

Part C – Decision Under Appeal

The decision under appeal is the Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction (the "Ministry") decision dated October 27, 2025, which denied the Appellant designation as a person with disabilities ("PWD").

As required under section 2(2) of the *Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Act*, the Ministry found the Appellant met the age (over 18), duration (impairment likely to last more than two years) and severe mental or physical impairment requirements. However, the Ministry found the Appellant did not meet the requirements for:

- significant restriction on the ability to perform daily living activities; and
- needing help to perform daily living activities.

The Ministry found the Appellant was not one of the prescribed classes of persons eligible for PWD on alternative grounds. As there was no information or argument on this point, the Panel considers it not to be an issue in this appeal.

Part D – Relevant Legislation

Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Act ("Act"), section 2

Employment and Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Regulation ("Regulation"), section 2

Employment and Assistance Act, sections 22(3), 22(4)

Part E – Summary of Facts

With the consent of both parties, the hearing was conducted as a written hearing on December 30, 2025, pursuant to section 22(3)(b) of the *Employment and Assistance Act*.

Evidence Before the Ministry at Reconsideration

- A PWD Application, comprising of Medical and Assessor Reports, both completed by the Appellant's Doctor, who has been the Appellant's Doctor for 25 years and who has seen the Appellant two to ten times in the past twelve months, and a Self Report completed by the Appellant. Information from these Reports is set out below.
- A PWD Denial Decision Summary from the Ministry explaining the reasons for denying PWD designation.

A Request for Reconsideration was made by the Appellant. The Appellant did not provide a written reason for requesting a reconsideration, however, he did provide a revised PWD Application with highlighted updates from the Doctor dated September 19, 2025.

The information in the PWD Application, relevant to the two criteria that were not met, included the following:

Self Report

The Appellant, in response to the question, "How does your disability affect your life and your ability to take care of yourself?" wrote (summarized):

- He cannot walk more than 50 feet without pain and must use a cane to get around.
- Having a shower can be difficult because he can't stand for too long.
- Cleaning his house is hard unless he takes a lot of breaks.
- Grocery shopping is hard unless he uses a cart for support.
- Cooking can be hard because he can't stand for more than 5 minutes at a time. He uses food that is easy to prepare, such as canned food or one-pot meals.

Medical and Assessor Reports

Diagnoses

The Doctor provides diagnoses of compression fractures of spine and ribs, with the date of onset being October 2023, mastocytosis and osteoporosis with date of onset noted as "lifelong".

Health History

The Doctor wrote that the Appellant has had mastocytosis for 20+ years and then had an injury at work that caused compression fractures in his spine and ribs due to the mastocytosis. The Doctor wrote that the Appellant will be getting treatment for both conditions, but the spinal fractures will prevent him from doing any kind of work in the future.

The Doctor indicates that the Appellant is on a narcotic medication for pain and noted that the anticipated duration of the medication is indefinite.

Daily Living Activities

The Doctor did not complete this section in the Medical Report. On September 19, 2025, the Doctor added in the following comments in this section: "has extremely severe disease with osteoporosis and compression fracture of his spine, he is very limited in his ability to walk or bend or carry".

In the Assessor Report, the Doctor indicates that the Appellant takes significantly longer than typical with walking indoors/outdoors, climbing stairs, standing, lifting, carrying and holding and writes, "due to spinal compression fracture and osteoporosis".

In the Assessor Report, the Doctor indicates that the Appellant takes significantly longer than typical in all areas of personal care, basic housekeeping, shopping, food preparation, cooking, getting in and out of a vehicle, using public transit. As an explanation, the Doctor wrote "all are affected by his spinal fractures and osteoporosis. On September 19, 2025, the Doctor added a comment "mobility issues due to back pain".

In the Assessor Report, the Doctor indicates that the Appellant is independent with meal planning, safe storage of food, paying rent and bills, taking medications and using transit schedules and arranging transportation.

In the Assessor Report, the Doctor provided additional comments that his medical condition "limits his mobility and ADL".

Assistance Provided for the Applicant

In the Assessor Report, the Doctor indicates that friends provide help for daily living activities and comments "needs help with basic housework/yard work. On September 19, 2025, the Doctor additionally wrote, "could use help with housework, shopping, and meal preparation". The Doctor indicates that the Appellant uses a cane.

