
Future Opponents

Posted by CWC - 2008/05/10 15:47

Future Football Opponents

Below is a list of future non-conference football opponents. Please be aware that all future schedules are tentative and subject to change. Nothing is ever final until the University announces its full schedule in late February each year.

2008

Nevada

@ Washington

UCLA

@ Utah State

2009

@ Arizona State

Florida State

Utah State

2010

Washington

@ Florida State

@ Utah State

2011

@ Washington

@ Army

Arizona State

Utah State

2012

Army

Washington

Utah State

Looking ahead gets me really excited. It's going to be a lot of fun playing the Seminoles and Arizona State.

Can someone tell me why we enter into five year contracts with Utah State?

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/05/10 16:35

Our contract is for six years, I believe-4 in Provo and 2 in Logan. It started in 06, skipped 07, and starts up again this season.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by BOID - 2008/05/10 17:00

What happened to Notre Dame? I thought we had a two and two deal with them, starting '09 or '10.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by TRUEblueBYUfan - 2008/05/10 17:33

CWC wrote:Can someone tell me why we enter into five year contracts with Utah State?

Do you want the smart "A" version?
So we can pad our record, and tell the rest of the state of Utah "shut it!"
Or would you rather hear a "proper version".
"We love the in-state rivalry and look forward to a continued tradition of what has become the quest for the Beehive
Boot/Old Wagon Wheel." :P

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/05/10 18:09

BOID wrote:

What happened to Notre Dame? I thought we had a two and two deal with them, starting '09 or '10.

We play ND there in 2010 & 2012, here in 2011 & 2013.

As to the USU games. Personally I think it sucks. All it does is give us a major hit on the SOS each year we play them. We don't need that. If we have to take an SOS hit, at least do it against a weak BCS team. We can then at least argue that we tried to find a decent opponent.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/05/10 18:18

Conosticator wrote:

BOID wrote:

What happened to Notre Dame? I thought we had a two and two deal with them, starting '09 or '10.

We play ND there in 2010 & 2012, here in 2011 & 2013.

As to the USU games. Personally I think it sucks. All it does is give us a major hit on the SOS each year we play them. We don't need that. If we have to take an SOS hit, at least do it against a weak BCS team. We can then at least argue that we tried to find a decent opponent.

Do you have a source on that ND series? I'm pretty sure that we don't have a contract as of now. Nationalchamps.net and a couple other sites used to have ND on our schedule, but now they don't.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by detmer4prez - 2008/05/10 18:19

I am pretty sure the ND series fell through.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/05/10 18:50

BYUtx wrote:

Conosticator wrote:

BOID wrote:

What happened to Notre Dame? I thought we had a two and two deal with them, starting '09 or '10.

We play ND there in 2010 & 2012, here in 2011 & 2013.

As to the USU games. Personally I think it sucks. All it does is give us a major hit on the SOS each year we play them. We don't need that. If we have to take an SOS hit, at least do it against a weak BCS team. We can then at least argue that we tried to find a decent opponent.

Do you have a source on that ND series? I'm pretty sure that we don't have a contract as of now. Nationalchamps.net and a couple other sites used to have ND on our schedule, but now they don't.

Try <http://www.geocities.com/CollegePark/5696/sched-f.htm#teams>.

In edit: Of course I'm also finding links that don't show us on the ND schedule. The planned series might have been cancelled as has been previously mentioned.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/05/10 19:01

Here is another site that says we do play ND. <http://hikend.com/futureschedules>

Does anyone really know what time it is...?

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by OLB - 2008/05/10 22:05

BYUtx wrote:

Conosticator wrote:

BOID wrote:

What happened to Notre Dame? I thought we had a two and two deal with them, starting '09 or '10.

We play ND there in 2010 & 2012, here in 2011 & 2013.

As to the USU games. Personally I think it sucks. All it does is give us a major hit on the SOS each year we play them. We don't need that. If we have to take an SOS hit, at least do it against a weak BCS team. We can then at least argue that we tried to find a decent opponent.

Do you have a source on that ND series? I'm pretty sure that we don't have a contract as of now. Nationalchamps.net and a couple other sites used to have ND on our schedule, but now they don't.

This has been discussed in a few threads over the past couple of years.

BYU does NOT have a future series with Notre Dame. I think the story is that Holmoe failed to follow up with Notre Dame after BYU made switch in schedule to helpout the Irish. I'm not saying whether it is true or not, but if I remember prior threads correctly, that seems to have been the issue. I think Val Hale had a good relationship with Notre Dame, but he was fired shortly after the start of the 2004 season -- the last time the Irish played in Provo. When Holmoe came on, BYU still had the return trip to South Bend.

National Champs had BYU and ND playing for a long time, I think mostly because some Irish fan sites thought the game was on.

