

## Chapter 4 – Market Summary

The purpose of the market summary chapter is to benchmark the City's compensation practices against that of its market peers; to establish how competitive the City is with the market. To complete this market study, Evergreen compared pay ranges of select benchmark positions that the City possesses against the compensation of positions performing those same duties within peer organizations. By aggregating the differences in pay ranges across all the positions, a reasonable determination is made as to the City's competitive position within the market.

It is important to note that individual salaries are not analyzed in this methodology, since individual compensation can be affected by several variables such as experience and job performance. For this reason, Evergreen looked at average pay ranges across the entire classification to make the most accurate comparison. The results of this market study should be considered reflective of the current state of the market at the time of this study; however, market conditions can change rapidly. Consequently, it is necessary to conduct market surveys of peer organizations at regular intervals for an organization to consistently monitor its position within the market. Furthermore, the market results detailed in this chapter provide a foundation for understanding the City's overall structural standing in the market, and the rates reflected in this chapter, while an important factor, are not the sole determinant for how classifications were placed into the proposed salary ranges outlined in **Chapter 6**.

Evergreen conducted a comprehensive market salary survey for the City, which included soliciting 20 target peer organizations (19 cities and one county), approved by City Council, for 50 benchmark positions. Of the 20 total organizations contacted, 16 responded and provided data for the benchmark positions. Target peers were selected based on a few factors, including geographic proximity, number of residents and employees, operating budget, total tax rate, per capita income and identity. Target organizations were also identified for their competition with the City for employee recruitment and retention efforts. The list of targets that provided data for the purpose of this study are included in **Exhibit 4A**.



#### EXHIBIT 4A RESPONDENT MARKET PEERS

Respondent Organizations
Alamo Heights
Bee Cave
Boerne
Bulverde
Flower Mound
Heath
Helotes
Kyle
New Braunfels
San Antonio
San Marcos
Schertz
Seguin
Selma
Shavano Park
Southlake
Terrell Hills
Trophy Club
University Park
Kendall County

Because the data collected for the market summary was from various regions, it was necessary to adjust peer responses relative to the City based on cost-of-living. For all organizations that fell outside the City's immediate region, a cost-of-living adjustment was applied to the reported pay ranges to ensure a market average was attained in terms of the spending power an employee would have in the City's local area. Evergreen utilizes cost-of-living index information from the Council for Community and Economic Research. The cost-of-living index figures for the City and each of the respondent market peers are in **Exhibit 4B**.

**EXHIBIT 4B**  
**RESPONDENTS WITH COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS**

Organization	Cost of Living
<b>City of Fair Oaks Ranch, TX</b>	<b>100.1</b>
Alamo Heights	100.1
Bee Cave	106.6
Boerne	111.0
Bulverde	111.0
Flower Mound	104.0
Heath	103.2
Helotes	100.1
Kyle	94.8
New Braunfels	98.9
San Antonio	100.1
San Marcos	94.8
Schertz	96.0
Seguin	96.0
Selma	100.1
Shavano Park	100.1
Southlake	111.0
Terrell Hills	100.1
Trophy Club	101.5
University Park	109.2
Kendall County	111.0

#### 4.1 MARKET DATA

The results of the market study are displayed in **Exhibit 4C**, which includes the benchmark job titles and the market average salaries for each position at the minimum, midpoint, and maximum points of the pay ranges. Also included within the exhibit are the percentage differentials of the City's pay ranges at each respective point, relative to the market average pay. A positive percent differential is indicative of the City's pay range exceeding that of the average of its market peers; alternatively, a negative percent differential indicates the City's compensation for a given position lagging behind the average of its peers. For those classifications where no differential is shown, this is due to the City not possessing a pay range for comparison to the market. The exhibit also includes the average pay range for the market respondents for each position, as well as how many responses each benchmark received.

While all benchmarks are included in the survey, not every peer organization possesses an appropriate match. Consequently, the benchmarks receive varying levels of response. For this study, any position that would have received fewer than five matches from market peers would not be considered in establishing the City's competitive position. The rationale behind those



exclusions is that insufficient response can lead to unreliable averages that may skew the aggregated data, blurring the reality of the City's actual position in the market. Of the 50 positions surveyed, 50 met the criteria for inclusion and none were excluded.

