




## Braceville

Community Data Snapshot

Municipality Series

June 2021 Release



## About the Community Data Snapshots

The Community Data Snapshots is a series of data profiles for every county, municipality, and Chicago Community Area (CCA) within the [Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning \(CMAP\)](#) seven-county northeastern Illinois region. The snapshots primarily feature data from the American Community Survey (ACS) five-year estimates, although other data sources include the U.S. Census Bureau, Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA), Illinois Department of Employment Security (IDES), Illinois Department of Revenue (IDR), HERE Technologies, and CMAP itself.

CMAP publishes updated Community Data Snapshots annually to reflect the most recent data available. The latest version can always be found at [cmap.illinois.gov/data/community-snapshots](http://cmap.illinois.gov/data/community-snapshots). The underlying data can be downloaded from the [CMAP Data Hub](#). Please direct any inquiries to [info@cmap.illinois.gov](mailto:info@cmap.illinois.gov).

To improve the Community Data Snapshots in the future, CMAP wants to hear from you! **Please take a quick survey** to describe how you use this data and what you would like to see in next year's snapshots.

## User Notes

### Definitions

For data derived from the ACS, the Community Data Snapshots uses terminology based on the [ACS subject definitions](#).

### Margins of Error

The ACS is a sample-based data product. Exercise caution when using data from low-population communities, as the margins of error are often large compared to the estimates. For more details, please refer to the [ACS sample size and data quality methodology](#).

### Regional Values

Regional values are estimated by aggregating ACS data for the seven counties that compose the CMAP region. These counties are Cook, DuPage, Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry, and Will.

### Median Values

The Census Bureau encourages users to aggregate small levels of geographies into larger areas to estimate median values for those areas. Median values for the aggregated geographies (CCAs and the CMAP region) are estimated from the [grouped frequency distributions](#) reported in the ACS.

### Municipalities Located in Multiple Counties

County data is presented for the CMAP county containing the largest portion (by area) of the municipality.

### Municipalities That Extend Beyond the CMAP Region

Values derived from CMAP analyses are generally restricted to geographies that fall within the CMAP regional boundaries. Specifically, values in the General Land Use, Equalized Assesed Value, Park Access, Transit Availability, Walkability, Water Supply, and ON TO 2050 Indicators tables only represent the portion of each municipality that falls within the seven-county CMAP region. **This snapshot is for Braceville, which extends beyond the CMAP region.**

## Population and Households

The population and household tables include general demographic, social, and economic characteristics summarized for Braceville.

### General Population Characteristics, 2015-2019

	Braceville	Will County	CMAP Region
<b>Total Population</b>	759	689,315	8,483,267
<b>Total Households</b>	285	229,498	3,123,330
<b>Average Household Size</b>	2.7	3.0	2.7
<b>Percent Population Change, 2010-19</b>	-4.3	1.7	0.6
<b>Percent Population Change, 2000-19</b>	-4.2	37.2	4.1

Source: 2000 and 2010 Census, 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

### Race and Ethnicity, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>White (Non-Hispanic)</b>	648	85.4	438,965	63.7	4,331,282	51.1
<b>Hispanic or Latino (of Any Race)</b>	88	11.6	119,765	17.4	1,952,500	23.0
<b>Black (Non-Hispanic)</b>	0	0.0	76,586	11.1	1,406,500	16.6
<b>Asian (Non-Hispanic)</b>	3	0.4	37,434	5.4	610,365	7.2
<b>Other/Multiple Races (Non-Hispanic)</b>	20	2.6	16,565	2.4	182,620	2.2

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Total population

### Age Cohorts, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Under 5</b>	48	6.3	40,632	5.9	518,065	6.1
<b>5 to 19</b>	174	22.9	152,328	22.1	1,644,152	19.4
<b>20 to 34</b>	123	16.2	125,380	18.2	1,794,152	21.1
<b>35 to 49</b>	179	23.6	147,318	21.4	1,701,494	20.1
<b>50 to 64</b>	140	18.4	136,743	19.8	1,635,766	19.3
<b>65 to 74</b>	58	7.6	53,074	7.7	691,947	8.2
<b>75 to 84</b>	27	3.6	24,377	3.5	346,833	4.1
<b>85 and Over</b>	10	1.3	9,463	1.4	150,858	1.8
<b>Median Age</b>	38.3		37.9		37.5	

