



State of New Jersey

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
DIVISION OF FAMILY DEVELOPMENT
PO BOX 716

TRENTON, NJ 08625-0716

SARAH ADELMAN
Commissioner

TAHESHA L. WAY
Lt. Governor

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 **14469-25 T.R.**

AGENCY DKT. NO. **C021047010 (HUNTERDON COUNTY BD. OF SOC. SVCS.)**

Petitioner challenges the correctness of the Respondent Agency's calculation of her monthly Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program ("SNAP") benefits. Because Petitioner appealed, the matter was transmitted to the Office of Administrative Law for a hearing. On September 23, 2025, the Honorable Sarah G. Crowley, Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ"), held a telephonic plenary hearing, took testimony, and admitted documents into evidence. On October 7, 2025, the ALJ issued an Initial Decision, affirming the Agency's determination.

No Exceptions to the Initial Decision were received.

As Assistant Commissioner, Division of Family Development ("DFD"), Department of Human Services, I have considered the ALJ's Initial Decision, and following an independent review of the record, the ALJ's Initial Decision is hereby ADOPTED, and the Agency determination is AFFIRMED, based on the discussion below.

Regulatory authority applicable to SNAP benefit cases, defines income as "all income from whatever source unless such income is specifically excluded." See N.J.A.C. 10:87-5.3. Additionally, for SNAP benefits cases, unearned income includes survivors, disability, and Social Security benefits for both adults and children in the household, and also includes unemployment compensation. See N.J.A.C. 10:87-5.5(a)(2).

In order to determine an applicant's eligibility for SNAP, the applicant's income and resources must be below a certain threshold. N.J.A.C. 10:87-6.16 outlines the procedures used to calculate net income and benefit levels for SNAP recipients. The regulation provides that the applicant's monthly net income is determined by adding together all earned and unearned income, then subtracting all income exclusions. Then, the standard deduction, based upon the size of the household, is subtracted from the income.

Thereafter, the household is evaluated to determine if a medical deduction is appropriate, which is if the household has medical expenses that exceed \$35.00. If the household is entitled to a medical deduction, then the amount in excess of \$35.00 is subtracted from the applicant's income. Then, the applicant is evaluated for an excess shelter deduction. Such a deduction is permitted when the individual's shelter costs exceed 50% of their net income. If this deduction is allowable, then the difference between the shelter costs and the 50% net income, or up to the maximum allowable amount, is subtracted from the individual's income. The remaining figure is Petitioner's net income. This net income is then compared against the maximum allowable net income amount for the household's size, as outlined at N.J.A.C. 10:87-12.3, to determine eligibility. If eligible, the household's monthly SNAP allotment shall be equal to the maximum food stamp allotment for the household's size, reduced by 30 percent of the household's net monthly income. See N.J.A.C. 10:87-12.6(a)(1).



Here, the record reveals that Petitioner had submitted a medical bill to the Agency, which the Agency erroneously processed as a monthly expense rather than averaging the amount of the one-time bill over twelve months. See Initial Decision at 2; see also Exhibits R-1 through R-10. The Agency representative testified that Petitioner should not have been receiving a monthly deduction for the one-time medical bill, which had led to an increase in her SNAP benefit amount, and then subsequently a deduction in her SNAP benefit amount upon the realization the bill was not properly averaged. Ibid. Petitioner did not dispute that the medical bill in question was a one-time hospital bill and not a monthly bill. Ibid. Based on the foregoing, the ALJ concluded that the Agency's calculations of Petitioner's monthly SNAP benefits allotment, which resulted in a decrease in the amount of benefits effective August 1, 2025, were correct and must stand. See Initial Decision at 4. Based upon an independent review of the record, I agree.

Accordingly, the Initial Decision in this matter is ADOPTED, and the Agency's determination is hereby AFFIRMED, as outlined above.

Officially approved final version. November 07, 2025

Natasha Johnson
Assistant Commissioner

