

**Part C – Decision Under Appeal**

The decision under appeal is the Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction (ministry) reconsideration decision dated April 20, 2022, which determined that the appellant was not eligible for a moving cost supplement as per section 55 of the Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Regulation.

**Part D – Relevant Legislation**

Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Act (EAPWDA) section 5

Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Regulation (EAPWDR) section 55

**Part E – Summary of Facts****Relevant Evidence Before the Minister at Reconsideration****Ministry records show:**

The appellant is a recipient of disability assistance receiving \$983.50 support, \$375.00 shelter and \$52.00 transportation allowance minus \$760.97 Canada Pension Plan income for a total of \$649.53.

On February 11, 2022 the appellant requested a supplement to pay for moving costs to move to Ontario so she would be able to afford to live. She indicated she was facing homelessness due to the rental crisis.

With the request, the appellant submitted a note from her prospective landlord in Ontario stating she would be renting a place for \$700.00 per month including utilities; a security deposit was not required until she was back on her feet.

**Estimate for Truck Rental – February 16, 2022**

\$3,314.00

**Letter from Appellant to Whom It May Concern – March 7, 2022**

The appellant states her original move date to Ontario was set for June 30, 2022 but it has been rescheduled for June 9, 2022. She has calculated the cost of the truck rental, length of travel, time and motel costs.

**Email from Truck Rental Company to Appellant – March 10, 2022**

Cost for truck rental - \$3,154.00

**Request for Reconsideration – April 4, 2022- summary**

The appellant states the denial for moving expenses to Ontario makes no sense to her. Her income is \$1,359.50/month and her expenses total \$1,823.63/month.

For over 14 months she has been searching for resources. The appellant states she has contacted the Prime Minister, the Premier, the Minister responsible for Housing, advocates and all community services. She was told there are no resources unless she literally becomes homeless. She has also contacted the newspaper to bring attention to the lack of resources available. And, she is still in communication with the MLA's office and has been for over a year.

The appellant states she is a woman with disabilities (in her 60s) and has worked since she was 11 years old. She's been recommended for four surgeries as she has mobility issues. Dealing with this and with the lack of resources is overwhelming and causes great anxiety on a daily basis. As well, her daughter cannot help all the time as she too is struggling with rising costs.

In Ontario, the appellant has been offered \$200/month to feed and let out the landlord's dogs as they work 12 to 14 hours/day.

The appellant adds that her current accommodation is not only unaffordable but unsafe as well. She's had to call the police and property managers because her neighbour has been harassing her.

**Letter from MLA to Minister of Social Development and Poverty Reduction – April 4, 2022**

The MLA states the appellant is in her 60s and lives with multiple disabilities. For many months she has struggled with the increasing cost of living while trying to get by on a fixed income of \$1359.47/month. Her total expenses are roughly \$1820/month. The appellant's monthly deficit is approximately \$460.00. She is at urgent and severe risk of losing her housing. The appellant has been on the wait list for subsidized housing for many months. She has been told she does not qualify for Shelter Aid for Elderly Renters (SAFER) because she is on PWD. For 14 months the appellant has researched additional resources - from the ministry, the federal government and all local agencies. There is a nearly a zero vacancy rate in her community and the cost of listed rental units continues to increase. As a result, there are no available rental units, which would provide improved living conditions for the appellant distraught by the lack of available alternatives for housing.

The appellant sought to improve her circumstances by broadening her search for housing to other provinces. She identified a rental unit in Ontario where she would pay \$700.00/month (utilities included). Additionally, her landlord has offered to subsidize her rent by \$200.00/month in exchange for letting their dogs out during work days. However, the appellant is in need of assistance to help cover costs associated with the move.

With the unsuccessful attempts to improve her living conditions through provincial, federal and local services it seems that this move, which may reduce her expenses by up to \$600 a month, is required.

**Additional Information**

Appellant

**Notice of Appeal (April 28, 2022)**

The appellant states she had two choices, either homelessness or move to Ontario.

She states that she understands that what she is asking for does not fall under the guidelines. However, she's exhausted all options to reduce her moving costs and her only option is a moving truck. She's enquired about a U-box which would be a cheaper option, but the company does not deliver to her community and does not deliver to her residence in Ontario.