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Total population

**Educational Attainment\*, 2015-2019**

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than High School Diploma	28	6.0	40,481	9.0	663,242	11.5
High School Diploma or Equivalent	225	48.5	121,538	26.9	1,314,011	22.8
Some College, No Degree	124	26.7	96,777	21.4	1,100,596	19.1
Associate's Degree	51	11.0	37,993	8.4	404,417	7.0
Bachelor's Degree	30	6.5	100,578	22.3	1,377,160	23.9
Graduate or Professional Degree	6	1.3	54,298	12.0	906,665	15.7

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Population 25 years and older

\*Highest degree or level of school completed by an individual.

**Nativity, 2015-2019**

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Native	750	98.8	604,385	87.7	6,857,014	80.8
Foreign Born	9	1.2	84,930	12.3	1,626,253	19.2

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Total population

**Language Spoken at Home and Ability to Speak English, 2015-2019**

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
English Only	702	98.7	515,531	79.5	5,462,068	68.6
Spanish	4	0.6	80,948	12.5	1,469,511	18.4
Slavic Languages	0	0.0	10,033	1.5	275,630	3.5
Chinese	0	0.0	2,798	0.4	90,487	1.1
Tagalog	0	0.0	5,334	0.8	73,562	0.9
Arabic	0	0.0	4,008	0.6	61,851	0.8
Korean	0	0.0	1,310	0.2	36,522	0.5
Other Asian Languages	0	0.0	7,518	1.2	109,161	1.4
Other Indo-European Languages	5	0.7	18,350	2.8	329,735	4.1
Other/Unspecified Languages	0	0.0	2,853	0.4	56,675	0.7
<b>TOTAL NON-ENGLISH</b>	9	1.3	133,152	20.5	2,503,134	31.4
Speak English Less than "Very Well"*	0	0.0	51,140	7.9	946,875	11.9

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Population 5 years and older

\*For people who speak a language other than English at home, the ACS asks whether they speak English "very well," "well," "not well," or "not at all."

Household Size, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
1-Person Household	80	28.1	48,755	21.2	907,247	29.0
2-Person Household	77	27.0	69,980	30.5	962,910	30.8
3-Person Household	37	13.0	39,263	17.1	487,229	15.6
4-or-More-Person Household	91	31.9	71,500	31.2	765,944	24.5

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Type, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Family</b>	196	68.8	171,227	74.6	2,020,927	64.7
Single Parent with Child	27	9.5	17,466	7.6	255,505	8.2
<b>Non-Family</b>	89	31.2	58,271	25.4	1,102,403	35.3

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Income, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than \$25,000	31	10.9	25,208	11.0	529,858	17.0
\$25,000 to \$49,999	72	25.3	35,461	15.5	567,834	18.2
\$50,000 to \$74,999	57	20.0	37,173	16.2	490,586	15.7
\$75,000 to \$99,999	46	16.1	33,370	14.5	395,676	12.7
\$100,000 to \$149,999	45	15.8	49,071	21.4	533,771	17.1
\$150,000 and Over	34	11.9	49,215	21.4	605,605	19.4
<b>Median Income</b>	\$64,563		\$86,961		\$73,572	
<b>Per Capita Income*</b>	\$30,185		\$36,524		\$39,058	

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

\*Universe: Total population

Household Computer and Internet Access, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>One or More Computing Devices</b>	271	95.1	215,300	93.8	2,844,477	91.1
Smartphone(s) Only	38	13.3	10,872	4.7	189,503	6.1
<b>No Computing Devices</b>	14	4.9	14,198	6.2	278,853	8.9
<b>Internet Access</b>	247	86.7	209,127	91.1	2,741,960	87.8
Broadband Subscription	247	86.7	204,546	89.1	2,640,864	84.6
<b>No Internet Access</b>	38	13.3	20,371	8.9	381,370	12.2