I used to visit an Irish fan site, and they seemed to be okay with playing BYU -- most posters on the site seemed to prefer playing BYU over Boston College because BC fans were "morons."

I wish we would see a renewal of the series, but I don't see the two teams playing (barring a bowl match-up) anytime in the next 10 or 12 years -- at least.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by CWC - 2008/05/10 22:48

It would be kind of cool to be like Notre Dame and just play whoever you feel like it.

I'm sure it's more complicated than that but still that would be cool.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/05/10 23:32

I think part of the issue was that when ND played at AFA, the MTN contract prevented most ND fans from being able to view the game. That would make ND hesitant to do a future home & home series with any MWC team.

Also, ND always schedules seven home games every year. Now they've started to limit their away games to four at the opponents' field and then one at a "neutral" site in an area where they like to recruit - like Texas. An example of this is their scheduled neutral site game against WSU.

How would it be to have a program where you only actually play four games at the opponents' venue every year. BTW I believe the NCAA requirements require a minimum of four away games in order to be bowl eligible. They probably call that the ND rule.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by Cougy_Monster - 2008/05/11 11:09

In a 12 game season, the NCAA should require 6 home and 6 away games (or 6 home, 5 away and a neutral site) to be bowl eligible. This lopsided scheduling for the "power" schools is lame. If they had as much confidence in their team as the media does they wouldn't have a problem playing away games.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by BYUtx - 2008/05/11 15:05

Cougy_Monster wrote:

In a 12 game season, the NCAA should require 6 home and 6 away games (or 6 home, 5 away and a neutral site) to be bowl eligible. This lopsided scheduling for the "power" schools is lame. If they had as much confidence in their team as the media does they wouldn't have a problem playing away games.

I think you're on to something, Cougy. I just think there are too many things BCS teams hide behind, and scheduling 4 road games is one of them that really pisses me off. Other similar tactics include playing in the Big Ten or being Notre Dame.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by MajorCougar - 2008/05/12 10:19

Conosticator wrote:

Does anyone really know what time it is...?

"Does anybody really care?" (continuing the Chicago theme... :laugh:

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by WinnemuccaCougar - 2008/05/12 10:24

Conosticator wrote:

BOID wrote:

What happened to Notre Dame? I thought we had a two and two deal with them, starting '09 or '10.

We play ND there in 2010 & 2012, here in 2011 & 2013.

As to the USU games. Personally I think it sucks. All it does is give us a major hit on the SOS each year we play them. We don't need that. If we have to take an SOS hit, at least do it against a weak BCS team. We can then at least argue that we tried to find a decent opponent.

No more so than UNLV and SDSU the last few years. I don't want to have to play these guys either but if, in the future, it comes down to USU or a Division 2 school I would prefer USU and that is already set let's hope the forth team on the SCHDLE in the future is some one decent.

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by MajorCougar - 2008/05/12 10:26

Conosticator wrote:

BOID wrote:

What happened to Notre Dame? I thought we had a two and two deal with them, starting '09 or '10.

As to the USU games. Personally I think it sucks. All it does is give us a major hit on the SOS each year we play them. We don't need that. If we have to take an SOS hit, at least do it against a weak BCS team. We can then at least argue that we tried to find a decent opponent.

I personally don't have a problem with playing USU - there have been some historical precedence of some great games (although, others that were not so great). I personally would drop (at all possible) FCS games, schedule USU early in the season; play a decent, non-BCS opponent (Tulsa was actually that: as an example, they had a decent year and were vying for the C-USA championship); and 2 "name-brand", "BCS" schools (even if they are on the "downside"... ;) If this includes ND, then so be it. I love beating ND; besides, they do have classy fans.

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/05/12 10:54

Cougy_Monster wrote:

In a 12 game season, the NCAA should require 6 home and 6 away games (or 6 home, 5 away and a neutral site) to be bowl eligible. This lopsided scheduling for the "power" schools is lame. If they had as much confidence in their team as the media does they wouldn't have a problem playing away games.

It's not confidence in the team it's \$\$\$\$\$. Stadium revenue is BY FAR the #1 revenue source for major football programs. It makes BCS money look like chump change.

I highly doubt that Ohio State, Michigan, Florida, Texas, etc. are afraid to travel to smaller programs. They just don't want to play in a stadium with only 35,000 people or less when programs like that pack in 80-100,000 people. They lose MAJOR revenue by taking on smaller schools.

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by jaga97 - 2008/05/12 11:05

Let Notre Dame schedule all their games at home if other schools are stupid enough to agree. I wish BYU would never agree to a 2 for 1 or neutral site contract. The smaller conferences should unite and sign a pact that they will not schedule anything but home and away. Of course they need the money and that will never happen.