The appellant states that at no time did she think she would be denied assistance to secure a roof over her head. She's already halfway packed and paid for vehicle insurance until the end of June. The truck is reserved for June 19. The appellant's final walk through of her apartment is scheduled for June 21.

The appellant states she will become homeless in BC as a disabled woman, in her 60s, with a little 12-year old dog if she is again denied.

**Submission 1– May 9, 2022 - summary**

*Email from Appellant to Panel – May 9, 2022*

The appellant stated the cost of the truck rental has changed three times, going down significantly over time without any explanation from the rental company. As well, the appellant stated that at no time did she ask the ministry to pay for all moving costs. She explained to the ministry that she would be receiving \$975.00 back for a security deposit and half a month's rent. She also has an old vehicle she's hoping to receive \$1500.00 for (although \$1000.00 is probably more likely).

*Rental Truck Reservation - March 4, 2022*  
One-Way Reservation – Rental Rate \$2,883.00

*Letter from Building Management to Appellant - March 10, 2022*

Re: vacating notice

The letter states this is the appellant's first notice to schedule an outgoing inspection and they would like to schedule the inspection for June 21, 2022 at 2:00 PM.

*Letter to Appellant from the Attorney General and Minister responsible for Housing in BC - March 17, 2022*

The minister states they asked BC Housing to look into the appellant's housing registry application and was advised the appellant should expand her housing preferences to include other communities where housing that fits her needs is more available. The minister encouraged the appellant to explore the affordable rental housing listings on the BC housing website in addition to the SAFER program which helps make rent affordable for BC seniors, without a moderate income, by providing direct cash access to eligible seniors.

*Response to Appellant from the Prime Minister's office - May 10, 2022*

The response states that although the Prime Minister appreciates hearing comments, suggestions and concerns from all Canadians in these trying times, the matter falls primarily within the responsibilities of the provincial government

*Email from Appellant to the Tribunal - May 10, 2022*

The appellant states this process is and has been affecting her wellbeing for some time. She has purchased baby aspirin as the anxiety is overwhelming. In her 60s and disabled, the thought of possibly becoming homeless in BC has taken its toll. The appellant adds that she was a single mother and that in itself was a difficult job.

### **Submission 2 – May 10, 2022 – summary**

*Email from Client Service Coordinator – February 24, 2021*

Re: one-on-one coaching to ensure appellant is accessing all possible income supports and to discuss budget

*Email from Poverty Law - April 1, 2021*

Re: arranging a homeless prevention coordinator

*Email from Premier of BC to Appellant – May 3, 2022*

Referred to appropriate ministry

### **Submission 3 – May 11, 2022 - summary**

*Letter from Appellant's Landlord - April 8, 2021*

- advocating on behalf of appellant

The appellant's landlord stated they have been working with the appellant for several months trying to come to a solution on her housing affordability crisis that is in part precipitated by her daughter moving out and in part by the cost of living crises.

They have been an advocate for the appellant while she has waded through a myriad of options trying to figure out how to have enough money for housing let alone anything left over to live off. The appellant is

an adult on disability, at risk of homelessness. Her current income versus expenses do not leave her with enough money to pay her rent once her daughter moves out. The appellant has been applying to get on a list for subsidized housing, but the wait will be several years. She has been working with several agencies but keeps being advised she doesn't qualify. The stress and panic that the appellant is under is very heartbreaking. The landlord accommodated the appellant on an under-market rate for rent as they knew she was going to be a good tenant. The appellant is unable to pay her rent without her daughter living with her. Her rent would be 75% of her actual income. The 25% left is not enough to pay other bills and eat while trying to access services.

The appellant has been told to redo her budget – move to a smaller place (currently renting for \$300.00 to \$400.00 more than her current tenancy agreement) or get a roommate.

At the hearing, the appellant reiterated that if she can't get assistance to move to Ontario she will become homeless as she just can't afford to live in BC anymore. Her daughter moved out in April 2021 and was helping her with rent but is unable to continue. She was trying to secure housing on Vancouver Island so she could stay close to her daughter. She doesn't want to live in the lower mainland as she doesn't know anyone there. The appellant states she has exhausted all housing options across the island. The appellant added that she has a friend who lives in the community in Ontario she would like to move to, and this friend would be a support to her. The appellant used to live in Ontario and moved to BC in 1993. She has kept in close touch with her friend.