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Housing Occupancy and Tenure, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Occupied Housing Units</b>	285	84.1	229,498	94.1	3,123,330	91.6
Owner-Occupied*	227	79.6	186,528	81.3	1,996,297	63.9
Renter-Occupied*	58	20.4	42,970	18.7	1,127,033	36.1
<b>Vacant Housing Units</b>	54	15.9	14,409	5.9	286,760	8.4

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Housing units  
\*Universe: Occupied housing units

Housing Costs as a Percentage of Household Income\*, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Less than \$20,000</b>	17	6.2	16,014	7.1	346,898	11.4
Less than 20 Percent	0	0.0	261	0.1	8,867	0.3
20 to 29 Percent	0	0.0	976	0.4	25,618	0.8
30 Percent or More	17	6.2	14,777	6.6	312,413	10.3
<b>\$20,000 to \$49,999</b>	83	30.3	41,684	18.5	684,002	22.5
Less than 20 Percent	29	10.6	5,668	2.5	77,326	2.5
20 to 29 Percent	14	5.1	9,018	4.0	145,913	4.8
30 Percent or More	40	14.6	26,998	12.0	460,763	15.1
<b>\$50,000 to \$74,999</b>	49	17.9	36,753	16.3	485,439	15.9
Less than 20 Percent	27	9.9	11,315	5.0	151,167	5.0
20 to 29 Percent	17	6.2	13,182	5.8	173,246	5.7
30 Percent or More	5	1.8	12,256	5.4	161,026	5.3
<b>\$75,000 or More</b>	125	45.6	131,125	58.1	1,527,241	50.2
Less than 20 Percent	101	36.9	84,288	37.4	1,022,835	33.6
20 to 29 Percent	24	8.8	35,818	15.9	382,768	12.6
30 Percent or More	0	0.0	11,019	4.9	121,638	4.0

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

\*Excludes households with zero/negative income, and renting households paying no cash rent.

Housing & Transportation (H+T) Costs as a Percentage of Household Income\*, 2012-2016

	Median-Income Family**	Moderate-Income Family***
<b>Housing Costs</b>	25	31
<b>Transportation Costs</b>	25	27
<b>TOTAL H+T COSTS</b>	49	58

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, [Location Affordability Index](#) (2012-2016).

\*The purpose of the H+T Index is to isolate the effect of location on housing and transportation costs, and is reported for different household typologies. The values above represent the percent of household income that an average household of each type spends on housing and transportation. The standard threshold of affordability is 30% for housing costs alone, and 45% for housing and transportation costs combined.

\*\*"Median-income family" assumes a 4-person, 2-commuter household with income equal to the regional median.

\*\*\*"Moderate-income family" assumes a 3-person, 1-commuter household with income equal to 80% of the regional median.

## Housing Characteristics

The housing characteristics tables include housing unit estimates by housing type, size, and age summarized for Braceville.

### Housing Type, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Single Family, Detached	318	93.8	182,200	74.7	1,710,011	50.1
Single Family, Attached	2	0.6	29,263	12.0	254,103	7.5
2 Units	2	0.6	4,908	2.0	237,977	7.0
3 or 4 Units	0	0.0	5,232	2.1	268,945	7.9
5 to 9 Units	0	0.0	4,699	1.9	270,643	7.9
10 to 19 Units	0	0.0	5,898	2.4	151,076	4.4
20 or More Units	0	0.0	8,346	3.4	490,331	14.4
Mobile Home/Other*	17	5.0	3,361	1.4	27,004	0.8

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Housing units

\*"Other" includes boats, recreational vehicles (RVs), vans, etc.

### Housing Size, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
0 or 1 Bedroom	18	5.3	13,880	5.7	548,002	16.1
2 Bedrooms	71	20.9	47,835	19.6	965,749	28.3
3 Bedrooms	214	63.1	98,733	40.5	1,133,210	33.2
4 Bedrooms	35	10.3	69,437	28.5	597,921	17.5
5 or More Bedrooms	1	0.3	14,022	5.7	165,208	4.8
Median Number of Rooms*	5.6		6.5		6.0	

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Housing units

\*Includes living rooms, dining rooms, kitchens, bedrooms, etc., that are separated by built-in, floor-to-ceiling walls.

