

PART C – Decision under Appeal

The decision under appeal is the Ministry of Social Development and Social Innovation (ministry) reconsideration decision dated October 31, 2013 which denied the appellant's request for a supplement for moving costs. The ministry held that the requirements of Section 55 of the *Employment and Assistance for Persons With Disabilities Regulation* (EAPWDR) were not met as the ministry found:

- the amount of \$1,701.88 claimed by the appellant included items that do not fall within the definition of "moving costs;" and,
- there was insufficient information to establish that the amount of \$1,701.88 claimed by the appellant as moving costs was the least expensive appropriate mode of moving.

PART D – Relevant Legislation

Employment and Assistance for Persons With Disabilities Regulation (EAPWDR), Section 55

Employment and Assistance for Persons With Disabilities Act (EAPWDA), Section 5

PART E – Summary of Facts

The evidence before the ministry on Reconsideration included the following documents:

- 1) Shelter Information for the appellant dated August 14, 2013 and stamped received by the ministry on August 16, 2013, indicating an address for intended rental with B.C. Housing as of September 1, 2013, with the appellant's portion at \$595.00 per month, and the total rent being \$1,105.00 for 3 adults and 2 children, and a handwritten notation "document signing August 20, 2013";
- 2) Receipts for purchases that total \$730.98 as follows:
 - August 21, 2013 for \$15.27 from a grocery store for soft drinks and cigarettes;
 - August 24, 2013 for \$45.00 from a gas station for fuel;
 - August 25, 2013 for \$23.47 from a gas station for cigarettes;
 - August 26, 2013 for \$24.85 from a grocery store for cigarettes;
 - August 26, 2013 for \$9.08 from a grocery store for soft drinks and dog food;
 - August 26, 2013 for \$40.00 from a gas station for fuel;
 - August 26, 2013 for \$2.22 from a store for soft drinks;
 - August 26, 2013 for \$37.65 from a pizza restaurant;
 - August 27, 2013 for \$65.19 from a grocery store for soft drinks and food;
 - August 27, 2013 for \$33.14 from a grocery store for cigarettes;
 - August 28, 2013 for \$31.06 from a convenience store for cigarettes;
 - August 28, 2013 for \$20.98 from a pizza restaurant;
 - August 28, 2013 for \$31.11 from a fast food restaurant for food;
 - August 28, 2013 for \$34.65 from a pizza restaurant;
 - August 29, 2013 for \$30.27 from a fast food restaurant for food;
 - August 29, 2013 for \$167.72 from a equipment rental company for rental of a van trailer from August 23, 2013 to August 29, 2013
 - August 30, 2013 for \$5.34 from a dollar store for drinks;
 - August 31, 2013 for \$20.90 from a fast food restaurant for food;
 - August 31, 2013 for \$9.73 from a dollar store for drinks; and,
 - August 31, 2013 for \$83.35 from a towing service transferring a vehicle to the appellant's new address.
- 3) Receipts for cash withdrawals that total \$200.00 as follows:
 - August 29, 2013 for \$120.00 with notation "cash towards labour"; and,
 - August 30, 2013 for \$80.00 with notation "\$60.00 towards labour".
- 4) Savings Account Statement for the period August 16, 2013 through August 31, 2013 with amounts circled that total \$1,526.08, and notations indicating items as follows:
 - August 20, 2013- \$315.00 for "access" and \$22.17 for "food";
 - August 21, 2013- \$60.00 for "labor" and \$15.27 for "cigs- labor";
 - August 22, 2013- \$40.00 for "labor" and \$34.59 for "lunch-labor";
 - August 23, 2013- \$27.75 for "fuel" and \$200.00 for "labor";
 - August 24, 2013- \$30.00 for "labor" and \$68.47 for "food";
 - August 26, 2013- \$59.67 for "food", \$23.47 for "lunch", \$40.00 for "fuel", \$10.98 for "cigs-labor", and \$37.65 for "food";
 - August 27, 2013- \$40.00 for "food",
 - August 28, 2013- \$80.00 for "labor", \$31.06 for "cigarettes-labor";
 - August 29, 2013- \$120.00 for "labor", \$30.00 for "lunch";
 - August 30, 2013- \$40.00 for "labor", \$60.00 for "labor";

- August 31, 2013- \$140.00 for "labor"; and,
 - Handwritten notes: "Total cost of move: \$1,581.88 plus \$120.00, totals \$1,701.88."
- 5) Undated note in which the appellant wrote that he spoke with the supervisor about the moving expense and "we have been cleared for refund of total cost of the move, most receipts are not there because we did not know that it would be covered until August 30, 2013 so we have shown on bank record most of what we have spent towards this move;" and,
 - 6) Request for Reconsideration dated October 18, 2013.