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by MajorCougar - 2008/05/12 11:24

mormonrasta wrote:

Cougy_Monster wrote:

In a 12 game season, the NCAA should require 6 home and 6 away games (or 6 home, 5 away and a neutral site) to be bowl eligible. This lopsided scheduling for the "power" schools is lame. If they had as much confidence in their team as the media does they wouldn't have a problem playing away games.

It's not confidence in the team it's \$\$\$\$\$. Stadium revenue is BY FAR the #1 revenue source for major football programs. It makes BCS money look like chump change.

I highly doubt that Ohio State, Michigan, Florida, Texas, etc. are afraid to travel to smaller programs. They just don't want to play in a stadium with only 35,000 people or less when programs like that pack in 80-100,000 people. They lose MAJOR revenue by taking on smaller schools.

I guess we should replace:

WF - 31,500
Duke - 33,941
Cincinnati - 35,000
WSU - 35,117

with:

UAB - 71,594
SDSU - 70,561
Rice - 70,000
Tulane - 69,703
Temple - 68,532
BYU - 64,045

:blink:

While I admit the ticket sales are a factor, I'm still not seeing Florida budge out of its swamp to come play a game at any of these venues... :P :laugh:

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/05/12 12:55

MajorCougar wrote:

I guess we should replace:

WF - 31,500
Duke - 33,941
Cincinnati - 35,000
WSU - 35,117

with:

UAB - 71,594
SDSU - 70,561
Rice - 70,000
Tulane - 69,703
Temple - 68,532
BYU - 64,045

:blink:

While I admit the ticket sales are a factor, I'm still not seeing Florida budge out of its swamp to come play a game at any of these venues... :P :laugh:

Stadium capacity doesn't mean jack unless you fill the seats. Yeah it's nice that Temple plays in a large venue, but since only 10,000 people actually go to those games they are an unattractive road destination. If you want examples of what I'm talking about look at Ohio State. Their only road nonconference game this year is at USC, last year it was

Washington, and the year before it was Texas. All of those schools have HUGE venues and crowds by college football standards.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/05/12 14:20

I'm wondering if the real reason we are playing USU is to help them stay D1 eligible? The NCAA requires (for the D1 FBS) an avg home attendance over any consecutive two year period of 15,000. Playing BYU at home in alternate years and selling out that game will probably be the only thing keeping USU in D1.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by Isola - 2008/05/12 15:05

mormonrasta wrote:

Cougy_Monster wrote:

In a 12 game season, the NCAA should require 6 home and 6 away games (or 6 home, 5 away and a neutral site) to be bowl eligible. This lopsided scheduling for the "power" schools is lame. If they had as much confidence in their team as the media does they wouldn't have a problem playing away games.

It's not confidence in the team it's \$\$\$\$. Stadium revenue is BY FAR the #1 revenue source for major football programs. It makes BCS money look like chump change.

I highly doubt that Ohio State, Michigan, Florida, Texas, etc. are afraid to travel to smaller programs. They just don't want to play in a stadium with only 35,000 people or less when programs like that pack in 80-100,000 people. They lose MAJOR revenue by taking on smaller schools.

I agree that money is a big reason why they schedule extra home games, as if they need the extra cash. It is not small wonder that most college coaches suck at the college level. Nick Saban found out that his success at LSU had less to do with his coaching ability as it did built in advantages to large schools.

The again, I would not support the idea of BYU playing road games at some dinky MAC or Sun Belt School. I think they need to thin the FBS.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by MajorCougar - 2008/05/12 15:08

mormonrasta wrote:

MajorCougar wrote:

I guess we should replace:

WF - 31,500

Duke - 33,941

Cincinnati - 35,000

WSU - 35,117

with:

UAB - 71,594

SDSU - 70,561

Rice - 70,000

Tulane - 69,703

Temple - 68,532

BYU - 64,045

:blink:

While I admit the ticket sales are a factor, I'm still not seeing Florida budge out of its swamp to come play a game at any of these venues... :P :laugh:

Stadium capacity doesn't mean jack unless you fill the seats. Yeah it's nice that Temple plays in a large venue, but since only 10,000 people actually go to those games they are an unattractive road destination. If you want examples of what I'm talking about look at Ohio State. Their only road nonconference game this year is at USC, last year it was Washington, and the year before it was Texas. All of those schools have HUGE venues and crowds by college football standards.

But stadium size was your premise in your original statement. Why does Florida ONLY play smaller programs OOC? If it was revenue-based only, wouldn't they be willing to play LARGER programs? Something doesn't add up here.

The reason that Florida (I use them as an example, because they are one of the most blatant "offenders") is because they know they can get practically every OOC game AT HOME. They "feel" that because the Conference schedule is tough, that they don't have to risk a loss when they have 4 guaranteed wins.

When was the last time Florida played anyone of significance (other than FSU) OOC?

