

Reasons for Decision:

Order #AP1718-0172

The appellant appealed that the amount of income assistance the appellant received was insufficient.

The appellant applied for income assistance on <date removed> under the <text removed> category. The appellant provided a copy of a custody agreement, which states that the appellant's children reside with the appellant 50% of the time. The appellant also declared that the appellant was enrolled in three secondary courses, and expected to graduate at the end of June 2017. The appellant resided in subsidized housing, and was required to pay parking and hydro in addition to the regular subsidized housing rate.

The appellant was found eligible for income assistance and the budget was calculated by providing the appellant with the <text removed> subsidized rent rate of <amount removed>. Basic needs were calculated based on family size at 50% of the guideline rates. An amount of <amount removed> per month was also provided for hydro. The program indicated that educational support costs were not added to the appellant's budget as the appellant's education program had not been approved by the Employment and Income Assistance Program. Work expectations were waived to allow the appellant to graduate. The worker at the hearing indicated that the Employment and Income Assistance Program does not provide any funds for vehicle costs, phone, internet, or television costs. Transportation or phone allowances are only provided in relation to medical needs.

The appellant indicated that as part of the custody agreement, the children's other parent receives the Child Tax Credit. The appellant has a lot of bills that must be paid, and no funds to pay them. The appellant stated the appellant is falling further and further behind, and has large outstanding bills with <text removed>. The appellant is worried that the hydro will be cut off, but if the appellant pays the hydro bill the appellant will have no money for food. The appellant also advised that in reality the appellant has the children with the appellant more than 50% of the time.

After carefully considering the written and verbal information the Board has determined that the appellant is currently receiving the maximum entitlement to income assistance benefits. The Manitoba Assistance Regulation only allows for basic and essential costs. It would be in the appellant's best interests to pursue applying for a portion of the Child Tax Benefit in order to have some exempted income to cover additional costs not covered by income assistance benefits. In addition the appellant would be able to access additional funds if the appellant were to find employment, as a portion of the appellant's earnings would be exempted. Therefore the decision of the Director has been confirmed.

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.