Evidence submitted after Reconsideration

On the Notice of Appeal, the Appellant wrote, "do not agree with the decision".

Appellant's Written Submission

The Appellant provided a written submission through an advocacy agency along with a supporting letter from the Doctor.

The advocacy agency provided an overview of the decision under appeal, background facts regarding the Appellant's medical condition, the time frame for his application for PWD designation, the Regulation, a statement regarding how the Employment and Assistance Appeal Tribunal is permitted to consider additional evidence submitted by the Appellant, and information regarding jurisdictional instruction provided by the BC Supreme Court which allows for unique interpretation of social assistance legislation.

The advocacy agency then outlines how the Appellant does meet the criteria regarding restriction to daily living activities and needing help to perform those activities. They write, (summarized):

Regarding significant restriction to the ability to perform daily living activities

- In the initial PWD application, the Doctor confirms that the Appellant "has multiple compression fractures in his spine and ribs which limit mobility and **affect ADL(s)**".
- In the initial PWD application, the Doctor indicates that the Appellant "takes significantly longer than typical" in all aspects of mobility and physical ability, personal care, basic housekeeping, shopping, food preparation, cooking, getting in and out of a vehicle and using public transit.
- In the updated assessment provided to the Tribunal, the Doctor confirms that the Appellant is significantly restricted in at least five daily living activities (personal care, basic housekeeping, shopping, meals and transportation) and provides significant narrative detail regarding the nature, frequency and duration of those restrictions.
- The Doctor provides additional assessment in a letter of support. He writes, "Due to his severe physical impairments, the Appellant is restricted to home approximately 50% of the time due

to the severity of his pain and his need for multiple days of rest after exerting himself. Accordingly, on the days he is restricted to home, he is also unable to complete daily living activities outside of the home such as grocery shopping."

- They submit that the available evidence clearly demonstrates that the Appellant's severe physical impairments directly and significantly restrict his ability to complete multiple daily living activities.

Regarding assistance required to perform daily living activities

- In the initial PWD application, the Doctor notes that the Appellant "could benefit from help with basic housekeeping/laundry, etc.".
- In the updated PWD application submitted at reconsideration, the Doctor reiterates that the Appellant "could use help with basic housekeeping, shopping and meal preparation".
- In the most recent assessment provided to the Tribunal, the Doctor confirms that the Appellant "requires both assistive devices and significant help from others to perform his daily living activities".
- The Doctor identifies that the Appellant relies on a cane for mobility inside and outside the home, for walking any distance, for balance to avoid falls and risk of significant further injury.
- The Doctor writes that the Appellant would also greatly benefit from other mobility aids in his home such as a shower chair and grab bars and would benefit from assistance from another person with housekeeping, shopping and meal preparation.
- Section 2(2)(b)(ii) of the *Act* asks whether the applicant requires help with daily living activities, not whether they are currently receiving help.
- They submit that, based on all the information provided, that the Appellant, due to his severe physical impairments and resulting significant restrictions in performing daily living activities, requires continuous assistance in several areas of daily living.

The Doctor wrote a letter of support to the Tribunal. The Doctor confirms that they are the physician who completed the Appellant's PWD application and that it is their opinion that the Appellant's severe physical impairments do directly and significantly restrict his ability to perform daily living activities, and that he requires assistance with these activities as a result. The Doctor writes that the updated assessment is being provided after careful review and further consultation with the Appellant.

The Doctor confirms the Appellant has severe and debilitating chronic pain in his lower back and that since the PWD application was completed the Appellant has developed numbness in his right hand and fingers. He is unable to bend his right thumb. This makes it very difficult for the Appellant to grasp or grip items. The Appellant has been referred to a specialist and test results are pending.