Excludes bathrooms, porches, balconies, foyers, halls, and unfinished basements.

### Housing Age, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Built 2000 or Later	38	11.2	71,367	29.3	463,304	13.6
Built 1970 to 1999	156	46.0	112,348	46.1	1,161,616	34.1
Built 1940 to 1969	96	28.3	42,423	17.4	1,044,859	30.6
Built Before 1940	49	14.5	17,769	7.3	740,311	21.7
Median Year Built	1973		1991		1968	

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Housing units

## Transportation

The transportation tables include vehicle availability by household, mode of travel to work, annual vehicle miles traveled, and transit availability for Braceville.

### Vehicles Available per Household, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>No Vehicle Available</b>	5	1.8	8,483	3.7	399,783	12.8
<b>1 Vehicle Available</b>	76	26.7	57,750	25.2	1,111,243	35.6
<b>2 Vehicles Available</b>	105	36.8	100,163	43.6	1,098,207	35.2
<b>3 or More Vehicles Available</b>	99	34.7	63,102	27.5	514,097	16.5

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

### Mode of Travel to Work, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Work at Home*</b>	2	0.6	16,687	4.8	226,183	5.4
<b>Drive Alone</b>	323	92.8	287,635	83.3	2,865,893	68.4
<b>Carpool</b>	20	5.7	20,759	6.0	323,457	7.7
<b>Transit</b>	0	0.0	13,360	3.9	557,002	13.3
<b>Walk or Bike</b>	3	0.9	3,136	0.9	164,065	3.9
<b>Other</b>	0	0.0	3,550	1.0	53,525	1.3
<b>TOTAL COMMUTERS</b>	346	99.4	328,440	95.2	3,963,942	94.6
<b>Mean Commute Time (Minutes)</b>	28.8		33.0		32.5	

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Workers 16 years and older

\*Not included in total commuters or mean commute time.

### Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled per Household\*, 2017

	Braceville	Will County	CMAP Region
<b>Average Vehicle Miles Traveled per Year</b>	N/A	24,988	17,165

Source: Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning analysis of 2017 Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, HERE Technologies, and U.S. Census Bureau data.

\*Data not available for all communities in the CMAP region.

### Transit Availability of Resident and Job Locations\*, 2017

	Braceville	Will County	CMAP Region
<b>High Transit Availability</b>	N/A	5.3%	53.9%
<b>Moderate Transit Availability</b>	N/A	26.4%	20.6%
<b>Low Transit Availability</b>	N/A	68.3%	25.5%

Source: Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning analysis of the 2017 [Transit Availability Index](#).

\*The CMAP Transit Availability Index is based on four factors: frequency of transit service, proximity to transit stops, activities reachable without a transfer, and pedestrian friendliness. This table reports the share of residents plus jobs whose home and workplace locations, respectively, are within each Transit Availability Index category.



## Employment

The employment tables include general workforce characteristics for Braceville.

### Employment Status, 2015-2019

	Braceville		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>In Labor Force</b>	384	67.3	368,652	68.7	4,546,758	67.3
Employed†*	365	95.1	351,095	95.2	4,260,595	93.7
Unemployed*	19	4.9	17,294	4.7	274,246	6.0
<b>Not in Labor Force</b>	187	32.7	168,120	31.3	2,213,132	32.7

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Population 16 years and older

†Does not include employed population in the Armed Forces.

\*Universe: In labor force

### Private Sector Employment\*, 2020

	Braceville		Will County		6-County Region**	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Private Sector Employment</b>	N/A	N/A	213,001	N/A	3,574,346	N/A
<b>Job Change, 2010-20</b>	N/A	N/A	57,507	37.0	441,295	14.1
<b>Job Change, 2002-20</b>	N/A	N/A	92,871	77.3	215,986	6.4
<b>Private Sector Jobs per Household***</b>	N/A		0.93		1.14	

Source: Illinois Department of Employment Security, Where Workers Work report (2020).

\*Figures exclude employees not covered by unemployment insurance. Data not available for all communities in the CMAP region.