At the hearing, the appellant provided additional documents as follows:

- 1) Print out of excerpts of the legislation;
- 2) Application for BC Housing by the appellant's spouse dated February 26, 2013;
- 3) Psycho-educational Assessment dated June 17, 2011 for the appellant's son which concluded in part that the appellant's son should be identified as a student with mild intellectual disabilities, as a temporary diagnosis pending further assessment;
- 4) Consultation Report dated October 17, 2012 for the appellant's son which concluded in part that the appellant's son has a number of neurodevelopmental and neuropsychiatric challenges including intellectual disability, and not autism spectrum disorder.
- 5) Consultation Report dated February 25, 2013 for the appellant's son which concluded in part that the appellant's son is almost at the moderately intellectual disability range;
- 6) Diagnostic Assessment Summary dated July 3, 2013 for the appellant's son which includes diagnoses for autism spectrum disorder, mild intellectual disability, ADHD;
- 7) Speech-Language Assessment Report dated July 4, 2013 for the appellant's son; and,
- 8) Occupational Therapy Consultation Report for the appellant's son stamped July 10, 2013.

In his Request for Reconsideration, the appellant wrote that the ministry failed to investigate the family history which provided the basis for this move. The appellant wrote that his family would not have accepted the new housing unit if he knew the cost would come out of his disabled son's benefits. The ministry referred to this benefit as a 'resource' and denied his moving expenses. The ministry admitted that his family is eligible for this move based on the regulations. The payment of \$1,701.98 has created undue hardship on their disabled son and the entire household unit. This money is required to provide services for their son's health and well-being.

In his Notice of Appeal dated November 19, 2013, the appellant wrote that his family meets the moving allowance criteria and the ministry has confirmed this. The appellant wrote that his family is experiencing financial hardship and severe stress as a result of this move. The appellant provided a list of ministry and health professionals who can verify that his family needed to move. The appellant wrote that he and his partner have health issues, their son suffers from a range of issues, and their adult daughter has a young son. Their son has autism but was not diagnosed until July 3, 2013 and received the increase in the child tax benefit for children with disabilities in one lump sum. The appellant wrote that if the [moving] expense was to be solely theirs, they would not have moved even though deemed necessary. The appellant wrote that the money received for their son's child tax benefit is exempt income. The ministry did not have to provide a damage deposit as a result of the family moving into low income housing and the ministry admits to not processing their file properly. Although the ministry stated that the family put the shelter confirmation in on August 19, 2013, that is not true because the family put the shelter confirmation in on August 16, 2013 and it is stamped with that date.

At the hearing, the appellant's advocate stated that:

- The documents relating to the appellant's son show the reason for the public health nurse's recommendation that the family unit move as their previous residence was "not liveable for anyone."
- The ministry confirmed that the information regarding the appellant's move had been received on August 16, 2013 but was not processed until August 29, 2013. The ministry subsequently requested that the appellant submit the receipts for the moving costs to be reviewed for reimbursement.
- There is no limit set out in legislation on the amount that the ministry can reimburse for the cost of moving, but the ministry told the appellant that they can only pay a maximum of \$500.00 for moves. No one would move for the cost of \$1,700.00 if they were told that all they would be getting towards the cost was \$500.00. In some cases, the ministry may only pay for the cost of a truck, but in the appellant's circumstances it was a move for a family of 5 people.

At the hearing, the appellant's spouse stated that:

- The move into the BC Housing unit was a "mental health necessity" for her son. He has autism and the extra amount received from the federal government is to assist with his schooling and to help "avoid embarrassment" when he is on public transit.
- If they had known that they would have to use part of their son's Child Tax Benefit (CTB) payment to cover the cost of their move, they would not have moved.
- Their son's CTB payment came in a lump sum in July 2013 and they reported the amount of \$8,072.00 to the ministry. The amount of the CTB is exempt and these were their son's funds and not to be used for moving costs. She has taken "a few bucks" to get their vehicle going and to get some new bath towels but she only has one set of clothes and is using old, soiled shoes and has not used any of the money received for new clothes for herself.
- On July 29, 2013, BC Housing let them know that a suite was available for them and she went to look at it. The representative for BC Housing told her that she would not have to contact the ministry because BC Housing would contact the ministry directly and the process for providing shelter documents would be by-passed. The representative for BC Housing then went on holidays.
- On August 1, 2013, she told the ministry that they would be moving. The ministry said that 2 quotes for moving costs would be required but to hold off until confirmation had been received from the ministry that the move was approved.
- She submitted the shelter information to the ministry on August 16, 2013, and pointed out that this was a Friday so the ministry's claim that the information had been submitted on August 18, 2013 meant that it was submitted on a Sunday, which is not correct. As to her efforts to get quotes for moving, the appellant stated "a blind man cannot cross the street without direction" and she was waiting for a call from the ministry to say the move had been approved and the call "never came."
- At the document signing with BC Housing on August 20, 2013, she was told that nothing more needed to be submitted to the ministry for shelter information as there is a "behind the scenes" connection between BC Housing and the ministry.
- She called some places to get a truck but everything was booked and she was told that if she had called at the beginning of August it would not have been a problem.
- The three men who agreed to help them move wanted food every day and she would make them sandwiches and they bought other food for snacks for the men as an incentive to keep them coming back. They had to get a pack of cigarettes for each of them every day, which was in lieu of cash for the cost of their labour. The appellant clarified that the receipt that

included an amount for dog food had a notation that they were not claiming the amount of the dog food from the ministry and that \$1.08 was noted as deducted from that receipt.

- The labour costs are for the men to work 8 hours per day for 6 days. It took them 6 days to move and they rented a trailer for the van owned by one of the men, which they had for 5 days. The trailer's taillights were broken for one day and it took a day for the rental company to fix it. They also paid for fuel for the van that the men used.
- Just before the move, the appellant had gone through two procedures on the one kidney he still has left. His instructions were to not lift anything heavy for several weeks. She could not do the move herself as she was caring for their son.
- On August 24, 2013, the ministry called and advised that they had received information about the appellant's daughter's move but the costs of her move would not be covered.
- On August 30, 2013, the ministry said to submit the receipts for the appellant's move for reimbursement.
- Their son is benefitting from the move. He has his own room and "dances around" because he is happier, and they made a decision to get a bigger place and this makes the family unit better by improving everyone's mental health.

At the hearing, the appellant stated that:

- Their previous residence was a 2-bedroom unit for 5 people in a high rise building. It was not liveable for anyone. The landlord there was "a terror" and if they did not get another place they would be "out on the streets."
- He and his spouse were also answering to all the people involved in assessing their son.
- Although the ministry had told them that the cost of their daughter's move would not be covered, her belongings were minimal and included a bed, lap top, suitcase and some baby possessions. The bulk of the move was for items belonging to him and his spouse.
- On August 22, 2013, they felt they were "trapped into a move" and they had to go and round up some "unsavoury" individuals at a coffee shop near an employment office to help them get their belongings moved. They found a man who had a van and two younger men to do the lifting. They agreed to work on an hourly basis for an average of \$10 per hour each plus all the cigarettes, food and drinks that they needed each day.
- Looking at the Savings Account Statement for the period August 16, 2013 through August 31, 2013, the charge of \$315.00 for "access" on August 20, 2013 is the pro-rated rent to get into the new place early to give them time to do the move. The August 31, 2013 expense for \$83.35 from a towing service was to transfer their vehicle to the appellant's new address, since it was not mechanically able to be driven and was not insured and had just been parked at their previous residence.
- They feel that they incurred all these expenses and were "dropped into it" because the ministry "dropped the ball" in not advising them that the cost of the move had been approved. Since they had not booked ahead, this was the cheapest way to move because it was the only way they could move.
- If they had known that all the ministry would pay towards the cost of a move is \$500.00, they would not have moved.

The Ministry relies on the reconsideration decision which stated that the appellant is a recipient of disability assistance, with a spouse with Persons With Disabilities (PWD) designation and a dependent child. On July 31, 2013 the appellant requested a moving supplement to move his family unit as well as his adult daughter and her young son, who reside with him. The appellant was

advised that once the ministry determined that his shelter costs would be lower, he would be requested to submit two estimates for moving costs. The appellant submitted information regarding his new accommodations on August 16, 2013 but the ministry did not process this information until August 29, 2013, and determined that the appellant's rental costs were reduced. The ministry requested that the appellant submit his receipts for his moving costs for the ministry to review.