The Doctor then provides additional information regarding impacts and restrictions to the Appellant's daily living activities. He writes, (summarized):

Regarding Daily Living Activities

- The Appellant is restricted to home 50% of the time due to the severity of his pain and his need for multiple days of rest after exerting himself. On days he is restricted to home, he is also unable to complete daily living activities outside the home, such as grocery shopping.
- The Appellant struggles with dressing and he must sit to dress his lower extremities as he is unable to balance on one foot to put on pants or socks. Due to numbness and reduced mobility in his hands, he has trouble with fine motor skills, such as buttoning up pants or tying shoelaces.
- The Appellant cannot complete hygiene as frequently as he would like as falls are a constant concern when standing in the shower. The Appellant is limited to very short showers and only two to three times a week as he is unable to bend to wash lower than his knees. The Appellant is at serious risk of falling in the shower, which would likely cause further serious injury.
- The Appellant is currently unable to cut his fingernails due to numbness and limited mobility in his hands and fingers.
- The Appellant struggles with transfers in and out of bed as pain is most severe upon waking and at the end of the day.
- The Appellant can only complete one load of laundry each week as he must sit or lie down to take a break after each step of loading, taking laundry out. As the Appellant does not have a dryer, he must hang laundry to dry and because he forgets or lacks energy to hang the clothes they sometimes sit in washer for two days.
- The Appellant can vacuum only every two weeks as it requires a significant amount of exertion, and he needs one to two days of rest after doing so.
- The Appellant has difficulty cleaning the bathroom due to pain and mobility restrictions as he cannot bend over. He cleans the bathroom only once a month on average and does not recall the last time he was able to clean the bathtub as it is too difficult for him to bend and reach.
- The Appellant must take rest breaks when doing dishes once a day.
- The Appellant heats with firewood and can only bring in one piece of firewood at a time as he is unable to bend, lift and carry more than one at a time.
- The Appellant finds grocery shopping difficult due to severe pain and restricted mobility. He must brace on a shopping cart as a makeshift walker. When shopping, he can only shop for five to ten minutes at a time because of inability to stand more than five minutes. Further, because of current issue with his hands, he can only carry the equivalent weight of a jug of milk at a time.
- The Appellant finds pain and fatigue make him unable to stand more than five minutes, so he is unable to cook more complex meals. He is restricted to preparing simple meals.

- The Appellant requires support from his cane to transfer in and out of a car and it takes him significantly longer for transfers.

Regarding assistance required

- The Appellant requires both assistive devices and significantly help from others to perform his daily living activities.
- The Appellant relies on a cane for mobility inside and outside of the home and for walking any distance. He cannot walk more than one block unaided.
- The Appellant would greatly benefit from other mobility aids in his home such as a shower chair and grab bars in his bathroom.
- The Appellant would benefit from assistance from another person with housekeeping, shopping, and meals preparation tasks; for example, a cleaning service, or grocery/meal delivery.
- The Appellant receives emotional support and companionship from his dog.

The Doctor writes that this letter serves to endorse that the Appellant's severe physical impairments restrict his daily living activities and that he requires significant help from assistive devices and from others with daily living activities as a result.

Ministry's Written Submission

The Ministry did not provide a written submission.

Admissibility of Additional Evidence

The Appellant's written submission, which includes statements from an advocacy agency and the Appellant's Doctor, provides additional detail regarding the Appellant's PWD Application. The Ministry did not dispute the Appellant's written submission. The Panel accepts and admits the Appellant's additional evidence as evidence under section 22(4) of the *Employment and Assistance Act*, which allows for the admission of evidence reasonably required for a full and fair disclosure of all matters related to the decision under appeal.

Part F – Reasons for Panel Decision

The issue on appeal is whether the Ministry's decision denying the Appellant designation as a PWD is reasonably supported by the evidence or is a reasonable application of the legislation in the circumstances of the Appellant. The evidence considered includes new evidence accepted by the Panel. That is, was the Reconsideration Decision reasonable, considering the previous evidence and new evidence not previously available to the Ministry?

Appellant's Position

The Appellant's position is that his Doctor has confirmed that he has a severe physical impairment that significantly restricts his ability to manage daily living activities and that he requires assistance to perform those activities.

Ministry's Position

At Reconsideration:

At reconsideration, the Ministry determined that the Appellant met the age, duration and severe mental or physical impairment requirements. However, the Ministry had determined that:

- the Appellant had not met the requirement that the severe impairment significantly restricts daily living activities continuously or periodically for extended periods; and
- to perform the directly and significantly restricted daily living activities the Appellant requires an assistive device, the significant help of another person or the services of an assistance animal.