The appellant also stated that she tried to inquire about financial assistance (PWD equivalent) from the Ontario government but was unable to. She stated that when she tried contacting Ontario to find information on social assistance rates and eligibility, "it did not allow her call to go through from out of province."

#### Ministry

At the hearing, the ministry stated it doesn't only consider reducing shelter costs when determining whether or not living circumstances would be improved. The ministry considers factors such as family support, overall affordability, government assistance for disabled persons, medical resources etc. The ministry added that the appellant has family in BC as her daughter lives in BC. As well, the ministry was unsure whether the appellant would qualify for assistance in Ontario. Therefore, it is not sure the appellant's life would truly be improved by moving to Ontario. The decision is made on a case-by-case basis and reducing shelter costs can be accomplished in BC.

The ministry did not raise any objections to the appellant's additional submissions.

The panel determined the additional information is reasonably required for a full and fair disclosure of all matters related to the decision under appeal and therefore is admissible under section 22(4) of the *Employment and Assistance Act*.

## Part F – Reasons for Panel Decision

The issue on appeal is whether the ministry's reconsideration decision that determined the appellant was not eligible for a moving cost supplement as per section 55 of the EAPWDR was reasonably supported by the evidence or was a reasonable application of the legislation in the circumstances of the appellant.

The ministry is satisfied that the appellant requested the ministry's approval prior to incurring any moving costs and that she does not have the funds to cover the costs. In addition, the ministry is satisfied the appellant has provided the least expensive appropriate quotes to move her personal items.

Relevant sections of the legislation can be found in the Schedule of Legislation at the end of this decision.

### Appellant Argument

The appellant argues she had two choices, either homelessness or move to Ontario. Her income is \$1,359.50/month and her expenses total \$1,823.63/month. For over 14 months she has been searching for additional resources. She has contacted the Prime Minister, the Premier, the Minister responsible for Housing, advocates and all community services but was told there are no resources unless she literally becomes homeless.

The appellant also argues that she was trying to secure housing on Vancouver Island so she could stay close to her daughter but has now exhausted all housing options across the island. She argues further that she has a friend who lives in Ontario and who would be a support to her. The appellant used to live in Ontario and moved to BC in 1993. She has kept in close touch with her friend since.

The appellant also argues that she is a woman with disabilities (in her 60s), has worked since she was 11 years old and has been recommended for four surgeries, as she has mobility issues. Dealing with this and with the lack of resources is overwhelming and has caused great anxiety.

In addition, the appellant argues that her current accommodation is unaffordable as well as unsafe as she's had to call the police and property managers because her neighbour has been harassing her.

### Ministry Argument

The ministry argues the appellant's request did not meet the criteria for a moving supplement because the sole reason for the move was for a reduction in rental costs and not to improve living circumstances. Reducing shelter costs can be accomplished in BC. The ministry argues it doesn't only consider reducing shelter costs, when determining whether or not living circumstances would be improved. It considers factors such as family support, overall affordability, government assistance for disabled persons, medical resources etc. The ministry added that the appellant has family in BC as her daughter lives in BC. As well, the ministry was unsure if the appellant would qualify for assistance in Ontario, so questions whether the appellant's life would truly be improved by moving to Ontario.

The ministry added that the appellant had stable and safe housing in a safe community with supports available.

The ministry argues further that although her shelter costs would be significantly reduced, it is only permitted to provide a supplement to pay for moving costs for this reason if the appellant is moving within BC.

The ministry also argues that although the appellant has been offered \$200.00/month to feed her landlord's dogs, she has not provided any information to support this and therefore the ministry is not satisfied the appellant has confirmed employment that would significantly promote financial independence, and is required to move to begin that employment.

In addition, the ministry argues that although the appellant advised her that her accommodation was not safe due to a harassing neighbour, she has not provided any evidence to support that she is required to move to avoid imminent threat to her physical safety.

