



2014 HACC Cases/Players/Assignments

Problem #	Player	Team	Position	Midpoint Salary
1	Cody Franson	Toronto Maple Leafs	D	\$3,300,000
2	Lars Eller	Montreal Canadiens	F	\$3,500,000
3	Derick Brassard	New York Rangers	F	\$5,000,000

TEAM ASSIGNMENTS

	<i>Pacific</i>	<i>Central</i>	<i>Metropolitan</i>	<i>Atlantic</i>
Assignment	Franson- Player Eller- Club Brassard- Player	Franson - Club Eller- Player Brassard- Club	Franson - Player Eller - Player Brassard - Club	Franson - Club Eller - Club Brassard- Player
Team	UofT 1 (Team 1)	UNB (Team 9)	UofT 2 (Team 17)	McGill 1 (Team 25)
	McGill 2 (Team 2)	Osgoode 1 (Team 10)	Queen's 1 (Team 18)	UBC (Team 26)
	USask 1 (Team 3)	Queen's 3 (Team 11)	Osgoode 4 (Team 19)	Osgoode 2 (Team 27)
	Queen's 4 (Team 4)	USask 2 (Team 12)	Sherbrooke 1 (Team 20)	Sherbrooke 2 (Team 28)
	Queen's 2 (Team 5)	Western 1 (Team 13)	McGill 3 (Team 21)	UofT 3 (Team 29)
	Osgoode 3 (Team 6)	UOttawa 1 (Team 14)	Tulane (Team 22)	Toledo (Team 30)
	Western 2 (Team 7)	Windsor 2 (Team 15)	Calgary 1 (Team 23)	Calgary 2 (Team 31)
	Windsor 1 (Team 8)	Western 3 (Team 16)	UOttawa 2 (Team 24)	Windsor 3 (Team 32)



Teams assigned to the Player/NHLPA side are to argue that the player is worth at least one dollar above the midpoint salary, while teams assigned to the Club side are to argue that the player is worth at least one dollar below the midpoint salary. Please see below for further instructions.

Recommended Procedures for Comparable Player Analysis

Note: Please refer to Article 12 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the National Hockey League and the National Hockey League Players' Association for the permissible and non-permissible evidence in salary arbitration.

Definitions

1. "Player at Hand" is the player who is arbitration-eligible in the HACC's case/problem.
2. "Valid Comparable Player" is a player that either side may use in arguing/presenting their case.
3. "Representative" is the team that is advocating on behalf of either the Player/NHLPA or Club in relation to the HACC case/problem.
4. "Platform Year" is the year immediately preceding a player's arbitration eligibility.
5. "Award" is the salary that the arbitration-eligible player either was awarded by an arbitrator or negotiated with his club.

Step 1: Understand the Player at Hand and Valid Evidence

1. The Representative of the Player or the Club must have an understanding of the overall performance of the Player at Hand, including his statistical performance during his Platform Year and over the duration of his career.
2. The Representative should have a strong understanding of the player's injury history (if any) and whether his injuries (if any) affected his performance.
3. The Representative should know the player's overall value to his current club, including his years of service, age, contribution to the club's success/failure, and any leadership or public appeal qualities.

Step 2: Identify Valid Comparable Players

1. Only players who were arbitration-eligible at the end of the 2013-2014 or the 2012-2013 NHL Seasons are Valid Comparable Players. In other words, players who were arbitration eligible during the 2014 (current) off-season or 2013 (last) off-season are Valid Comparable Players. The players must have either reached a negotiated settlement with their respective club or received an arbitration award during one of these two off-seasons.

2. The most relevant and persuasive comparable players are those that either received an award from an arbitrator or settled with their club prior to arbitration for a contract of not more than 2 years in length. *

**Note:* Players who settled with their club for a contract longer than 2 years may also be used as comparables, but they are less persuasive than comparables who meet criteria (1) and (2) above.

3. If there are only a few players available as valid comparables who match the above criteria from this or last off-season, then players who settled with their club or who were awarded a salary in arbitration in off-seasons prior to the 2013 off-season may be used as comparables. These players, however, are the least persuasive.

4. Forwards should only be compared to forwards, defensemen to defensemen, and goalies to goalies.

Step 3: Compare the Statistics and Relevant Salary of the Player at Hand with Valid Comparable Players

1. When examining the Valid Comparable Players' age, use the players' age from the off- season during which he signed the relevant contract or was awarded the relevant arbitration salary.

2. Each side may use either the comparables' actual salary or the Average Annual Value of the comparables' contracts and may introduce arguments as to why that salary is the appropriate/relevant one.