobile in the slightest. Jorgenson is going to have a big day. Bottom line vs UCLA, if we can run the ball against them and force Big Ben into long 3rd downs, I think we'll win by 25. If they can run and we see a lot of 3rd and shorts, Ben gets a little confidence, or Max finds ways to turn the ball over still, it will be tight.

Honestly, our toughest games this year will be Utah, Air Force, and TCU, if we can't beat washington or ucla, we'll probably drop one of those conference roadies too. Going undefeated will be a monumental task (which is why we've only done it once in our history) but we have the horses.

Dominator...will you clarify the Dulan situation? I hadn't heard about his not going on a mission.

Dulan is playing next year, not sure what needs to be clarified.

---

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by Cougarbib2 - 2008/03/29 15:22

I am not trying to say that BSU or UH were great teams or that UW was a great team. But those were the easy games. UW was not a bad team. UCLA was only slightly better.

By contrast, BYU had three pushover games. BYU had another three fairly easy games. Then BYU played 6 decent teams and a decent team rematch in the Las Vegas Bowl. BYU did not play any great teams so we do not know how they would have done against a Top Ten team or a team like Georgia that may have been the best team in the country at the end of the season. BYU did not lose to any bad teams but lost to two decent teams on the road in different time

zones.

In 2008, BYU plays two decent teams - UW and UCLA in OOC games and two that should be gimmes (although one of them is as good as the team that beat Michigan last year). Now if we argue that this is not true and that UCLA and UW are not decent teams -then BYU plays zero decent teams in OOC schedule. There will also end up being 2 or 3 pathetic teams on the MWC schedule. In other words, UCLA or UW would have 5 or 6 easy wins if they substituted these games for the weakest games on their schedules. In yet other words, if you have fewer wins than losses in MWC games or with poor to mediocre OOC games, you are not a good team. But if you go 5 and 7 in the PAC 10 playing Wisconsin, Syracuse, Boise State, and UH at Hawaii for OOC, you might still be a decent team. Not a great team, though.

I am not knocking BYU. I love BYU. I also know that it is almost impossible to go undefeated even if you played UNLV 12 weeks in a row at home. Put half of those games on the road and it becomes more improbable. Put half of those games in different time zones and it becomes more improbable. Put 6 of those games against decent teams like UCLA, UW, Utah, TCU, New Mexico and whomever else turns out to be decent in the MWC and it is quite improbable. Not impossible. Don't take UW or UCLA or anyone else lightly.

Go Cougs! Go Cougs! GO Cougs!

---

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by Cougarbib2 - 2008/03/29 15:35

The UW 2008 schedule is about like last year. You can't accuse UW of dodging anyone. In 2007, BYU played Arizona (won), UCLA (lost), and UCLA (won) all of whom could be said to be similar to a typical UW opponent last year or this year. BYU played Tulsa (lost), Utah (won), TCU (won), and New Mexico (won) who were decent teams. BYU did not play anyone ranked as high as the 4 best UW opponents. BYU has only beaten UCLA 2 outof about 8 tries. BYU is probably about even with UW over history in head-to-head games. BYU is probably about even with Oregon. BYU has lost far more to Arizona and ASU, but that was before the glory years. Since then BYU is about even with them. In fact, you could probably go back and look at BYU historical records back to when Lavell started, and find that BYU is about 50-50 against PAC 10 opponents.

I know I am going to lose my last karma point for this, but do not overlook anybody from the PAC 10.

Go Cougs! Go Cougs! Go Cougs!

### Washington Football Future Schedules

Note: Future football schedule are tentative and subject to change

#### 2008

##### Date Opponent

Aug. 30 at Oregon

Sept. 6 BYU

Sept. 13 Oklahoma

Sept. 27 Stanford

Oct. 4 at Arizona

Oct. 18 Oregon State

Oct. 25 Notre Dame

Nov. 1 at USC

Nov. 8 Arizona State

Nov. 15 UCLA

Nov. 22 at Washington State

Dec. 6 at California

#### 2009

##### Date Opponent

Sept. 5 To Be Determined

Sept. 12 Idaho

Sept. 19 USC

Sept. 26 at Stanford

---

Oct. 3 at Notre Dame  
Oct. 10 California  
Oct. 17 at Arizona State  
Oct. 24 Oregon  
Oct. 31 Arizona  
Nov. 7 at UCLA  
Nov. 14 at Oregon State  
Nov. 21 Washington State