DRAFT



EXHIBIT 4C  
MARKET SURVEY RESULTS

ID	Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Survey Avg Range	# Resp.
		Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff		
1	Accountant I	\$58,184.77	-0.1%	\$70,606.15	2.2%	\$83,027.52	3.8%	42.9%	8.0
2	Accounting Manager	\$86,183.33	-15.8%	\$105,878.04	-14.6%	\$125,572.75	-13.7%	46.0%	6.0
3	Administrative Assistant	\$41,886.24	3.1%	\$50,520.83	5.9%	\$59,155.42	7.8%	41.3%	12.0
4	Administrative Clerk	\$38,648.10	1.3%	\$45,776.10	7.3%	\$52,904.10	11.2%	36.8%	9.0
5	Administrative Clerk-Temp/PT	\$38,214.06	2.4%	\$45,125.04	8.6%	\$52,036.02	12.7%	36.1%	9.0
6	Administrative Support Specialist	\$42,237.94	2.3%	\$50,960.85	5.1%	\$59,683.75	7.0%	41.4%	12.0
7	Animal Services Officer	\$41,528.66	-11.4%	\$49,864.13	-7.7%	\$58,199.61	-5.2%	40.2%	11.0
8	Assistant City Manager	\$134,579.12	4.8%	\$166,823.11	5.0%	\$199,067.10	5.1%	48.1%	10.0
9	Asst. Director of Public Works	\$114,517.75	-26.6%	\$142,073.64	-26.3%	\$169,629.53	-26.1%	48.4%	8.0
10	Building Inspector	\$52,086.30	1.1%	\$62,231.51	4.9%	\$72,376.72	7.4%	39.1%	12.0
11	Building Official	\$94,534.14	-27.1%	\$115,183.40	-24.7%	\$135,832.66	-23.0%	43.9%	8.0
12	Chief of Police	\$135,648.30	-12.1%	\$165,853.09	-9.9%	\$196,057.89	-8.4%	44.6%	9.0
13	City Manager	\$199,417.04	-10.2%	\$225,783.69	-0.5%	\$252,150.35	6.1%	26.5%	7.0
14	City Planner	\$64,370.85	4.5%	\$78,830.15	5.9%	\$93,289.45	6.8%	44.9%	7.0
15	City Secretary	\$88,362.90	-18.8%	\$105,348.09	-14.0%	\$122,333.28	-10.8%	38.5%	11.0
16	Civilian Investigator	\$75,977.40	-30.7%	\$87,711.22	-21.5%	\$99,445.04	-15.3%	30.8%	6.0
17	Code Compliance Officer	\$47,088.39	1.3%	\$56,780.32	4.2%	\$66,472.25	6.1%	41.3%	14.0
18	Court Administrator	\$73,298.87	-32.5%	\$90,740.66	-32.0%	\$108,182.46	-31.7%	47.7%	11.0
19	Court Clerk	\$42,798.06	1.0%	\$51,180.53	4.7%	\$59,563.01	7.2%	39.2%	12.0
20	Custodian/Maintenance Worker	\$36,119.09	-1.8%	\$43,214.40	3.4%	\$50,309.72	6.8%	39.5%	12.0
21	Deputy City Secretary	\$63,975.00	-27.6%	\$76,503.76	-22.9%	\$89,032.53	-19.7%	39.5%	8.0
22	Director of Finance	\$128,826.84	-6.4%	\$157,529.93	-4.3%	\$186,233.03	-2.9%	44.7%	13.0
23	Director of HR & Communication	\$124,535.20	-12.8%	\$153,634.15	-12.0%	\$182,733.11	-11.5%	46.9%	11.0
24	Director of Public Works & Eng	\$126,993.37	-15.0%	\$156,055.66	-13.8%	\$185,117.95	-12.9%	45.8%	14.0
25	GIS Technician	\$54,828.63	0.9%	\$67,025.80	2.5%	\$79,222.97	3.5%	44.6%	9.0
26	Human Resources Generalist	\$58,702.89	12.9%	\$71,250.73	14.9%	\$83,798.57	16.2%	42.9%	10.0
27	Infrastructure Inspector	\$57,432.54	6.0%	\$68,868.28	9.2%	\$80,304.02	11.4%	40.1%	10.0
28	Police Lieutenant	\$105,928.42	-18.7%	\$116,579.54	-9.9%	\$127,230.65	-3.4%	20.4%	8.0
29	Police Sergeant	\$90,004.56	-11.5%	\$100,198.28	-4.4%	\$110,391.99	0.8%	22.8%	14.0
30	IT Manager	\$89,741.77	14.6%	\$108,644.05	16.8%	\$127,546.34	18.2%	42.1%	9.0
31	IT Network Specialist	\$58,174.58	4.8%	\$70,392.43	7.2%	\$82,610.29	8.9%	42.1%	9.0
32	Maintenance Lead	\$48,671.36	-7.2%	\$58,034.11	-2.9%	\$67,396.86	0.0%	38.5%	11.0
33	Maintenance Supervisor	\$62,256.70	3.0%	\$75,162.58	5.7%	\$88,068.47	7.5%	41.5%	12.0
34	Maintenance Technician	\$40,299.10	-2.9%	\$47,902.80	3.0%	\$55,506.49	6.9%	37.7%	11.0
35	Manager of Engineering Service	\$98,612.93	-3.5%	\$119,791.80	-1.3%	\$140,970.66	0.3%	43.2%	6.0
36	Mechanic	\$46,080.16	12.5%	\$54,590.18	16.5%	\$63,100.20	19.3%	37.0%	8.0
37	Multimedia Comms. Officer	\$59,720.79	11.4%	\$72,640.26	13.2%	\$85,559.73	14.5%	43.5%	8.0
38	Payroll & AP Specialist	\$50,279.11	-10.7%	\$60,414.96	-7.1%	\$70,550.80	-4.7%	40.6%	12.0
39	Police Corporal	\$80,118.73	-18.3%	\$90,436.87	-12.3%	\$100,755.01	-7.9%	26.0%	5.0
40	Police Officer	\$66,756.45	-11.6%	\$77,629.38	-9.1%	\$88,502.31	-7.3%	32.4%	14.0
41	Police Sergeant	\$90,004.56	-11.5%	\$100,198.28	-4.4%	\$110,391.99	0.8%	22.8%	14.0
42	Procurement Manager	\$81,150.97	-14.6%	\$99,203.52	-12.8%	\$117,256.08	-11.6%	44.6%	8.0
43	Project Manager	\$76,816.77	-8.5%	\$92,956.05	-5.7%	\$109,095.33	-3.8%	42.1%	7.0
44	School Resource Officer	\$67,380.51	-12.6%	\$78,197.28	-9.9%	\$89,014.05	-7.9%	31.9%	11.0
45	Utilities Clerk	\$40,026.78	-2.2%	\$48,224.59	2.3%	\$56,422.40	5.3%	41.0%	9.0
46	Utility Technician	\$42,578.52	-8.7%	\$51,445.61	-4.2%	\$60,312.70	-1.2%	41.8%	9.0
47	Wastewater Supervisor	\$62,402.85	11.9%	\$75,983.02	13.6%	\$89,563.19	14.8%	43.7%	8.0
48	Water Supervisor	\$62,402.85	11.9%	\$75,983.02	13.6%	\$89,563.19	14.8%	43.7%	8.0
49	Water/Wastewater Operator II	\$47,395.53	-4.4%	\$58,214.81	-3.2%	\$69,034.09	-2.4%	45.9%	7.0
50	Water/Wastewater Operator III	\$51,012.63	-6.9%	\$62,570.91	-5.6%	\$74,129.18	-4.7%	45.7%	5.0
Overall Average			-5.8%		-2.4%		-0.1%	39.9%	9.6
Outliers Removed*			-5.8%		-2.4%		-0.1%	39.9%	9.6