### **Majority Analysis**

#### Section 5, EAPWDA - disability assistance and supplements

Section 5 states the minister may provide disability assistance or a supplement to or for a family unit that is eligible for it. Ministry records show the appellant is a recipient of disability assistance.

Section 55(2), EAPWDR states the minister may provide a supplement to or for a family unit that is eligible for disability assistance to assist with one or more of the following:

#### Section 55(2)(a), EAPWDR – moving for employment

Section 55(2)(a) states the minister may provide a supplement to assist with 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.

Although in her request for reconsideration the appellant states she has been offered \$200/month to feed and let out the landlord's dogs, the majority panel finds this is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that she is moving to Ontario for employment that would significantly promote financial independence.

Therefore, the majority panel finds the ministry reasonably determined the appellant is not eligible for a moving expense supplement under section 55(2)(a).

#### Section 55(2)(b), EAPWDR – moving to improve living circumstances

Section 55(2)(b) states the minister may provide a supplement to assist with moving costs required to move to another province or country, if the family unit is required to move to improve its living circumstances.

The appellant argues she had two choices, either homelessness or move to Ontario. Her income is \$1,359.50/month and her expenses total \$1,823.63/month. She also argues she has exhausted all affordable housing options on Vancouver Island. In the letter from the MLA to the Minister (April 4, 2022), the MLA states the appellant sought to improve her circumstances by broadening her search for housing to other provinces. She identified a rental unit in Ontario where she would pay \$700.00 a month (utilities included). The appellant also argues that she has a friend who lives in Ontario and who would be a support for her.

The ministry argues that when determining whether or not living circumstances would be improved it doesn't only consider reducing shelter costs and each case is made on a case-by-case basis. It considers factors such as family support, overall affordability, government assistance for disabled persons, medical resources etc. The ministry added that the appellant's daughter lives in BC and also is unsure if the appellant would qualify for assistance in Ontario. Therefore, the ministry is not satisfied the

appellant's life would truly be improved by moving to Ontario. And, the ministry argues that reducing shelter costs can be accomplished in BC.

The majority panel notes, in her request for reconsideration, the appellant states her income is \$1,359.50/month and her expenses total \$1,823.63/month. At the hearing, the appellant stated that she tried to inquire about financial assistance (PWD equivalent) from the Ontario government but was unable to. She stated that when she tried contacting Ontario to find information on social assistance rates and eligibility, "it did not allow her call to go through from out of province."

Although ministry records show the appellant submitted a note from her prospective landlord in Ontario stating she would be renting a place for \$700.00 per month including utilities, the majority panel finds there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that moving to Ontario is required to improve the appellant's living circumstances. In BC the appellant is fully aware of her income and expenses. However, she has not obtained information as to what her total income in Ontario would be. In addition, she only has information on her rental cost, but not other expenses.

The majority panel finds the appellant is asking that the ministry provide moving expenses for Ontario so she can live where her income is at least sufficient to meet her expenses and yet she has provided insufficient evidence to demonstrate that this move will accomplish that.

As well, the majority panel notes the appellant argued that she exhausted all affordable housing on the island, but the majority panel finds there is insufficient information to show the appellant has exhausted all affordable housing options across BC.

Therefore, the majority panel finds the ministry reasonably determined the appellant is not eligible for a moving expense supplement under section 55(2)(b).

Section 55(2)(c), EAPWDR – moving as compelled to vacate residence

Section 55(2)(c) states the minister may provide a supplement to assist with moving costs required to move anywhere in British Columbia because the family unit is being compelled to vacate the family unit's rented residential accommodation for any reason, including the following:

- (i) the accommodation is being sold
- (ii) the accommodation is being demolished
- (iii) the accommodation has been condemned

The majority panel finds there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the appellant is compelled to vacate her residence for the reasons listed above.

Therefore, the majority panel finds the ministry reasonably determined the appellant is not eligible for a moving expense supplement under section 55(2)(c).

