

---

## 2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by TimO - 2008/04/30 16:31

---

it looks like a new bowl in DC and st. petersburg, Florida are now official  
<http://sports.espn.go.com/ncf/news/story?id=3375625>

i'd love to see a bowl in provo-it'd be interesting to see who'd go but probably wouldn't happen because of the yewts location

also, if we keep up with the vegas bowl how quick will we be sick of it? Just like the holiday bowl we could potentially go for 7 plus seasons, i don't think it would bother me, if we dont go to BcS, but what are your thoughts? COUGS

Also, i'm sharing internet with byu's current football grad. asst. and is working with physical therapy and injured players under Omer, but i'll update on some players soon, though contact is quite low he frequently sees them over the summer for taping, etc.

---

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by cszjr - 2008/04/30 16:46

---

Will they be able to find teams with winning records. If memory serves me correctly, I didn't think there were that many eligible teams that didn't get invited. Who can help us here???

---

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by Yndian - 2008/04/30 16:55

---

How can anyone think more bowl games are a good idea (other than the people that make money off of them)? I thought everyone (unofficially) agreed there were already too many. It's bad enough watching the usually-lame B\_S games.

---

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by craigscarson - 2008/04/30 17:00

---

cszjr wrote:

Will they be able to find teams with winning records. If memory serves me correctly, I didn't think there were that many eligible teams that didn't get invited. Who can help us here???

Maybe they expect to reduce the rule to below .500 so teams like Notre Dame can still go to bowls in the future. :unsure:

---

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by cszjr - 2008/04/30 17:12

---

Since I believe in the free market, if you can make it pay then you should be able to do it. So, if they can market it successfully, then why are we trying to stop them???

If people would pay alot of money to see a losing team play a bowl, then I can't protect them from their own stupidity.

---

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by craigscarson - 2008/04/30 17:15

---

cszjr wrote:

---

Since I believe in the free market, if you can make it pay then you should be able to do it. So, if they can market it successfully, then why are we trying to stop them???

If people would pay alot of money to see a losing team play a bowl, then I can't protect them from their own stupidity.

i.e. Notre Dame fans

=====

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by dlouc - 2008/04/30 17:52

---

cszjr wrote:

Will they be able to find teams with winning records. If memory serves me correctly, I didn't think there were that many eligible teams that didn't get invited. Who can help us here???

I wish I could remember where I read this, but I believe there were 5 (give or take 1) bowl-eligible teams that were not invited to bowl games last year.

=====

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by Florwood - 2008/04/30 18:32

---

Interesting that the DC bowl plans on having Navy. I thought the Poinsetteeee Bowl had them penciled in every other year or so.

=====

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/04/30 18:58

---

The Navy contract ended last year.

=====

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by TimO - 2008/04/30 20:13

---

that's really weird to me that so many teams can make it into the post-season, perhaps the congress is too focused on denying bcs outsiders a way in (for the most part), and start getting rid of trashy bowls-not all are trash but there are some good trashy ones

=====

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/04/30 22:25

---

I was hoping to use my 2000th post for some wonderful insightful piece of journalistic prose, but oh well, why change try to do the impossible...

There are a couple of factors involved in the plethora of bowl games.

1. The NCAA added the 12th game option.
2. The NCAA changed the eligibility rules to allow teams with a .500 record (ie 6-6) to receive bowl invites.
3. The NCAA changed the rules to allow at least one game against an FCS team to count towards the six wins so long as the FCS school has offered at least 90% of the permitted football scholarships the previous two years.
4. Any bowl with an "at-large" berth available must offer the position to any uncommitted team with seven or more wins before they can choose a 6-6 team.

---

Last year, Troy at 8-4 was the only team with a winning record not invited to a bowl game. All other bowl eligible teams were 6-6. Troy lost out in the Texas Bowl at-large berth to TCU (7-4). Notice how there is nothing saying that the team with the best record must be chosen, only that any team with seven or more wins must be chosen before a 6-6 team.

The "gotcha" factor in all of this is that any bowl with a conference tie-in doesn't have to play by the seven wins takes precedence over six rule. Hence the race to create the tie-ins.