## 4.2 SALARY SURVEY RESULTS

### Market Minimums

It is important to assess where an organization is relative to its market minimum salaries, as they are the beginning salaries of employees with minimal qualifications for a given position. Organizations that are significantly below market may experience recruitment challenges with entry-level employees. As seen in **Exhibit 4C**, the City is currently 5.9 percent below the market average minimum, when considering positions with sufficient responses. The City's benchmark positions ranged from 32.5 percent below to 14.6 percent above the market minimum.

The following points are regarding the City's position relative to the market average minimum:

- Of the 50 benchmarked positions, 31 were below market, averaging 13.1 percent below. These 31 classifications represent 62.0 percent of the surveyed positions that met the criteria for inclusion.
- Of the 31 positions below market, 11 were more than 15 percent below the average market minimum. These positions are displayed in **Exhibit 4D**.

#### EXHIBIT 4D CLASSIFICATIONS MORE THAN 15 PERCENT BELOW THE MINIMUM

Classification	% Diff
Court Administrator	-32.5%
Civilian Investigator	-30.7%
Deputy City Secretary	-27.6%
Building Official	-27.1%
Asst. Director of Public Works	-26.6%
City Secretary	-18.8%
Police Lieutenant	-18.7%
Police Corporal	-18.3%
Accounting Manager	-15.8%
Director of Public Works & Eng	-15.0%

- Of the 50 benchmarked positions, 19 were above the market, averaging 5.9 percent above. These 19 classifications represent 38.0 percent of the surveyed positions that met the criteria for inclusion.
- Of the 19 positions above market, six were more than 10 percent above the average market minimum. These positions are displayed in **Exhibit 4E**.