\*\*Data is not available for Kendall County.

\*\*\*Based on households from 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

### Employment of Braceville Residents\*, 2018

TOP INDUSTRY SECTORS	Count	Percent
1. N/A	N/A	N/A
2. N/A	N/A	N/A
3. N/A	N/A	N/A
4. N/A	N/A	N/A
5. N/A	N/A	N/A
TOP EMPLOYMENT LOCATIONS		
1. N/A	N/A	N/A
2. N/A	N/A	N/A
3. N/A	N/A	N/A
4. N/A	N/A	N/A
5. N/A	N/A	N/A

### Employment in Braceville\*, 2018

TOP INDUSTRY SECTORS	Count	Percent
1. N/A	N/A	N/A
2. N/A	N/A	N/A
3. N/A	N/A	N/A
4. N/A	N/A	N/A
5. N/A	N/A	N/A
TOP RESIDENCE LOCATIONS		
1. N/A	N/A	N/A
2. N/A	N/A	N/A
3. N/A	N/A	N/A
4. N/A	N/A	N/A
5. N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics program (2018).

\*Excludes residents working outside of, and workers living outside of, the seven-county CMAP region.

## Land Use

The land use tables include general land use composition, park access, and walkability for Braceville.

### General Land Use, 2015

	Acres	Percent
Single-Family Residential	0.0	0.0
Multi-Family Residential	0.0	0.0
Commercial	0.0	0.0
Industrial	0.0	0.0
Institutional	0.0	0.0
Mixed Use	0.0	0.0
Transportation and Other	825.2	100.0
Agricultural	0.0	0.0
Open Space	0.3	0.0
Vacant	0.1	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>825.6</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning analysis of the 2015 [Land Use Inventory](#).

### Park Access, 2015

	Braceville	Will County	CMAP Region
Accessible Park Acreage per 1,000 Residents*	N/A	9.23	5.78

Source: Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning analysis of the 2015 [Park Access Layer](#).

\*Neighborhood parks (smaller than 35 acres) are considered accessible for residents living within 0.5 miles; community parks (35 acres or larger) are considered accessible for residents living within 1 mile.

### Walkability of Resident and Job Locations\*, 2015

	Braceville	Will County	CMAP Region
High Walkability	N/A	2.6%	40.5%
Moderate Walkability	N/A	13.5%	23.8%
Low Walkability	N/A	83.9%	35.8%

Source: Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning analysis of the 2015 [Walkability Layer](#).

\*The CMAP Walkability Layer is based on several factors: the number of amenities within walking distance; population/employment density; bicycle/pedestrian crashes and fatalities; and physical characteristics (e.g., tree cover, block length). It does not currently account for the presence or absence of sidewalks. This table reports the share of residents plus jobs whose home and workplace locations, respectively, are within each Walkability Layer category.

## Revenue

The revenue tables include Braceville revenues based on sales and current land use.

### General Merchandise Retail Sales, 2020

	Braceville	Will County	CMAP Region
<b>General Merchandise</b>	\$2,474,432	\$8,586,391,452	\$93,778,223,174
<b>Total Retail Sales</b>	\$2,740,449	\$10,573,047,453	\$122,031,206,863
<b>Total Sales per Capita*</b>	\$3,611	\$15,338	\$14,385

Source: Illinois Department of Revenue, 2020.

\*Per capita calculations based on population from 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

### Equalized Assessed Value, 2019

<b>Residential</b>	\$11,017,126
<b>Commercial</b>	\$892,432
<b>Industrial</b>	\$620,797
<b>Railroad</b>	\$310,289
<b>Farm</b>	\$155,204
<b>Mineral</b>	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$12,995,848

Sources: Illinois Department of Revenue, 2019.

## Change Over Time

The time series tables include comparisons of current 2015-2019 ACS estimates to historic year estimates from the 2000 Census and 2006-2010 ACS.