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by gordito - 2008/05/12 15:10

Isola wrote:

mormonrasta wrote:

Cougy_Monster wrote:

In a 12 game season, the NCAA should require 6 home and 6 away games (or 6 home, 5 away and a neutral site) to be bowl eligible. This lopsided scheduling for the "power" schools is lame. If they had as much confidence in their team as the media does they wouldn't have a problem playing away games.

It's not confidence in the team it's \$\$\$\$. Stadium revenue is BY FAR the #1 revenue source for major football programs. It makes BCS money look like chump change.

I highly doubt that Ohio State, Michigan, Florida, Texas, etc. are afraid to travel to smaller programs. They just don't want to play in a stadium with only 35,000 people or less when programs like that pack in 80-100,000 people. They lose MAJOR revenue by taking on smaller schools.

I agree that money is a big reason why they schedule extra home games, as if they need the extra cash. It is not small wonder that most college coaches suck at the college level. Nick Saban found out that his success at LSU had less to do with his coaching ability as it did built in advantages to large schools.

The again, I would not support the idea of BYU playing road games at some dinky MAC or Sun Belt School. I think they need to thin the FBS.

Good points. The built-in advantages are taken for granted in the big picture but when it's SEC powerhouse against BIG 10 powerhouse all else is equal and it's style of football and good coaching that wins out.

Most importantly, why should big programs be forced to schedule smaller programs? Because it's fair? :laugh:

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by ltpwfdcm - 2008/05/12 18:04

MajorCougar wrote:

The reason that Florida (I use them as an example, because they are one of the most blatant "offenders") is because they know they can get practically every OOC game AT HOME. They "feel" that because the Conference schedule is tough, that they don't have to risk a loss when they have 4 guaranteed wins.

When was the last time Florida played anyone of significance (other than FSU) OOC?
I did a little research for the last 10 years of Florida football (since 1998) and aside from FSU, they have played Miami (FL) twice. That's it as far as non-BCS OOC games. They have played a lot of directional schools (EMU, WMU, UCF before they went to the Big East, NE La, WKy, WCarolina) They have played some semi-tough teams depending on the year, though the teams were not necessarily "good teams" the year Florida played them such as UAB, Marshall, So Miss, La Tech and Troy; and then the patsies like SJSU, MTSU, FAMU, Ohio, Ball State Fighting Letterman's, and the Citadel. I think you'll find similar slates for most "big name" schools as well as those that thrive of the success of top-tier teams simply because of their conference affiliation (see Kansas State, Duke, Baylor et al.) It seems to be a perk of being in the Big Money Club...you can schedule patsies and everyone seems to not care by and large.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by SLCreder - 2008/05/14 16:19

Conosticator wrote:

I'm wondering if the real reason we are playing USU is to help them stay D1 eligible? The NCAA requires (for the D1 FBS) an avg home attendance over any consecutive two year period of 15,000. Playing BYU at home in alternate years and selling out that game will probably be the only thing keeping USU in D1.

Former Utah State Athletic director Randy Spetman had a good relationship with Tom Holmoe probably factors more than anything on why BYU is willing to travel to Logan in 2008 and 2010. From purely a college athletics business perspective it only makes sense for BYU to insist that Utah State play all games in the series in Provo, the same holds true for Utah to insist that all future games with the Aggies be played in Rice-Eccles Stadium. Both schools do financially much better by playing the Aggies in the bigger stadiums they call home

But Utah State still has more political power both with BYU's Board of Trustees and Utah's Board of Regents and legislative committees than many can ever imagine. There has been little doubt on my mind that for BYU, Tom Holmoe has been told by one prominent and high ranking trustee who is a USU alumnus, that he must agree to; "Play Utah State in Logan or else!" One reason Tom Holmoe's predecessor was booted back in 2004 was Val Hale's inability to work with some trustees at BYU as I see it. This one trustee in particular is very difficult to work with at times, and in the observation of many still thinks BYU should operate the way they did in the Ernest L. Wilkinson era (1951-1971). Chris Hill no doubt faces similar heat from state higher education regents and legislators up at Utah.

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by TimO - 2008/05/18 21:16

i remember an article with tom holmoe where he was working with Boise st. to make a four year schedule plan. I thought that went through, but perhaps they are still working on it. Out of the 5 teams in our conference that still have yet to win a football mwc title (AFA, unlv, sdsu, wyo., and unm) we should trade one of them for BSU

=====

Re:Future Opponents

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/05/18 23:58

TimO wrote:

i remember an article with tom holmoe where he was working with Boise st. to make a four year schedule plan. I thought that went through, but perhaps they are still working on it. Out of the 5 teams in our conference that still have yet to win a football mwc title (AFA, unlv, sdsu, wyo., and unm) we should trade one of them for BSU

Let's go for a 2'fer -- WYO & UNLV for BSU.

=====