At the hearing, the ministry stated:

- The basis for the ministry's offer to pay \$500 towards the appellant's moving costs is not clear, although it was not determined by some set limit or amount, but it was a one-time offer made to alleviate some hardship.
- The ministry requires that approval be obtained prior to costs being incurred as the ministry must apply due diligence in expending public funds and determine the reasonableness of the expenses being claimed.
- There might have been a misunderstanding about not getting quotes for the move as the ministry does not want to raise expectations that the cost will be covered and wants to spare the client the trouble of getting the quotes prematurely before approval has been given. However, the ministry told them back in July that they would need 2 estimates.
- The ministry is not responsible for any comments made to the appellant by BC Housing.
- While the ministry confirmed that the appellant's shelter information was submitted on August 16, 2013 and was not processed until August 29, 2013, there is also a question about the efforts that the appellant made to follow up with the ministry to determine whether approval had been obtained and whether she could get the quotes in the meantime. There is no file note indicating that the appellant requested a call back from the ministry once the shelter information was submitted.
- In order to have a basis of comparison and to determine the "least expensive" appropriate mode of moving, the ministry requires a minimum of two quotes and possibly more and these are typically obtained from moving companies.
- The ministry does not have the authority or discretion to expand the definition of "moving costs" as set out in the legislation and many of the items claimed by the appellant, such as food and cigarettes, do not fall within this definition.
- Since the expenses being claimed by the appellant are very unusual in not being a quote or an invoice from a moving company, the onus is placed on the appellant to provide sufficient information to show why the amounts should be included as moving costs and why it took so long for the move, and this information was not provided at reconsideration.
- Although amounts are claimed for "labour", there are not even handwritten receipts from the people who helped with the move to substantiate that these costs have been incurred, or a letter saying that they were accepting food in lieu of cash.

The ministry did not object to the admissibility of the new documents but pointed out that the reason for the appellant's move was not in dispute at reconsideration and the new documents, therefore, are not relevant to the appeal. The ministry also pointed out that these documents all pre-date the reconsideration decision but were not provided by the appellant at reconsideration. There were no objections raised to the oral testimony on behalf of either the appellant or the ministry. The panel reviewed the Application to BC Housing and the Reports for the appellant's son and admitted them into evidence, as well as the oral testimony on behalf of the appellant and the ministry, under Section 22(4) of the *Employment and Assistance Act*, as relating to the circumstances of the appellant's family unit around the time of their move and being in support of the information that was before the ministry on reconsideration. The panel received the excerpts of the legislation as argument.

PART F – Reasons for Panel Decision

The issue on this appeal is whether the decision by the ministry, which denied the appellant's request for a supplement for moving costs under Section 55 of the *Employment and Assistance for Persons With Disabilities Regulation* (EAPWDR) in the amount of \$1,701.88 because it included items that do not fall within the definition of "moving costs" and there was insufficient information to establish that this was the least expensive appropriate mode of moving, was reasonably supported by the evidence or a reasonable application of the applicable enactment in the circumstances of the appellant.

The relevant legislative criteria to be considered eligible for the supplement for moving costs are set out in Section 55 of the EAPWDR as follows:

Supplements for moving, transportation and living costs

55 (1) In this section:

"living cost" means the cost of accommodation and meals;

"moving cost" means the cost of moving a family unit and its personal effects from one place to another;

"transportation cost" means the cost of travelling from one place to another.

- (2) Subject to subsections (3) and (4), the minister may provide a supplement to or for a family unit that is eligible for disability assistance or hardship assistance to assist with one or more of the following:
- (a) moving costs required to move anywhere in Canada, if a recipient in the family unit is not working but has arranged confirmed employment that would significantly promote the financial independence of the family unit and the recipient is required to move to begin that employment;
 - (b) moving costs required to move to another province or country, if the family unit is required to move to improve its living circumstances;
 - (c) moving costs required to move within a municipality or unincorporated area or to an adjacent municipality or unincorporated area because the family unit's rented residential accommodation is being sold or demolished and a notice to vacate has been given, or has been condemned;
 - (d) moving costs required to move within a municipality or unincorporated area or to an adjacent municipality or unincorporated area if the family unit's shelter costs would be significantly reduced as a result of the move;
 - (e) moving costs required to move to another area in British Columbia to avoid an imminent threat to the physical safety of any person in the family unit;
 - (f) transportation costs and living costs required to attend a hearing relating to a child protection proceeding under the *Child, Family and Community Service Act*, if a recipient is given notice of the hearing and is a party to the proceeding;
 - (g) transportation costs, living costs, child care costs and fees resulting from
 - (i) the required attendance of a recipient in the family unit at a hearing, or
 - (ii) other requirements a recipient in the family unit must fulfil in connection with the exercise of a

maintenance right assigned to the minister under section 17 [categories that must assign maintenance rights].