### Race and Ethnicity, Over Time

	2000 Percent	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
White (Non-Hispanic)	98.1	92.2	85.4
Hispanic or Latino (of Any Race)	1.1	2.8	11.6
Black (Non-Hispanic)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Asian (Non-Hispanic)	0.0	2.9	0.4
Other/Multiple Races (Non-Hispanic)	0.8	2.1	2.6

Source: 2000 Census; 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Total population

### Age Cohorts, Over Time

	2000 Percent	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
19 and Under	32.3	34.8	29.2
20 to 34	24.1	16.4	16.2
35 to 49	22.9	27.3	23.6
50 to 64	13.8	13.5	18.4
65 and Over	6.9	7.9	12.5
Median Age	31.3	33.2	38.3

Source: 2000 Census; 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Total population

### Educational Attainment\*, Over Time

	2000 Percent	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
Less than High School Diploma	17.8	12.3	6.0
High School Diploma or Equivalent	41.3	38.1	48.5
Some College, No Degree	31.1	34.7	26.7
Associate's Degree	3.2	11.0	11.0
Bachelor's Degree	5.2	2.1	6.5
Graduate or Professional Degree	1.4	1.7	1.3

Source: 2000 Census; 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Population 25 years and older

\*Highest degree or level of school completed by an individual.

Nativity, Over Time

	2006-2010*	2015-2019
	Percent	Percent
<b>Native</b>	98.6	98.8
<b>Foreign Born</b>	1.4	1.2

Source: 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Total population  
\*Universe: Population 5 years and older

Language Spoken at Home and Ability to Speak English, Over Time

	2006-2010	2015-2019
	Percent	Percent
<b>English Only</b>	91.1	98.7
<b>Spanish</b>	2.8	0.6
<b>Slavic Languages</b>	0.0	0.0
<b>Chinese</b>	3.2	0.0
<b>Tagalog</b>	0.0	0.0
<b>Arabic</b>	0.0	0.0
<b>Korean</b>	0.0	0.0
<b>Other Asian Languages</b>	0.0	0.0
<b>Other Indo-European Languages</b>	2.8	0.7
<b>Other/Unspecified Languages</b>	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL NON-ENGLISH</b>	8.9	1.3
Speak English Less than "Very Well"*	1.4	0.0

Source: 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Population 5 years and older

\*For people who speak a language other than English at home, the ACS asks whether they speak English "very well," "well," "not well," or "not at all."

Household Size, Over Time

	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
1-Person Household	16.2	28.1
2-Person Household	38.0	27.0
3-Person Household	12.1	13.0
4-or-More-Person Household	33.7	31.9

Source: 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Type, Over Time

	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
Family	71.7	68.8
Single Parent with Child	11.1	9.5
Non-Family	28.3	31.2

Source: 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Income, Over Time

	2006-2010 (2019 Dollars)	2015-2019 (2019 Dollars)
Median Income	\$69,857	\$64,563

Source: 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Housing Occupancy and Tenure, Over Time

	2000 Percent	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
Occupied Housing Units	94.7	92.0	84.1
Owner-Occupied*	83.5	85.2	79.6
Renter-Occupied*	16.5	14.8	20.4
Vacant Housing Units	5.3	8.0	15.9

Source: 2000 Census; 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Housing units

\*Universe: Occupied housing units

Housing Costs as a Percentage of Household Income\*, Over Time

	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
<b>Less than \$20,000</b>	5.7	6.2
Less than 20 Percent	0.0	0.0
20 to 29 Percent	1.0	0.0
30 Percent or More	4.7	6.2
<b>\$20,000 to \$49,999</b>	25.6	30.3
Less than 20 Percent	7.7	10.6
20 to 29 Percent	5.1	5.1
30 Percent or More	12.8	14.6
<b>\$50,000 to \$74,999</b>	33.7	17.9
Less than 20 Percent	7.4	9.9
20 to 29 Percent	9.4	6.2
30 Percent or More	16.8	1.8
<b>\$75,000 or More</b>	31.6	45.6
Less than 20 Percent	22.6	36.9
20 to 29 Percent	7.7	8.8
30 Percent or More	1.3	0.0

Source: 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

\*Excludes households with zero/negative income, and renting households paying no cash rent.