**EXHIBIT 4E**  
**CLASSIFICATIONS MORE THAN 10 PERCENT ABOVE THE MINIMUM**

Classification	% Diff
IT Manager	14.6%
Human Resources Generalist	12.9%
Mechanic	12.5%
Wastewater Supervisor	11.9%
Water Supervisor	11.9%
Multimedia Comms. Officer	11.4%

**Market Midpoints**

The market midpoint is exceptionally important to analyze, as it is often considered the closest estimation of market average compensation. As seen in **Exhibit 4C**, the City is currently 2.3 percent below the market average midpoint, when considering positions with sufficient responses. The City's benchmark positions ranged from 32.0 percent below to 16.8 percent above at the market midpoint.

The following points are regarding the City's position relative to the market average midpoint:

- Of the 50 benchmarked positions, 27 were below the market, averaging 11.1 percent below. These 27 classifications represent 54.0 percent of the surveyed positions that met the criteria for inclusion.
- Of the 27 positions below market, five were more than 15 percent below the average market minimum. These positions are displayed in **Exhibit 4F**.

**EXHIBIT 4F**  
**CLASSIFICATIONS MORE THAN 15 PERCENT BELOW THE MIDPOINT**

Classification	% Diff
Court Administrator	-32.0%
Asst. Director of Public Works	-26.3%
Building Official	-24.7%
Deputy City Secretary	-22.9%
Civilian Investigator	-21.5%

- Of the 50 benchmarked positions, 23 were above the market, averaging 8.0 percent above. These 23 classifications represent 46.0 percent of the surveyed positions that met the criteria for inclusion.
- Of the 23 positions above market, seven were more than 10 percent above the average market midpoint. These positions are displayed in **Exhibit 4G**.



**EXHIBIT 4G**  
**CLASSIFICATIONS MORE THAN 10 PERCENT ABOVE THE MIDPOINT**

Classification	% Diff
IT Manager	16.8%
Mechanic	16.5%
Human Resources Generalist	14.9%
Wastewater Supervisor	13.6%
Water Supervisor	13.6%
Multimedia Comms. Officer	13.2%

**Market Maximums**

The pay range maximum averages, and how they compare to the City's, are also detailed in **Exhibit 4C**. As seen in **Exhibit 4C**, the City is currently 0.1 percent above the market average maximum, when considering positions with sufficient responses. The City's benchmark positions ranged from 31.7 percent below to 19.3 percent above the market maximum.

The following points are regarding the City's position relative to the market average maximum:

- Of the 50 benchmarked positions, 23 were below market, averaging 10.3 percent below. These 23 classifications represent 54.0 percent of the surveyed positions that met the criteria for inclusion.
- Of the 23 positions below market, five were more than 15 percent below the average market maximum. These positions are displayed in **Exhibit 4H**.

**EXHIBIT 4H**  
**CLASSIFICATIONS MORE THAN 15 PERCENT BELOW THE MAXIMUM**

Classification	% Diff
Court Administrator	-31.7%
Asst. Director of Public Works	-26.1%
Building Official	-23.0%
Deputy City Secretary	-19.7%
Civilian Investigator	-15.3%

- Of the 50 benchmarked positions, 27 were above the market, averaging 9.0 percent above. These 27 classifications represent 54.0 percent of the surveyed positions that met the criteria for inclusion.
- Of the 27 positions above the market, 10 were more than 10 percent above the average market maximum. These positions are displayed in **Exhibit 4I**.



**EXHIBIT 4I**  
**CLASSIFICATIONS MORE THAN 10 PERCENT ABOVE THE MAXIMUM**

Classification	% Diff
Mechanic	19.3%
IT Manager	18.2%
Human Resources Generalist	16.2%
Wastewater Supervisor	14.8%
Water Supervisor	14.8%
Multimedia Comms. Officer	14.5%
Administrative Clerk-Temp/PT	12.7%
Infrastructure Inspector	11.4%
Administrative Clerk	11.2%

### 4.3 SALARY SURVEY CONCLUSION

The standing of individual classifications pay range relative to the market should not be considered a definitive assessment of actual employee salaries being similarly above or below the market; however, such differentials can, in part, explain symptomatic issues with recruitment and retention of employees.

The main summary points of the market study are as follows:

- The City's pay ranges are approximately 5.8 percent below the market minimum.
- The City's pay ranges are approximately 2.4 percent below the market midpoint.
- The City's pay ranges are approximately 0.1 percent below the market maximum.
- The City's pay range spread is approximately 47.7 percent, while its peers' pay range spread is 39.9 percent. That means that the City's salary scale is wider than its peers. As a result, even though the City is slightly below the average compared to the market at the minimum, because it has a wider spread it catches up to its peers at the higher end of the spectrum and surpasses the market by a few percentage points at the maximum.

The results of the market summary chapter are pivotal in the formulation of recommendations by Evergreen Solutions. By establishing the City's market position relative to its peers, Evergreen is better able to propose recommendations that enable the City to occupy its desired competitive position.

