




Grayslake

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. The underlying data can be downloaded from the [CMAP Data Hub](#). Please direct any inquiries to 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 Grayslake, which does *not* extend beyond the CMAP region.

Population and Households

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

General Population Characteristics, 2015-2019

	Grayslake	Lake County	CMAP Region
Total Population	20,720	701,473	8,483,267
Total Households	7,777	246,122	3,123,330
Average Household Size	2.7	2.8	2.7
Percent Population Change, 2010-19	-1.1	-0.3	0.6
Percent Population Change, 2000-19	12.0	8.9	4.1

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

Race and Ethnicity, 2015-2019

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
White (Non-Hispanic)	15,255	73.6	432,361	61.6	4,331,282	51.1
Hispanic or Latino (of Any Race)	2,573	12.4	152,141	21.7	1,952,500	23.0
Black (Non-Hispanic)	579	2.8	45,923	6.5	1,406,500	16.6
Asian (Non-Hispanic)	1,449	7.0	53,654	7.6	610,365	7.2
Other/Multiple Races (Non-Hispanic)	864	4.2	17,394	2.5	182,620	2.2

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

Universe: Total population

Age Cohorts, 2015-2019

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Under 5	1,227	5.9	40,703	5.8	518,065	6.1
5 to 19	4,084	19.7	152,672	21.8	1,644,152	19.4
20 to 34	4,445	21.5	128,316	18.3	1,794,152	21.1
35 to 49	4,333	20.9	137,299	19.6	1,701,494	20.1
50 to 64	4,439	21.4	146,144	20.8	1,635,766	19.3
65 to 74	1,357	6.5	57,332	8.2	691,947	8.2
75 to 84	714	3.4	26,661	3.8	346,833	4.1
85 and Over	121	0.6	12,346	1.8	150,858	1.8
Median Age	36.7		38.4		37.5	

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

Universe: Total population

Educational Attainment*, 2015-2019

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than High School Diploma	497	3.7	42,861	9.4	663,242	11.5
High School Diploma or Equivalent	1,685	12.5	95,007	20.8	1,314,011	22.8
Some College, No Degree	2,988	22.1	83,348	18.2	1,100,596	19.1
Associate's Degree	954	7.1	29,020	6.3	404,417	7.0
Bachelor's Degree	4,555	33.7	121,501	26.5	1,377,160	23.9
Graduate or Professional Degree	2,838	21.0	85,939	18.8	906,665	15.7

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.
 *Highest degree or level of school completed by an individual.

Universe: Population 25 years and older

Nativity, 2015-2019

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Native	18,007	86.9	570,075	81.3	6,857,014	80.8
Foreign Born	2,713	13.1	131,398	18.7	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

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
English Only	15,545	79.7	470,577	71.2	5,462,068	68.6
Spanish	1,960	10.1	114,481	17.3	1,469,511	18.4
Slavic Languages	295	1.5	19,308	2.9	275,630	3.5
Chinese	58	0.3	7,726	1.2	90,487	1.1
Tagalog	475	2.4	6,045	0.9	73,562	0.9
Arabic	18	0.1	1,092	0.2	61,851	0.8
Korean	400	2.1	5,397	0.8	36,522	0.5
Other Asian Languages	247	1.3	10,410	1.6	109,161	1.4
Other Indo-European Languages	418	2.1	22,603	3.4	329,735	4.1
Other/Unspecified Languages	77	0.4	3,131	0.5	56,675	0.7
TOTAL NON-ENGLISH	3,948	20.3	190,193	28.8	2,503,134	31.4
Speak English Less than "Very Well"*	1,088	5.6	67,033	10.1	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

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
1-Person Household	1,911	24.6	55,252	22.4	907,247	29.0
2-Person Household	2,526	32.5	79,353	32.2	962,910	30.8
3-Person Household	1,466	18.9	41,834	17.0	487,229	15.6
4-or-More-Person Household	1,874	24.1	69,683	28.3	765,944	24.5

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Type, 2015-2019

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Family	5,271	67.8	180,068	73.2	2,020,927	64.7
Single Parent with Child	562	7.2	19,589	8.0	255,505	8.2
Non-Family	2,506	32.2	66,054	26.8	1,102,403	35.3

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Income, 2015-2019

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than \$25,000	1,040	13.4	29,993	12.2	529,858	17.0
\$25,000 to \$49,999	824	10.6	39,275	16.0	567,834	18.2
\$50,000 to \$74,999	962	12.4	35,950	14.6	490,586	15.7
\$75,000 to \$99,999	1,147	14.7	30,200	12.3	395,676	12.7
\$100,000 to \$149,999	1,912	24.6	44,543	18.1	533,771	17.1
\$150,000 and Over	1,892	24.3	66,161	26.9	605,605	19.4
Median Income	\$97,265		\$89,427		\$73,572	
Per Capita Income*	\$42,963		\$45,766		\$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

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
One or More Computing Devices	7,330	94.3	231,828	94.2	2,844,477	91.1
Smartphone(s) Only	199	2.6	11,494	4.7	189,503	6.1
No Computing Devices	447	5.7	14,294	5.8	278,853	8.9
Internet Access	7,141	91.8	226,066	91.9	2,741,960	87.8
Broadband Subscription	7,070	90.9	220,965	89.8	2,640,864	84.6
No Internet Access	636	8.2	20,056	8.1	381,370	12.2