Housing Type, Over Time

	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
Single Family, Detached	99.1	93.8
Single Family, Attached	0.0	0.6
2 Units	0.9	0.6
3 or 4 Units	0.0	0.0
5 or More Units	0.0	0.0
Mobile Home/Other*	0.0	5.0

Source: 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.  
\*“Other” includes boats, recreational vehicles (RVs), vans, etc.

Universe: Housing units

Housing Size, Over Time

	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
0 or 1 Bedroom	0.9	5.3
2 Bedrooms	28.5	20.9
3 Bedrooms	65.9	63.1
4 Bedrooms	3.7	10.3
5 or More Bedrooms	0.9	0.3
Median Number of Rooms*	5.6	5.6

Source: 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Housing units

\*Includes living rooms, dining rooms, kitchens, bedrooms, etc., that are separated by built-in, floor-to-ceiling walls.  
Excludes bathrooms, porches, balconies, foyers, halls, and unfinished basements.

Housing Age, Over Time

	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
Built 2000 or Later	1.5	11.2
Built 1970 to 1999	45.5	46.0
Built 1940 to 1969	28.5	28.3
Built Before 1940	24.5	14.5
Median Year Built	1965	1973

Source: 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Housing units



Vehicles Available per Household, Over Time

	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
No Vehicle Available	0.0	1.8
1 Vehicle Available	18.9	26.7
2 Vehicles Available	53.9	36.8
3 or More Vehicles Available	27.3	34.7

Source: 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Mode of Travel to Work, Over Time

	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
Work at Home*	0.0	0.6
Drive Alone	87.6	92.8
Carpool	11.5	5.7
Transit	0.0	0.0
Walk or Bike	0.9	0.9
Other	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL COMMUTERS</b>	100.0	99.4
<b>Mean Commute Time (Minutes)</b>	N/A	28.8

Source: 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Workers 16 years and older

\*Not included in total commuters or mean commute time.

Employment Status, Over Time

	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
<b>In Labor Force</b>	61.9	67.3
Employed <sup>†*</sup>	90.1	95.1
Unemployed*	9.9	4.9
<b>Not in Labor Force</b>	38.1	32.7

Source: 2006-2010 and 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Population 16 years and older

<sup>†</sup>Does not include employed population in the Armed Forces.

\*Universe: In labor force

## Water Supply

CMAP supports an integrated approach to water resource management, and encourages communities to incorporate water supply and demand considerations into land use, transportation, and infrastructure investment decisions. Assessing demand, price, and loss trends of a community can inform decisions that strengthen regional water supply management, maintain drinking water infrastructure, and manage demand. CMAP's ON TO 2050 plan contains [more information](#) about how communities can coordinate and conserve our shared water supply resources.

### Water Source and Demand Trends of Braceville\*

Primary Water Source: N/A\*\*

	2003 MGD***	2013 MGD***	Percent Change
<b>Total Water Withdrawals****</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Residential Sector	N/A	N/A	N/A
Non-Residential Sector	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Analysis of Illinois Water Inventory Program water withdrawal data (2003-2013).

\*Only available for municipalities with community water suppliers providing service to the majority of the community.

\*\*The primary water source of a community is based on the source of the majority of withdrawals from all wells and intakes within the community, including community water suppliers and industrial and commercial businesses. The majority of withdrawals is calculated as an average from yearly data, given year to year fluctuations.

\*\*\*Millions of gallons per day.

\*\*\*\*Total includes all community water suppliers and industrial and commercial wells/intakes within a municipality; private residential wells are not included. Residential sector includes withdrawals identified as residential by community water suppliers. Non-residential sector includes withdrawals identified as non-residential by the community water suppliers and withdrawals from industrial and commercial wells/intakes.

### Daily Residential Water Demand per Capita

	Braceville			CMAP Region		
	2003	2013	Percent Change	2003	2013	Percent Change
<b>Residential* (GPCD**)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	104.2	87.5	-16.0

Source: Analysis of Illinois Water Inventory Program water withdrawal data (2003-2013).

\*Residential sector includes withdrawals identified as residential by community water suppliers. The prevalence of private residential wells or community water suppliers that provide water outside of the municipal boundary could lead to artificially lower or higher GPCD values respectively.