2010

Date Opponent  
Sept. 4 at BYU  
Sept. 11 Syracuse  
Sept. 18 Nebraska  
Sept. 25 at California  
Oct. 2 at USC  
Oct. 9 Arizona State  
Oct. 16 Oregon State  
Oct. 23 at Arizona  
Oct. 30 Stanford  
Nov. 6 at Oregon  
Nov. 13 UCLA  
Nov. 20 at Washington State

Printer-friendly format

---

## Re:UCLA and Washingtonm - its never too early!

Posted by Cougarbib2 - 2008/03/29 15:59

I had to go check. In 2007 we went 2-1 against the PAC 10 not having played anyone in their top third finishers. We split with UCLA and beat Arizona. In 2006 we went 1-1 against PAC 10 losing to Arizona, who was not as bad as their record indicated and beating (killing) Oregon in the Bowl Game. In 2005, BYU was 0-1 against the PAC 10 - losing to Cal in the Bowl Game.

Before we fire Bronco for being 50-50 agaisnt the PAC 10 not having played any of their best teams in his timeframe, let's celebrate the fact that no matter whether you go back a few years beyond his time or a lot of years, beyond his time, BYU has not broken even against PAC 10 opponents. So we are improving under Bronco, even at 500.

Lavell had 2 or 3 good years against PAC 10 teams near the end of his tenure, but BYU is sub 500 even in his tenure. Perhaps the main reason we won the NC in 1984 is that we did not play a PAC 10 team that year. Recall that UW was #2 and most national figures argued that they should have been #1.

We are 10 below 500 if you go back to 1984. If you go back to the first year of Lavell Edwards era, we are a little further below 500 and if you go back to 1969 and count the Arizona schools that were in the WAC at the time it gets to 15 under 500. I could not bear to go any further back as we never played Pac 10 teams in those days and U of A and ASU almost always killed us and we were sub 500 almost every year.

So let us not take anyone lightly and try to go 2-0 against the PAC 10 next year and get Bronco back above 500.

Go Cougs! Buck With Bronco! Raise the Bar! Be Invested!

Bib

---

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Wow! Some really wrong information in here!!!

From what I've seen, UW cares a lot less about offense (and winning games). From what I've seen (granted, it was last year), we don't need much of a defense.

Err, it was our defense that was horrible, not our offense. Well, the offense was not great, but it wasn't horrible by any means. We lost games because our Kent Baer "bend and then break" defense couldn't hold a lead, which we had in almost every game. If our new NFL defensive coordinator can pull a one off-season miracle out of his bum then things could be interesting this year.

i agree they were no that good offesnively last year and they'll liely be even less so with a new O-line, Wr, and RB. this game should be an double digit win.

We do not have a new Oline, we lost our right tackle, we return 7 of our 8 offensive lineman who played in games last year, including all starters but the right tackle Macklin. Our center Garcia was awarded a sixth year of eligibility because of some weird academic year or something. We did lose our wide receivers but we have more talented frosh replacing them. The frosh RB Brandon Johnson got a good amount of playing time last year (including the 2nd half against the Cal Bears where he wen't for over 100 yards) and with a veteran (and big!) offensive line including a veteran FB he should put up some great numbers as he is a talented young man.

Washington loses the following starters on Offense:  
(I could not find the data for the backup's starting experience)

Split End

Flanker

Center - Garcia was awarded another year of eligibility.

Right Guard - did not lose him, still here.

Right Tackle - graduated.

Tight End - three crappy to mediocre TE's gone, young highly talented ones replacing them including Chris Izbicki (rated 4th in nation in TE recruits) and Kavario Middleton (rated #2 in nation in TE recruits).

Tailback - we lost Rankin, but we have B. Johnson and some other young guns to replace him and they will have a veteran Oline to run behind.

Washington loses the following starters on Defense:

Right Defensive Tackle

Left Defensive Tackle

Right Defensive End

- we lost our starting defensive line except for Teo-neisheim. Should be addiction by subtraction because our seniors sucked.

Left Outside linebacker

Left Inside Linbacker

- we lost one starer, Dan Howell. Butler, Savannah, Tui and Foster return.

Free Safety

Strong Safety

Right Corner

- Ouch, our secondary sucks.

My biggest worry about UW is how do we slow down Locker's running game? He had 100+ yard rushing games last year

---

(as a Frosh) against UA, Ohio State, and Wazoo, plus putting up some decent but not great passing numbers. He's the top returning rusher in the Pac-10 even though he's the QB.

I'm hoping that his running ability doesn't translate into coverage errors for our inexperienced DBs. Our offense better be clicking early or it could be a long game.

He comes from a football family - dad and three uncles all played FB at WWU.