BTW, probably the biggest factor against the proposed SLC bowl game was that the other bowl was the BCS tie-ins.

The Congressional Bowl (only a 22% approval rating ;) ) has a tie-in with Navy and an ACC opponent - BCS and a local team with huge potential to fill the stadium with fans.

The St. Petersburg Bowl will have the Big East (BCS again) and C-USA (good chance for short travel distance, hence more likely to fill the stadium with fans).

Those backing the "Rocky Mountain Bowl" in SLC were absolutely stupid. The proposed to match a MWC team against a WAC team. Not BCS conf tie-in, hence no bowl approval.

There are 63 BCS schools and only 53 non-BCS schools in the FBS division. The non-BCS schools can never out vote the BCS. :angry:

The Rocky Mountain Bowl organizers failed to do their homework. What they should have done was sought an MWC & BCS tie-in for a couple of years, gotten the BCS schools "buy-in" then once the tie-in expired, switch over to the MCW - WAC game. It is much easier to get forgiveness that to get permission with the BCS cartel running things.

Where do I apply for the job of analyzing how to beat the BCS at their own game? Whoever is doing that for the MWC & WAC is living in a dream world. :angry:

=====

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/04/30 22:38

---

BTW, the Congressional Bowl originally was to be Navy vs a MAC team and got changed at the last minute to an ACC team with the MAC as a backup in case the ACC was unable to come up with a 9th bowl eligible team. The most they have had so far has been eight.

This is an example of a non-BCS conference getting screwed by the BCS cartel. If the ACC tie-in had not been involved, the Rocky Mtn Bowl might have had a chance for approval.

Now the MAC gets the table scraps but at least they get something.

When is the Federal government going to do something about breaking up this cartel?

=====

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by Mars - 2008/05/02 05:01

---

cszjr wrote:

Will they be able to find teams with winning records. If memory serves me correctly, I didn't think there were that many eligible teams that didn't get invited. Who can help us here???

7. 7 bowl-eligible teams that didn't play in a bowl game last year (like Wyoming in 2006, and New Mexico in 2005). All non-BCS. Coincidence?

=====

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by cszjr - 2008/05/02 07:08

Thanks mars.

---

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by CAFB\_04-12 - 2008/05/02 11:17

---

craigoscarson wrote:

cszjr wrote:

Will they be able to find teams with winning records. If memory serves me correctly, I didn't think there were that many eligible teams that didn't get invited. Who can help us here???

Maybe they expect to reduce the rule to below .500 so teams like Notre Dame can still go to bowls in the future. :unsure:  
Who needs to go to a bowl game when the BCS will pay you millions for not even coming close?

---

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by TimO - 2008/05/02 18:21

---

cszjr wrote:

Will they be able to find teams with winning records. If memory serves me correctly, I didn't think there were that many eligible teams that didn't get invited. Who can help us here???

the rules may change to allow teams with losses to lower divisions or out of conference to disregard a single loss...that would enable 5-6 records to go to a bowl...which is stupid and will never happen, but if the yewts basketball team that DOESN'T deserve a postseason tourney goes and gets more practice in the other other tourney, then it'd make sense to me to have that rule in football change so that if the yewts did happen to go 5-6 or 4-7 they'd still get to go bowlin' cruel irony? yes, possibility? soon if bowls keep popping out of holes in albeq., boise, and such

---

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by AF\_Puma - 2008/05/05 06:31

---

Just like Boise, I would have no desire to go to a bowl game in Washington DC or to Salt Lake City. If it isn't at least 50-60's normally that time of the year, then let's not have a bowl game there unless they have an indoor facility.

---

## Re:2 more bowls on the way, sorry salt lake

Posted by MajorCougar - 2008/05/05 10:38

---

AF\_Puma wrote:

Just like Boise, I would have no desire to go to a bowl game in Washington DC or to Salt Lake City. If it isn't at least 50-60's normally that time of the year, then let's not have a bowl game there unless they have an indoor facility.

I would exclude the Motor City Bowl, in Detroit, even with its indoor facility. Another dumpy bowl in yet another dumpy city.