Section 55(2)(d), EAPWDR – moving to reduce shelter costs

Section 55(2)(d) states the minister may provide a supplement to assist with moving costs required to move anywhere in BC if the family unit's shelter costs would be significantly reduced as a result of the move. In her request for reconsideration the appellant states she is moving to Ontario. The majority



panel finds as section 55(2)(d) allows for a move only within the province of BC, a moving supplement cannot be authorized to another province under this legislation.

Therefore, the majority panel finds the ministry reasonably determined the appellant is not eligible for a moving expense supplement under section 55(2)(d).

Section 55(2)(e), EAPWDR – moving to avoid an imminent threat to physical safety

Section 55(2)(e) states the minister may provide a supplement to assist with moving costs required to move anywhere in BC to avoid an imminent threat to the physical safety of any person in the family unit. Although the majority panel notes, in her request for reconsideration the appellant stated that her current accommodation is unsafe as she's had to call the police and property managers because her neighbour has been harassing her, the majority panel finds this is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the appellant needs to move to avoid imminent threat to her physical safety. In addition, as section 55(2)(e) allows for a move only within the province of BC, the panel finds a moving supplement cannot be authorized to another province under this legislation.

Therefore, the panel finds the ministry reasonably determined the appellant is not eligible for a moving expense supplement under section 55(2)(e).

As the panel finds the appellant did not meet any of the criteria under section 55(2) of the EAPWDR, the panel finds the ministry reasonably concluded that the appellant is not eligible for a moving supplement for her move to Ontario.

### **Majority Conclusion**

In conclusion, the majority panel finds the ministry decision which determined the appellant was not eligible for a moving cost supplement as per section 55 of the EAPWDR was reasonably supported by the evidence.

The appellant is not successful on appeal.

### **Dissenting Reasons**

The dissenting panel member would find that the ministry's interpretation of "improv[ing] your living circumstances" as applied to this case, is unreasonable.

In its Reconsideration Decision the ministry identified that the only possible applicable reason that could apply for an out-of-province move, is Section 55, subsection 2(b). This portion of the legislation reads: "You are moving to another province or country to improve your living circumstances."

In making its decision, the ministry concluded that the appellant was not eligible because the appellant is planning an out-of-province move to reduce shelter costs. The ministry Reconsideration Decision stated, "Moving for the purpose of reducing shelter costs is not eligible under the legislation."

The ministry wrote that, "[on] March 28, 2022, the ministry denied your request for a supplement to pay for moving costs noting your request did not meet the criteria for a moving supplement because the sole reason for the move was for a reduction in rental costs and was not to improve your living circumstances. You currently had [sic] stable and safe housing in a safe community with supports available."

In making its decision, the ministry relied on their own interpretation of EAPWD Regulation Section 55, subsection 2(b), specifically the phrase, "...to improve your living circumstances." During the Tribunal hearing, the ministry representative confirmed that, while there is some guidance provided in the ministry's policy manual, the meaning of "improv[ing] your living circumstances" is "somewhat subjective" and "interpretive" for ministry staff.

The appellant's MLA noted: "[The appellant] ... lives with multiple disabilities ... [The appellant's] monthly income deficit is approximately \$460 and is at urgent and severe risk of losing her housing ... She has searched for 14 months for additional resources from your ministry, the federal government, and all local agencies ... *Distraught* [emphasis added] by the lack of available alternatives for housing, [the appellant] *sought to improve her circumstances* [emphasis added] by broadening her search for housing to other provinces."

During the Tribunal hearing, the appellant testified that the MLA's correspondence of April 4, 2022, was provided to the ministry for inclusion in the reconsideration process. The ministry denies that it received this correspondence before the Reconsideration Decision was made.

During the Tribunal hearing, the appellant provided further clarification about her living situation, including:

- The appellant's daughter, who lived with the appellant until April 2021, had been providing the appellant with monthly funds to help pay the appellant's rent over the past year.
- The appellant's daughter is no longer in a financial position to continue helping to pay a portion of the appellant's monthly rent.

The appellant also further explained a stressful situation at her current home where she has been harassed on more than one occasion by her next-door neighbour. The ministry Reconsideration Decision noted that the appellant has not provided supporting information about this harassment claim. During the Tribunal hearing, the appellant reaffirmed that she contacted the police, was provided with a police file number, and that she offered this file number to the ministry. The appellant also explained that her fears have become so great that she has resorted to hanging a shower curtain between her outdoor sitting area and the neighbour's home so that he cannot see her.