Regarding Daily Living Activities

The Ministry finds that although the Appellant's Doctor indicates that the Appellant takes significantly longer than typical in the areas of personal care, basic housekeeping, shopping, food preparation, cooking, getting in/out of a vehicle and using public transportation, there is no description of how much longer they take. Therefore, the degree of restriction cannot be established.

Regarding Help Required with Daily Living Activities

The Ministry finds that the Doctor has indicated that friends provide help and help is needed with basic housework and yard work. However, as it has not been established that daily living activities are significantly restricted, it cannot be determined that significant help is required from other persons or a device.

On Appeal:

The Ministry did not provide a written submission on Appeal.

Panel's Decision

PWD Designation – Generally

Section 2 of the *Act* provides the Ministry with the discretion to designate someone as a PWD if the requirements are met. In the Panel's view, PWD designation is for persons who have significant difficulty in performing regular self-care activities.

Some requirements for PWD designation must have an opinion from a professional, and it is reasonable to place significant weight on these opinions. The PWD application form includes a Self Report. It is also appropriate to place significant weight on the Self Report and evidence from the Appellant, unless there is a legitimate reason not to do so.

The Ministry found the Appellant met the age (over 18), and duration (impairment likely to last more than two years) and severe mental or physical impairment requirements. However, the Ministry found the Appellant did not meet the requirements for:

- significant restrictions on the ability to perform daily living activities; and
- needing help to perform daily living activities.

Significant Restrictions on the Ability to Perform Daily Living Activities

Section 2(2)(b)(i) of the *Act* requires that a prescribed professional must provide an opinion that the applicant's impairment restricts the ability to perform the daily living activities listed in the legislation. The daily living activities that are considered are listed in the Regulation:

- prepare own meals;
- manage personal finances;
- shop for personal needs;
- use public or personal transportation facilities;

- perform housework to maintain the person's place of residence in an acceptable sanitary condition;
- move about indoors and outdoors;
- perform personal hygiene and self-care; and
- manage personal medication.

For a person who has a severe mental impairment, activities also include:

- make decisions about personal activities, care, or finances;
- relate to, communicate, or interact with others effectively.

Not all activities, or even the majority, need to be restricted. In the BC Supreme Court case of *Hudson v. British Columbia (Employment and Assistance Appeal Tribunal)*, 2009 BCSC 1461), the court stated that "there must be evidence from a prescribed professional indicating a direct and significant restriction on at least two daily living activities." The inability to work and financial need are not listed as daily living activities and are only relevant to the extent that they impact listed daily living activities.

The restrictions to daily living activities must be significant and caused by the impairment. This means that the restriction must be to a great extent, and that not being able to do the daily living activities without a lot of help or support will have a large impact on the person's life.

The restrictions to daily living activities also must be continuous or periodic. Continuous means the activity is generally restricted all the time. A periodic restriction must be for extended periods, meaning frequent or for longer periods of time. For example, the activity is restricted most days of the week, or for the whole day on the days that the person cannot do the activity without help or support. To figure out if a periodic restriction is for extended periods, it is reasonable to look for information on the duration or frequency of the restriction.

The Medical Report and Assessor Report also have daily living activities that are listed, and though they do not match the list in the Regulation exactly, they generally cover the same activities. The Medical Report and Assessor Report provide the professional with an opportunity to provide additional details on the applicant's restrictions.

In the Assessor Report, the Doctor indicated that the Appellant's impairment directly restricts his ability to perform daily living activities. The Doctor noted that the Appellant takes significantly longer than typical in all areas of personal care (dressing, grooming, bathing, toileting, feeding self, regulating diet, transfers in/out of bed and on/off chair), basic housekeeping (laundry, basic housekeeping), shopping (going to/from stores, reading prices and labels, making appropriate choices, paying for purchases, carrying purchases home), meals (food preparation and cooking),

and transportation (getting in and out of a vehicle and using public transit). As explanation, the Doctor writes, "due to back pain from fractures" and does not provide any additional detail regarding the frequency or duration of the Appellant's restrictions. This additional detail is necessary to determine whether the restrictions that the Appellant faces are significant.

