



State of New Jersey

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
DIVISION OF FAMILY DEVELOPMENT

CAROLE JOHNSON
Commissioner

SHEILA Y. OLIVER
Lt. Governor

PO BOX 716
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0716

NATASHA JOHNSON
Assistant Commissioner

The following Decision is distributed for your information. This Decision has been made in consideration of the specific facts of this case. This Decision is not to be interpreted as establishing any new mandatory policy or procedure otherwise officially promulgated.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

FINAL DECISION

OAL DKT. NO. HPW 17117-19 N.K.

AGENCY DKT. NO. C087374018 (SOMERSET COUNTY BOARD OF SOC. SVCS.)

Petitioner challenges the correctness of Respondent Agency's reduction of her Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program ("SNAP") benefits, at recertification. The Agency reduced Petitioner's SNAP benefits, at recertification, due to an increase in household income. Because Petitioner appealed, the matter was transmitted to the Office of Administrative Law for a hearing. On December 29, 2019, 2019, the Honorable Sarah G. Crowley, Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ"), held a plenary hearing, took testimony and admitted documents into evidence. On January 6, 2020, the ALJ issued an Initial Decision, affirming the Agency's determination.

No Exceptions to the Initial Decision were received.

As the Director of the Division of Family Development, Department of Human Services, I have reviewed the ALJ's Initial Decision and the record, and I hereby ADOPT the ALJ's Initial Decision, and AFFIRM the Agency's determination.

SNAP is designed to promote the general welfare and to safeguard the health and well-being of the population by raising the levels of nutrition among low-income households. See N.J.A.C. 10:87- 1.1(a).

Here, the record reflects that on October 23, 2019, the Agency notified Petitioner that beginning November 1, 2019, her SNAP benefits would be reduced to \$371 per month, due an increase in household earned income. See Initial Decision at 2; see also Exhibit R-1 at 2, and N.J.A.C. 10:87-5.4(a). The record further reflects that Petitioner worked an increased numbers of hours which lead to an increase of household income. See Initial Decision at 2. Thereafter, taking into consideration Petitioner's increased income, the Agency determined that Petitioner earned \$1,495 per month. Ibid.; see also Exhibit R-1 at 7, 8, 9; and N.J.A.C. 10:87-5.4(a). After the Agency applied the appropriate deductions, Petitioner's monthly SNAP net income was calculated at \$460. See Exhibit R-1 at 9, and N.J.A.C. 10:87-5.10(a), -6.16. Based on that amount, Petitioner's monthly SNAP benefit allotment was determined to be \$371 per month, which represented a decrease from the \$509 per month she previously received. See Initial Decision at 2, 4; see also Exhibit R-1 at 2, 9, and N.J.A.C. 10:87-12.6(a) (1). The ALJ found that Petitioner had provided the paystubs to the Agency for its use in calculating



her monthly SNAP benefits, and that the Agency had followed the procedures required by applicable regulatory authority in calculating the benefits amount. See Initial Decision at 3, 4; see also Exhibit R-1 at 7, 8. Accordingly, the ALJ concluded that the reduction of Petitioner's SNAP benefits was appropriate. See Initial Decision at 4; see also Exhibit R-1 at 2, and N.J.A.C. 10:87-5.4(a). I agree, and further note that as a household's income increases, with all other expenses and deductions remaining constant, SNAP benefits will decrease.

Accordingly, the Initial Decision is hereby ADOPTED, and the Agency's action is AFFIRMED.

Officially approved final version.

Natasha Johnson
Assistant Commissioner

JAN 13 2018