The appellant testified that she has exhausted her 14-month search for affordable housing in British Columbia. The appellant explained that her reason for seeking a move to Ontario specifically, is because she is from Ontario (having lived there until 1993.) The appellant stated that she has a friend in her destination community in Ontario to provide some support, and she does not know anyone in British Columbia, beyond the area where she is currently living.

The appellant stated that she also has been offered a rental rate of \$700 per month in the Ontario community along with a \$200 monthly deduction for taking care of the prospective landlord's pets. The appellant advised that she gave the prospective landlord's telephone number to the ministry to confirm his further offer to reduce the appellant's rent by \$200. The ministry asserts that it has not received documentation about the rent reduction offer. It is noted that the ministry's Decision package of March 28, 2022 includes a typed message from the prospective landlord briefly describing the terms of rental, including the offer of a \$700 monthly rent. A handwritten out-of-province telephone number also appears on this document from the prospective landlord.

The dissenting panel member would find that the stress and anxiety created by the appellant's lack of success in finding suitable alternative housing, compounded by the appellant's worries that she could

become homeless or may have to move somewhere in BC where she does not know anyone, and the reported harassment by the next-door neighbour have negatively impacted the appellant's current living situation. (As noted earlier, the MLA's letter of appeal on behalf of the appellant refers to the appellant as "distraught.")

Accordingly, the dissenting panel member would find the appellant's living situation will be improved by the move. There will be certainty of housing in the province where she grew up, a friend with whom she is in regular contact, the comfort of no longer being subjected to her current next-door neighbour's harassment, and a location where her rent would be less than the rent she currently pays.

For the reasons set out above, the dissenting panel member would not agree with the ministry's interpretation of the Act and find the decision to deny moving costs unreasonable in the circumstances of the appellant and would rescind the reconsideration decision.

## Schedule of Legislation

### Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Act

#### **Disability assistance and supplements**

**5** Subject to the regulations, the minister may provide disability assistance or a supplement to or for a family unit that is eligible for it.

### Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Regulation

#### **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

(a) moving a family unit and the family unit's personal effects from one place to another, and

(b) storing the family unit's personal effects while the family unit is moving if the minister is satisfied that storing the personal effects is necessary to preserve the personal effects;

"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 anywhere in British Columbia because the family unit is being compelled to vacate the family unit's rented residential accommodation for any reason, including the following:

(i) the accommodation is being sold;

- (ii) the accommodation is being demolished;
- (iii) the accommodation has been condemned;
- (d) moving costs required to move anywhere in British Columbia if the family unit's shelter costs would be significantly reduced as a result of the move;
- (e) moving costs required to move anywhere 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 [*assignment of 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) subject to subsection (3.1), a recipient in the family unit receives the minister's approval before incurring those costs.

(3.1) A supplement may be provided even if the family unit did not receive the minister's approval before incurring the costs if the minister is satisfied that exceptional circumstances exist.

(4) A supplement may be provided under this section only to assist with

- (a) in the case of a supplement under subsection (2) (a) to (e), the least expensive appropriate moving costs, and
- (b) in the case of a supplement under subsection (2) (f) or (g), the least expensive appropriate transportation costs and the least expensive appropriate living costs.

**Part G – Order**

The panel decision is: (Check one)       Unanimous       By Majority

The Panel       Confirms the Ministry Decision       Rescinds the Ministry Decision

If the ministry decision is rescinded, is the panel decision referred back to the Minister for a decision as to amount?      Yes       No

**Legislative Authority for the Decision:**

*Employment and Assistance Act*

Section 24(1)(a)       or Section 24(1)(b)

Section 24(2)(a)       or Section 24(2)(b)

**Part H – Signatures**

Print Name

Connie Simonsen

Signature of Chair

Date (Year/Month/Day)

2022/May/13

Print Name

Glenn Prior

Signature of Member

Date (Year/Month/Day)

2022/May/13

Print Name

Melissa McLean

Signature of Member - Dissenting

Date (Year/Month/Day)

2022/May/13