On Appeal, the Doctor wrote a letter explaining that they had done a careful review and further consultation with the Appellant. The Doctor writes that they had confirmed in the initial PWD application that the Appellant takes significantly longer than typical to complete personal care, housekeeping, shopping, meals, and transportation. Multiple fractures to the Appellant's spine and ribs limit his mobility and affect his ability to complete daily living activities. The Doctor provides additional clarification regarding the frequency and duration of the Appellant's restrictions. The Doctor confirms:

- The Appellant is restricted to home approximately 50% of the time due to the severity of his pain and his need for multiple days of rest after exerting himself.
- If he has to walk two blocks, he needs to rest for up to two days to recover.
- On days he is restricted to home, the Appellant is also unable to complete daily living activities outside of the home, such as grocery shopping.
- The Appellant is restricted to showering two to three times a week, with showers of less than five minutes duration, due to constant concern when standing in the shower.
- Due to severe pain upon waking and at the end of the day, the Appellant struggles with transfers in and out of bed.
- The Appellant can only complete one load of laundry each week on average.
- The Appellant can only vacuum every two weeks, and he needs one to two days rest after doing so.
- The Appellant can only clean his bathroom once a month, on average and when doing so, must take rest breaks between each individual task.
- The Appellant can only grocery shop for five to ten minutes at a time.
- The Appellant is unable to lift and carry bags.
- The Appellant eats on average two meals per day, and twice a week feels too fatigued and/or unmotivated to prepare supper and does not eat.
- The Appellant cannot stand for more than five minutes at a time to complete more complex cooking tasks.

The Panel finds that being restricted daily with getting in and out of bed, not being able to shower, restricted to standing for less than five minutes and not being able to maintain regular housekeeping demonstrates a significant restriction. The additional clarification provided by the Appellant's Doctor is sufficient evidence to establish that the Appellant's ability to manage his daily living activities is directly and significantly restricted either continuously or periodically for extended periods of time.

The Panel finds that the Reconsideration Decision was reasonable in finding that the Appellant's activities were not significantly restricted, either continuously or periodically for extended periods because information was missing from the PWD application. However, based on the new evidence from the Doctor, the Panel finds the Reconsideration Decision is no longer reasonable.

Needing Help to Perform Daily Living Activities

Section 2(2)(b)(ii) of the *Act* requires that a prescribed professional must provide an opinion that the person has a severe mental or physical impairment that, in the opinion of a prescribed professional directly and significantly restricts the person's ability to perform daily living activities either continuously or periodically for extended periods and as a result of those restrictions, the person needs help to perform the restricted activities. Help means using an assistive device, the help or supervision of another person, or using an assistance animal to perform the restricted daily living activities. An assistive device is something designed to let the person perform restricted daily living activities.

Since the Panel finds that the Appellant's ability to manage his activities is directly and significantly restricted either continuously or periodically for extended periods of time, it must now consider whether the Appellant requires significant help or uses an assistive device to perform those activities.

In his Self Report, the Appellant notes that although he does manage some of his daily living activities independently, it causes him severe pain, and it takes him significantly longer than typical to care for himself, or a housekeeping chore such as cleaning the bathtub just doesn't get done because he cannot bend down to do it. Section 2(2)(b) of the *Act* does not require that a person be currently receiving help, only that they must require help. The Panel considers that the Appellant not being able to stand to cook, having to take breaks when doing a load of laundry, or not being able to bend down to clean is indicative of a person who requires significant help to perform those activities. The Doctor confirms that the Appellant would benefit from having assistance from another person with housekeeping, shopping and meal preparation tasks; for example, a cleaning service or grocery/meal delivery.

The Panel finds that the evidence provided by the Doctor in the PWD Application, and in the additional letter from the Doctor provided on appeal, confirms that the Appellant uses a cane daily for mobility inside and outside the home and that he needs help with basic housekeeping, shopping and meal preparation. Further, the Doctor indicates that the Appellant would also greatly benefit from other mobility aids in his home, such as a shower chair and grab bars in his bathroom.

The Panel finds that the Ministry was reasonable in its finding in the Reconsideration Decision that it cannot be determined that significant help is required from other persons or an assistive device or assistance animal because they had not determined that the Appellant had significant restrictions in managing activities, which is a requirement of this criterion. However, as noted above, the evidence from the Doctor confirms that the Appellant uses a cane for mobility inside and outside the home and requires significant help from other persons to perform daily living activities. Therefore, the Panel finds the Reconsideration Decision can no longer be found to be reasonable.