\*\*Gallons of water per capita per day (estimated unit use). Population values used in sector totals come from the U.S. Census.

### Water and Wastewater Price Trends\*

REAL PRICE PER 1,000 GALLONS	2008 (2018 Dollars)	2018 (2018 Dollars)	Percent Change	Annualized Percent Change
<b>Drinking Water</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Sewer</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Combined** (if Applicable)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant Water Rates Data for Northeastern Illinois, IISG19-RCE-RLA-031.

\*Only available for communities with water utilities and that responded to data requests. Percent changes and 2008 prices were adjusted for inflation using the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index for the Chicago-Naperville-Elgin region.

\*\*Some utilities combine drinking water and sewer prices, rather than separating them out as two distinct rates.

**Water Loss\***

Reporting utility: nan

	<b>2017</b>
<b>Nonrevenue Water (Millions of Gallons per Day)**</b>	N/A
<b>Annual Cost of Nonrevenue Water</b>	N/A
<b>Percent of Nonrevenue Water to Water Supplied***</b>	N/A

Source: Illinois Department of Natural Resources, Lake Michigan Allocation Program, 2017.

\*Data is only regionally available for Lake Michigan permittees; water losses from other communities and industrial and commercial businesses are not reported to the state.

\*\*Nonrevenue water is the difference between net annual pumpage (water supplied) and billed, authorized consumption. Non-revenue water includes water that is lost from the system due to underregistration of meters, systematic data handling errors, leakage anywhere within the distribution system, unauthorized consumption, or unbilled authorized consumption.

\*\*\*The threshold for permit compliance is less than 12% of water supplied in Water Year 2015, decreasing to no more than 10% by Water Year 2019 and all years thereafter. Permittees that exceed the threshold are required to submit a water system improvement plan.

### ON TO 2050 Indicators

ON TO 2050 is the region’s long-range comprehensive plan, adopted by CMAP in 2018. The plan includes a set of indicators for quantifying its goals and measuring implementation progress. While many of these indicators can only be measured at a regional level, several can also be tracked at a local level. These have been laid out in the table below, with comparisons to the region’s current measure as well as the targets that the plan is aiming to reach by 2050. Visit [cmap.illinois.gov/2050/indicators](http://cmap.illinois.gov/2050/indicators) to learn more.

Plan Chapter	Indicator	Braceville	CMAP Region		Source
		Current	Current	2050 Target	
Community	Population located in highly walkable areas	N/A	41.5%	45.2%	CMAP, 2015
	Jobs located in highly walkable areas	N/A	38.2%	45.2%	CMAP, 2015
Prosperity	Population aged 25+ with an associate’s degree or higher	18.8%	46.6%	64.9%	ACS, 2015-2019
	Workforce participation rate among population aged 20-64	79.4%	80.8%	83.4%	ACS, 2015-2019
Environment	Population with park access of 4+ acres per 1,000 residents	N/A	41.8%	65.0%	CMAP, 2015
	Population with park access of 10+ acres per 1,000 residents	N/A	16.3%	40.0%	CMAP, 2015
	Impervious acres per household	0.52	0.18	0.15	USGS NLCD, 2016
	Daily residential water demand per capita (gallons)	N/A	87.5	65.2	ISWS IWIP, 2013
Governance	State revenue disbursement per capita	\$238.07	\$324.17*	N/A**	CMAP, 2020
	Is per capita disbursement at least 80% of regional median?	No	Yes for 78% of municipalities	Yes for 100% of municipalities	CMAP, 2020
Mobility	Population with at least moderately high transit availability	N/A	53.2%	65.0%	CMAP, 2017
	Jobs with at least moderately high transit availability	N/A	55.2%	58.0%	CMAP, 2017
	Percent of trips to work via non-single occupancy vehicle modes	7.2%	30.3%	37.3%	ACS, 2015-2019

\*Median value of CMAP region’s 284 municipalities.

\*\*ON TO 2050 does not have a target for state revenue disbursement per capita in dollars, but rather for the share of municipalities receiving at least 80% of the regional median. The dollar figures are presented as context for the next row.