- (3) A family unit is eligible for a supplement under this section only if
- (a) there are no resources available to the family unit to cover the costs for which the supplement may be provided, and
 - (b) a recipient in the family unit receives the minister's approval before incurring those costs.
- (4) A supplement may be provided under this section only to assist with
- (a) the cost of the least expensive appropriate mode of moving or transportation, and
 - (b) in the case of a supplement under subsection (2) (f) or (g), the least expensive appropriate living costs.

The ministry acknowledged that the appellant's move falls within Section 55(2)(d) of the EAPWDR since his family unit moved to an adjacent municipality and the family unit's shelter costs were significantly reduced as a result of the move. The ministry's position is that the amount of \$1,701.88 that the appellant submitted for moving costs included the cost of food and cigarettes and these items are not reasonably considered "moving costs." The ministry argued that the appellant failed to provide information to establish why food and cigarettes are reasonably included in "moving costs" or to explain why the costs were incurred over several days for a local move. The ministry argued that there is insufficient information to establish that the amount of \$1,701.88 is the least expensive appropriate mode of moving the appellant's family and his personal effects.

The appellant's position is that the ministry confirmed that the information regarding the appellant's move had been received on August 16, 2013 but was not processed by the ministry until August 29, 2013, and the ministry subsequently requested that the appellant submit the receipts for the moving costs to be reviewed for reimbursement due to the ministry's error. The advocate argued that there is no limit set out in legislation on the amount that the ministry can reimburse for the cost of moving and no one would move for the cost of \$1,700.00 if they were told that they would only be reimbursed \$500.00. The appellant argued that the amount of \$1,701.88 claimed is the least expensive mode as it was the only way for them to move at that time because neither he nor his spouse were able to assist with the move. The appellant argued that the men hired took 6 days to complete the move due to the appellant's health and child care issues and they required payment in food, cigarettes, and fuel in lieu of cash, as well as cash, in exchange for their labour.

Panel decision
"Moving cost"

Section 55(1) of the EAPWDR sets out a definition of "moving cost" to mean "the cost of moving a family unit and its personal effects from one place to another." As the ministry pointed out at the hearing, because the definition for moving cost is set out in the legislation, the ministry does not have the authority or discretion to include items that do not properly fall within that definition. The ministry stated that usually a claim is made under this section for the cost of having a moving company move a family unit's personal effects from one place to another. In the typical scenario, the moving company would, therefore, supply the equipment and manpower to effect the move and provide both an estimate and invoice for the cost. The panel finds that there is nothing in the definition of "moving cost" that requires a moving company's involvement; however, to fall within the definition of "moving cost," the panel finds that a cost must be directly related to moving personal effects, for example, the

rental of equipment or a vehicle to transport the personal effects, fuel required to operate the vehicle to transport the personal effects, the cost of labour to load and unload the personal effects onto/off a vehicle and into the new residence and to pack and unpack the personal effects.

Considering the amount claimed by the appellant for "moving costs," the items listed on a savings account statement supplied by the appellant and in copies of receipts covering the period August 20 through August 31, 2013 included amounts expended for food, soft drinks, and cigarettes. The panel finds that the ministry reasonably determined that these items are not directly related to moving the personal effects of the appellant's family unit, and are more in the nature of personal expenses. While the appellant argued that the men who conducted the move required payment through goods in lieu of cash in order to keep them coming back, the appellant ultimately intended to claim for moving costs from the ministry and the onus fell on him to ensure that these personal costs could be accepted by the ministry for reimbursement. The appellant explained that the charge of \$315.00 for "access" on August 20, 2013 is the pro-rated rent to get into the new place early to give them time to do the move, and the panel finds that this is a rent expense and not directly related to the cost of moving the family unit's personal effects from one place to another.