His QB rating was 105 last year with a 47% completion rate. Interestingly he also had four unassisted tackles (I'm assuming after interceptions or fumbles). He also played CB in high school so he knows how to make the open field tackle.

In another year, this kid could be a legit Heisman candidate. Here's hoping that we don't provide him his first big headline of the season.

Locker is good but all you have to do is put a man on him. He runs nearly most of the time and when he throws it is usually not a very good throw and is likely not to be caught. The guy is a run first throw maybe type of QB. He has an average arm and poor accuracy but is a great runner. I don't think he looks any farther then his first progression maybe his second if he is given time. New O-line and Jorgensen and Dulan coming in, not to mention Nixon he'll have little time to look past his 1st and he'll run. Personally I think he'll be surprised to find out how fast our LB's are.

Locker 2007 Highlights

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BMfiq9CXss8>

For a bunch of great Husky videos check out Pumas videos on Youtube.

=====

## Re:UCLA and Washington - its never too early!

Posted by Hengst - 2008/03/31 20:10

---

MLOdaws wrote:

Wow! Some really wrong information in here!!!

From what I've seen, UW cares a lot less about offense (and winning games). From what I've seen (granted, it was last year), we don't need much of a defense.

Err, it was our defense that was horrible, not our offense. Well, the offense was not great, but it wasn't horrible by any means. We lost games because our Kent Baer "bend and then break" defense couldn't hold a lead, which we had in almost every game. If our new NFL defensive coordinator can pull a one off-season miracle out of his bum then things could be interesting this year.

i agree they were no that good offesnively last year and they'll liely be even less so with a new O-line, Wr, and RB. this game should be an double digit win.

We do not have a new Oline, we lost our right tackle, we return 7 of our 8 offensive lineman who played in games last year, including all starters but the right tackle Macklin. Our center Garcia was awarded a sixth year of eligibility because of some weird academic year or something. We did lose our wide receivers but we have more talented frosh replacing them. The frosh RB Brandon Johnson got a good amount of playing time last year (including the 2nd half against the Cal Bears where he wen't for over 100 yards) and with a veteran (and big!) offensive line including a veteran FB he should put up some great numbers as he is a talented young man.

Washington loses the following starters on Offense:

(I could not find the data for the backup's starting experience)

---

Split End

Flanker

Center - Garcia was awarded another year of eligibility.

Right Guard - did not lose him, still here.

Right Tackle - graduated.

Tight End - three crappy to mediocre TE's gone, young highly talented ones replacing them including Chris Izbicki (rated 4th in nation in TE recruits) and Kavario Middleton (rated #2 in nation in TE recruits).

Tailback - we lost Rankin, but we have B. Johnson and some other young guns to replace him and they will have a veteran Oline to run behind.

Washington loses the following starters on Defense:

Right Defensive Tackle

Left Defensive Tackle

Right Defensive End

- we lost our starting defensive line except for Teo-neisheim. Should be addition by subtraction because our seniors sucked.

Left Outside linebacker

Left Inside Linbacker

- we lost one starer, Dan Howell. Butler, Savannah, Tui and Foster return.

Free Safety

Strong Safety

Right Corner

- Ouch, our secondary sucks.

My biggest worry about UW is how do we slow down Locker's running game? He had 100+ yard rushing games last year (as a Frosh) against UA, Ohio State, and Wazoo, plus putting up some decent but not great passing numbers. He's the top returning rusher in the Pac-10 even though he's the QB.

I'm hoping that his running ability doesn't translate into coverage errors for our inexperienced DBs. Our offense better be clicking early or it could be a long game.

He comes from a football family - dad and three uncles all played FB at WWU.

His QB rating was 105 last year with a 47% completion rate. Interestingly he also had four unassisted tackles (I'm assuming after interceptions or fumbles). He also played CB in high school so he knows how to make the open field tackle.

In another year, this kid could be a legit Heisman candidate. Here's hoping that we don't provide him his first big headline of the season.

Locker is good but all you have to do is put a man on him. He runs nearly most of the time and when he throws it is usually not a very good throw and is likely not to be caught. The guy is a run first throw maybe type of QB. He has an average arm and poor accuracy but is a great runner. I don't think he looks any farther then his first progression maybe his second if he is given time. New O-line and Jorgensen and Dulan coming in, not to mention Nixon he'll have little time to look past his 1st and he'll run. Personally I think he'll be surprised to find out how fast our LB's are.

Locker 2007 Highlights

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BMfiq9CXss8>

For a bunch of great Husky videos check out Pumas videos on Youtube.

Wow, the guy can definitely move his feet (reminds me of steve young). If he can learn to throw, he might just be able to resurrect UW football.