In summary, the Panel finds that the Appellant has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the remaining requirements of Section 2(2)(b) of the *Act*, namely a significant restriction on the ability to perform daily living activities and needing help to perform daily living activities, have been established.

Conclusion

After reviewing the evidence submitted in this appeal the Panel finds that the Ministry's Reconsideration Decision to deny the Appellant's PWD designation is not reasonably supported by the evidence. The Panel rescinds the Reconsideration Decision. The Appellant is successful in the appeal.

Schedule of Legislation

The Act

2(1) In this section:

“assistive device” means a device designed to enable a person to perform a daily living activity that, because of a severe mental or physical impairment, the person is unable to perform;

“daily living activity” has the prescribed meaning;

“prescribed professional” has the prescribed meaning:

(2) The minister may designate a person who has reached 18 years of age as a person with disabilities for the purposes of this Act if the minister is satisfied that the person is in a prescribed class of persons or that the person has a severe mental or physical impairment that

(a) in the opinion of a medical practitioner or nurse practitioner is likely to continue for at least 2 years, and

(b) in the opinion of a prescribed professional

(i) directly and significantly restricts the person’s ability to perform daily living activities either

(A) continuously, or

(B) periodically for extended periods, and

(ii) as a result of those restrictions, the person requires help to perform those activities.

(3) For the purposes of subsection (2),

(a) a person who has a severe mental impairment includes a person with a mental disorder, and

(b) a person requires help in relation to a daily living activity if, in order to perform it, the person requires

(i) an assistive device,

(ii) the significant help or supervision of another person, or

(iii) the services of an assistance animal.

(4) The minister may rescind a designation under subsection (2).

The Regulation

Definitions for Act

2(1) For the purposes of the Act and this regulation, "daily living activities",

(a) in relation to a person who has a severe physical impairment or a severe mental impairment, means the following activities:

- (i) prepare own meals;
- (ii) manage personal finances;
- (iii) shop for personal needs;
- (iv) use public or personal transportation facilities;
- (v) perform housework to maintain the person's place of residence in acceptable sanitary condition;
- (vi) move about indoors and outdoors;
- (vii) perform personal hygiene and self-care;
- (viii) manage personal medication, and

(b) in relation to a person who has a severe mental impairment, includes the following activities:

- (i) make decisions about personal activities, care or finances;
- (ii) relate to, communicate or interact with others effectively.

(2) For the purposes of the Act, "prescribed professional" means a person who is

(a) authorized under an enactment to practise the profession of

- (i) medical practitioner,
- (ii) registered psychologist,
- (iii) registered nurse or registered psychiatric nurse,
- (iv) occupational therapist,
- (v) physical therapist,
- (vi) social worker,
- (vii) chiropractor, or
- (viii) nurse practitioner, or

(b) acting in the course of the person's employment as a school psychologist by

- (i) an authority, as that term is defined in section 1(1) of the *Independent School Act*, or
- (ii) a board or a francophone education authority, as those terms are defined in section 1(1) of the *School Act*,

If qualifications in psychology are a condition of such employment.

(3) The definition of "parent" in section 1 (1) applies for the purposes of the definition of "dependent child" in section 1 (1) of the Act.

Employment and Assistance Act

Panels of the tribunal to conduct appeals

22 (1) If a person commences an appeal in accordance with section 21 (1), the chair must appoint a panel consisting of up to 3 members of the tribunal to hear and determine the appeal.

(2) If a panel consists of more than one member, the chair must designate a chair of the panel from among the members of the panel, and if a panel consists of one member, that member is the chair of the panel.

(3) A panel must conduct a hearing into the decision being appealed within the prescribed period either

- (a) orally, or
- (b) with the consent of the parties, in writing.

(4) A panel may consider evidence that is not part of the record as the panel considers is reasonably required for a full and fair disclosure of all matters related to the decision under appeal

APPEAL NUMBER 2025-0364

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

Janet Ward

Signature of Chair

Date (Year/Month/Day)

2025/12/30

Print Name

Glenn Prior

Signature of Member

Date (Year/Month/Day)

2025/12/31

Print Name

Rick Bizarro

Signature of Member

Date (Year/Month/Day)

2025/12/30