The items listed by the appellant included cash withdrawals totaling \$770.00 which the appellant stated were paid directly to the 3 men for "labour" in conducting the move; however, the ministry pointed out at the hearing that there is not even a handwritten receipt to substantiate the nature of the services that were provided for these sums, or specify to whom they were paid. The panel finds that the ministry reasonably required more information to confirm that these amounts were expended for moving costs. The items listed by the appellant also included an invoice for \$167.72 for rental of a van trailer for 6 days, \$112.75 for fuel, and an invoice for \$83.35 from a towing service for transferring his vehicle to the new residence, and the panel finds that these costs, totaling \$363.82, are verified by receipt for specific services and are directly related to moving the appellant's personal effects and would, therefore, fall within the definition of moving costs.

Least expensive appropriate mode

Section 55(4) of the EAPWDR stipulates that a supplement may be provided only to assist with the cost of the least expensive appropriate mode of moving, and the panel finds that there must be at least two options provided for a mode of moving in order for there to be a determination that one mode is the "least expensive." The appellant's spouse acknowledged that the ministry advised her on August 1, 2013 that 2 quotes for moving costs would be required, but she stated that the ministry also told her to hold off getting the quotes until approval for the move had been received from the ministry. As the appellant pointed out, the shelter information was submitted to the ministry on Friday, August 16, 2013 and, although approval for the move had not yet been received from the ministry, the appellant began to incur expenses that he claimed as "moving costs" on Tuesday, August 20, 2013.

The appellant's spouse stated that she called some places to get a truck but "everything was booked and the appellant argued that this was "the only way they could move" and was, therefore, the cheapest mode of moving. However no further information was provided regarding how many moving companies the appellant's spouse contacted or confirmation from those companies contacted that there were no trucks available in the time period prior to September 1, 2013. Furthermore, there is no evidence to indicate that she attempted to let the ministry know that they could not secure a moving truck and to discuss any other options for the move. The appellant stated that they had to incur all the listed expenses because the ministry "dropped the ball" in not advising them that the

move had been approved; however, the appellant did not claim to have asked the men for an estimate or to have considered any other options for a mode of moving besides the 3 men he approached at a coffee shop, even when he was faced with a demand for payment in goods in lieu of cash as well as cash, for which the men would not properly provide receipts.

The ministry pointed out at the hearing that the process of obtaining a minimum of 2 quotes helps to ensure that value is obtained when expending funds, particularly since the person providing the quote is required to estimate in advance the amount that will be charged for the move. The wording of Section 55 emphasizes that a supplement may be provided by the ministry "only" to assist with the cost of the least expensive option, and the panel finds there was no option explored by the appellant that resulted in a quote or an estimate being obtained in order to allow the ministry to exercise its due diligence and determine that the amount claimed was the least expensive appropriate mode of moving.

The appellant acknowledged that the ministry advised that the cost to move the appellant's daughter would not be covered. The appellant and his spouse and son moved from a 2-bedroom apartment and yet the costs claimed for moving span a period of 12 days, from August 20, 2013 through August 31, 2013, being the date span on the receipts the appellant provided. The appellant argued that the move took several days because he could not assist with lifting anything heavy due to recent medical procedures he had undergone, and his spouse was occupied with caring for their son; however, the appellant hired 3 men to conduct the move on their behalf and there was no further information provided to explain why it took 3 men so long to move the personal effects of the appellant's family unit from one location to another.

As discussed above, the amount of \$1,701.88 claimed by the appellant includes many items which are not properly considered "moving costs," and the total itself is not supported by the information provided. For example, the receipts provided sub-total \$730.98, less \$1.08 deducted for the dog food expense, and the amounts circled on the savings account statement sub-total \$1,526.08, for a total of \$2,255.98, less entries which appear on both documents totaling \$123.98, for a final total of \$2,132.00. The panel finds the ministry reasonably concluded that a move over several days is not typical for a move such as the appellant's, which was a local move of a small family unit (the appellant, his spouse and their son) to an adjacent municipality. The panel finds that the ministry reasonably concluded that there was insufficient information to establish that the amount of \$1,701.88 claimed by the appellant for moving costs was for the least expensive appropriate mode of moving.

Conclusion

The panel finds that the ministry's decision, which denied the appellant's request for a supplement for moving costs under Section 55 of the EAPWDR, was reasonably supported by the evidence and confirms the ministry's decision.