

Shortfall Payment Standard Study: July 2026

Summary

Option	Strategy	Biggest Upside	Biggest Downside	Protected Families Impacted	Avg. Increase (Protected)	Other Families Impacted	Avg. Increase (Other)	Overall Rent Burden (31%+)	Total families impacted	Annual HAP Savings	
Option 1	Maximum Savings Strategy	Generates the highest annual HAP savings (\$5.77 million), providing the greatest budget relief.	Achieves those savings by affecting 3,253 families with relatively high average rent increases.	921	\$122.34	2,332	\$147.88	40%	3253	\$5,772,544	*Maximize annual HAP savings while accepting broader tenant impacts.
Option 2	Deep Targeted Reduction	Reduces the number of affected families by approximately 37% compared with Option 1 while still generating more than \$3 million annually.	Produces some of the highest average rent increases for both protected and other families.	278	\$154.48	1,254	\$165.65	30%	1532	\$3,045,384	
Option 3	Balanced Savings Plan	Provides one of the strongest overall balances between budget savings, number of families affected, and average rent increases.	Does not lead any single category—it neither maximizes savings nor minimizes family impacts.	326	\$99.98	1,481	\$126.56	30%	1807	\$2,744,358	*Balance budget savings with the number of families affected and the size of rent increases.
Option 4	Broad Moderate Adjustment	Produces the second-highest annual HAP savings while keeping average rent increases relatively moderate.	Affects the largest number of families (2,940) of any option.	825	\$91.65	2,115	\$105.93	36%	2940	\$3,737,295	
Option 5	Uniform Minimal Adjustment	Produces the lowest average rent increases for both protected and other families while still generating nearly \$2.5 million in annual savings.	Still affects more than 2,600 families, resulting in a relatively low savings-per-family-impacted ratio.	715	\$69.07	1,888	\$79.00	33%	2603	\$2,467,715	
Option 6	High-Impact Concentrated Strategy	Limits payment standard reductions to the fewest families among the original high-savings options.	Produces the highest average rent increases for every family that is affected.	138	\$184.05	888	\$195.37	29%	1026	\$2,405,392	
Option 7	Selective Optimization	Offers a balanced middle ground with fewer families affected than Options 4 and 5 while maintaining relatively moderate rent increases.	Produces less savings than the higher-performing options while still affecting nearly 2,000 families.	345	\$91.77	1,632	\$107.83	31%	1977	\$2,558,264	
Option 8	Measured Savings Strategy	Generates more than \$2.18 million in annual savings while reducing impacts compared with the more aggressive savings strategies.	Protected households that are affected still experience relatively large average rent increases (approximately \$120).	482	\$120.27	932	\$128.77	33%	1414	\$2,184,885	
Option 9	Moderate Family Impact Strategy	Reduces both the number of families affected and average rent increases while still generating approximately \$1.73 million annually.	Produces noticeably less savings than the higher-performing options without minimizing impacts as much as the lowest-impact alternatives.	443	\$103.74	841	\$112.50	31%	1284	\$1,733,445	
Option 10	Minimal Protected Impact Strategy	Achieves approximately \$1.33 million in annual savings while keeping the average increase for protected households below \$90, the lowest among the targeted reduction strategies.	Requires affecting more households (and higher ratio of protected households) than Option 11 to achieve the additional savings.	394	\$88.76	750	\$96.71	30%	1144	\$1,327,654	
Option 11	Low-Impact Budget Relief	Produces the fewest families affected overall (672 total) while still generating just over \$1 million in annual HAP savings.	Protected households that are affected still experience average increases above \$110, concentrating impacts on a relatively small group.	126	\$112.06	546	\$127.97	27%	672	\$1,031,963	*Minimize impacts on participating families and administrative burden while still producing meaningful budget savings.

* Red highlight = Above the median threshold of "harm". However, each column represents a different type of impact, and some measures may be more important than others depending on priorities.