

## Football Club Budget Appeal

### What the club is asking for

- The club is asking for an increase in transport funds of **£1400**
- Still a **reduction of £1357** compared to 08/09
- Aim is to keep member costs below the ceiling of £200 pa and still reasonably priced compared to comparable sports.

### Costs of Transport

- The expected cost for home match transport in 2009/2010 is now **£17,125**.
- Falls in line with the 2008/2009 expenditure on home matches of **£15,585** with the expected **5% rise in transport costs** and the approximately **11% rise in member targets**.
- Away transport estimated to be **£8800**, all of which is covered from members own pockets.
- Total expenditure on transport for 09/10 is **£25,530**.

### What the club has done to avoid asking for subsidy

- Pushed up membership fees in 08/09 to **£50 per member (25% increase)**.
- Pushed up coach fees to **£5 per game (67% increase per game over 08/09)**. As the club plays twice a week, pushing fees up beyond this would make the sport significantly more expensive than other similar sports.
- Shared double-decker busses with other Harlington based clubs whenever possible.
- Sold excess capacity on busses to smaller Harlington based clubs.
- Used minibuses for games when few teams at home.
- Have negotiated equipment to be purchased by Sport Imperial as we were given 0 budget for equipment. We can't apply to the Harlington trust because balls are consumables and so the Harlington trust won't pay for them.
- Using 75% of our sponsorship funds to pay for transport where in previous years some of this has helped subsidise kit for players.

### Why we feel the initial budget allocation low?

- We are **only asking for 20% transport subsidy, well below the ACC allocated average**.
- Many budget lines say members should fund **60% of transport costs**. With the new proposal, club members would pay £20,097 of a total £ 25,530 for transport, approximately 80%.
- A misunderstanding with how much we rely on transport. We are the only club to play regularly on **both Wednesdays AND Saturdays** and therefore travel twice as much as comparable clubs (Harlington based clubs). On transport funding per head:

Union subsidy per member (based on 08/09 membership)	
Men's Football	£ 29.29
Women's Football	£ 40.32
Hockey	£ 53.61
Men's Rugby	£ 66.00
Women's Rugby	£ 58.06
Gaelic Football	£ 44.54

- We travel comparable distances, further and more frequently than these clubs which incur the same kinds of costs as football.
- With our increased subsidy we would be looking at **£43.00 per head**, which would put us on more of a level playing field with these other clubs.

#### Where could the money come from?

A number of clubs have received substantial budget increases despite fixed or even declining membership targets.

	09/10 Allocation	08/09 Allocation	% increase	09/10 Member Target	08/09 Members Achieved (Achieved/Target)	% increase
Aikido	£ 2,082.00	£ 824.00	153%	20	20/20	0
Basketball	£ 7,096.46	£ 4,017.45	77%	50	49/50	0
Capoeira	£ 1,226.50	£ 22.50	5351%	45	24/45	0
Judo	£ 2,302.57	£ 1,258.88	83%	20	24/20	0
Ju-Jitsu	£ 1,874.01	£ 0	-	22	16/30	-27%
Riding & Polo	£ 9,935.80	£ 7,878.33	26%	65	74/65	0
Football	£ 5,100.00	£ 7,421.76	-31%	100	99/90	11%

- Since 2005 Basketball have repeatedly missed their membership targets, yet this year they still received an increase in their subsidy of **£3079.01** (£7096.01 in 09/10, £4017.45 in 08/09).
- In 07/08 alone they had over £1500 withheld which meant other ACC clubs missed out on this money.

Alternatively there should be more parity between similar clubs (In this case the Harlington based field sports), especially for transport. There is no reason for the gulf in transport subsidy between football, rugby and hockey, despite football being the only club to play twice weekly and having higher membership targets. The difference between men's and women's football is even less understandable. All of these clubs subsidise merchandise and events for their members, where financially the football club couldn't contemplate this.

#### What would be the consequences of not receiving the increase?

- Club further raises fees.
  - Costs in excess of £200 p/a would reduce participation at university level.
  - Freshers are offered inter-halls football for free and so the Union Football club would suffer as people made do with this, instead of moving up to higher standards.
  - This would result in the possible collapse of teams and certainly deteriorating performance at all levels.
  - Football is one of the most popular sports at the college and we have in excess of 90 people representing the university every Wednesday and Saturday. The loss of these teams would certainly affect the sporting ethos as a whole at the college.
- Cancel training to save funds.

Clubs and Societies Board  
26<sup>th</sup> May 2009

- This would invariably harm the college's relationship with **QPR** who see us as one of their target projects. The relationship also brings in a significant amount of money to Harlington, which is distributed to all the clubs that play there, so these financial benefits would be at risk as well as the campus promotions such as reduced price football tickets to watch QPR.
- It would also most likely cost the club its **FA Charter Standard status** which we have recently achieved. This basically says that we are one of 10 focus universities for football development from the FA and they will help us in various ways (unfortunately not financially at the moment). This could in the future produce funds for the club and to lose it would be a great blow, both to the performance and running of the club.
- Performance at BUCS and ULU competitions would dramatically suffer.

### **Why was the appeal turned down by the ACC?**

From the minutes of the ACC meeting

#### *2. Arguments against appeal*

*'a. Ground hire and coaches come free of charge so transport is balanced'*

-Ground hire and instructors (coaches) have nothing to do with transport. However other clubs who use Harlington (for free) receive budget towards instructors and still more transport.

*'b. Other clubs based at Harlington have similar levels of financial subsidy for transport, i.e. there are no special favours for these clubs compared to other'*

-This is not the case, please see table of transport subsidy per head amongst all Harlington sports clubs

*'c. Football can find external funding from sponsorship'*

-Please see 'What we have done to avoid asking for funds?' We already have a number of sponsors and have diverted funds from kit to cover transport. Finding sponsors is not as easy as this suggests given the current financial climate.

*d. Source of additional funds not cited*

-Please see section 'Where could the money come from'!

I hope you will consider this appeal which I and a number of committee members have put a large amount of our time into. We feel it is necessary as after exploring the alternative options, this increase in budget would help the club continue to develop and represent Imperial College. I have tried to be accurate in all my figures and where I am uncertain, have been conservative in my estimates. I don't want to harm the running of other clubs as I am good friends with many fellow chairs on the ACC, but see this as the only solution to a serious problem.

Kind regards,

James Skeen

Football Club Captain 2008/2009