

Reasons for Decision:

Order # AP1920-0258

On <date removed>, <name removed> filed an appeal against the decision of the Director, Downtown/Point Douglas to provide limited funding for a start-up allowance. The decision was communicated through letters dated <date removed> and <date removed>.

The decision letters stated the funding was for items <name removed> lost in an apartment fire.

The Department told the Board <name removed> lost all their possessions in a fire at their apartment building in <date removed>. <name removed> provided the Department with a list of lost items. The Department compared <name removed>'s list with its list of eligible items, and determined they were eligible for <amount removed> in compensation.

<name removed> was represented at the hearing by an advocate. The advocate explained that there was a delay between the date of the fire and the date <name removed> submitted their list, because <name removed> became homeless as a result of the fire.

The advocate stated <name removed>'s roommate was provided with <amount removed> by the Department, despite submitting a much shorter list of lost possessions. <name removed> is concerned about the inconsistent treatment of their claim.

The advocate noted the Department's policy on the start-up allowance is discretionary. The appellant asserted the amounts provided by the Department were both arbitrary and insufficient.

The Board asked the Department to explain the difference in funding between <name removed> and their roommate. The Department stated it could not discuss another recipient's file during an appeal. The Department noted that funding is provided for basic and essential needs, according to guideline amounts.

The Department confirmed that the list of approved items was reviewed by a supervisor. The Department stated <name removed>'s submitted list was compared to the list of eligible items included on page 13 of the Department's written report.

The advocate asserted that the policy was discretionary, and suggested the Department

should make an exception to the guideline amounts in <name removed>'s case.

The Department told the Board that program specialists review start-up allowance decisions to ensure consistency between like cases.

After carefully reviewing the written and verbal evidence, the Board determines that the Department applied its start-up allowance policy correctly, and that <name removed>'s personal circumstances do not warrant an exception to the policy. The Board confirms the decision of the Director to provide <amount removed> in start-up allowance to <name removed>.

DISCLAIMER

These are electronic copies of the Reasons for Decision issued by the Social Services Appeal Board. These written reasons have been edited to protect the personal information of individuals by removing personal identifiers.