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Housing Occupancy and Tenure, 2015-2019

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Occupied Housing Units	7,777	97.4	246,122	93.2	3,123,330	91.6
Owner-Occupied*	5,304	68.2	179,679	73.0	1,996,297	63.9
Renter-Occupied*	2,473	31.8	66,443	27.0	1,127,033	36.1
Vacant Housing Units	209	2.6	17,956	6.8	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

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than \$20,000	802	10.4	19,250	8.0	346,898	11.4
Less than 20 Percent	0	0.0	697	0.3	8,867	0.3
20 to 29 Percent	96	1.2	1,447	0.6	25,618	0.8
30 Percent or More	706	9.2	17,106	7.1	312,413	10.3
\$20,000 to \$49,999	1,019	13.2	46,480	19.2	684,002	22.5
Less than 20 Percent	60	0.8	4,959	2.1	77,326	2.5
20 to 29 Percent	205	2.7	9,569	4.0	145,913	4.8
30 Percent or More	754	9.8	31,952	13.2	460,763	15.1
\$50,000 to \$74,999	962	12.5	35,493	14.7	485,439	15.9
Less than 20 Percent	220	2.9	10,168	4.2	151,167	5.0
20 to 29 Percent	457	5.9	12,922	5.3	173,246	5.7
30 Percent or More	285	3.7	12,403	5.1	161,026	5.3
\$75,000 or More	4,931	63.9	140,397	58.1	1,527,241	50.2
Less than 20 Percent	3,087	40.0	93,505	38.7	1,022,835	33.6
20 to 29 Percent	1,377	17.9	33,725	14.0	382,768	12.6
30 Percent or More	467	6.1	13,167	5.4	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***
Housing Costs	34	42
Transportation Costs	23	24
TOTAL H+T COSTS	56	67

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 Grayslake.

Housing Type, 2015-2019

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Single Family, Detached	4,658	58.3	177,495	67.2	1,710,011	50.1
Single Family, Attached	1,538	19.3	26,724	10.1	254,103	7.5
2 Units	78	1.0	6,800	2.6	237,977	7.0
3 or 4 Units	45	0.6	7,880	3.0	268,945	7.9
5 to 9 Units	359	4.5	9,831	3.7	270,643	7.9
10 to 19 Units	649	8.1	11,309	4.3	151,076	4.4
20 or More Units	655	8.2	19,484	7.4	490,331	14.4
Mobile Home/Other*	4	0.1	4,555	1.7	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

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
0 or 1 Bedroom	988	12.4	24,772	9.4	548,002	16.1
2 Bedrooms	1,933	24.2	60,860	23.0	965,749	28.3
3 Bedrooms	2,669	33.4	89,360	33.8	1,133,210	33.2
4 Bedrooms	2,130	26.7	70,161	26.6	597,921	17.5
5 or More Bedrooms	266	3.3	18,925	7.2	165,208	4.8
Median Number of Rooms*	6.2		6.3		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

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Built 2000 or Later	1,550	19.4	45,957	17.4	463,304	13.6
Built 1970 to 1999	5,101	63.9	131,490	49.8	1,161,616	34.1
Built 1940 to 1969	1,057	13.2	63,865	24.2	1,044,859	30.6
Built Before 1940	278	3.5	22,766	8.6	740,311	21.7
Median Year Built	1993		1981		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 Grayslake.

Vehicles Available per Household, 2015-2019

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
No Vehicle Available	437	5.6	12,425	5.0	399,783	12.8
1 Vehicle Available	2,047	26.3	67,000	27.2	1,111,243	35.6
2 Vehicles Available	3,897	50.1	109,395	44.4	1,098,207	35.2
3 or More Vehicles Available	1,396	18.0	57,302	23.3	514,097	16.5

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Mode of Travel to Work, 2015-2019

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Work at Home*	1,044	9.2	24,486	6.9	226,183	5.4
Drive Alone	8,900	78.8	273,445	76.8	2,865,893	68.4
Carpool	564	5.0	29,529	8.3	323,457	7.7
Transit	514	4.6	15,805	4.4	557,002	13.3
Walk or Bike	196	1.7	9,347	2.6	164,065	3.9
Other	71	0.6	3,306	0.9	53,525	1.3
TOTAL COMMUTERS	10,245	90.8	331,432	93.1	3,963,942	94.6
Mean Commute Time (Minutes)	30.6		30.4		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

	Grayslake	Lake County	CMAP Region
Average Vehicle Miles Traveled per Year	22,507	22,231	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

	Grayslake	Lake County	CMAP Region
High Transit Availability	0.6%	13.1%	53.9%
Moderate Transit Availability	51.6%	34.9%	20.6%
Low Transit Availability	47.7%	51.9%	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 Grayslake.

Employment Status, 2015-2019

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
In Labor Force	12,147	73.2	380,960	69.0	4,546,758	67.3
Employed†*	11,422	94.0	351,926	92.4	4,260,595	93.7
Unemployed*	643	5.3	19,357	5.1	274,246	6.0
Not in Labor Force	4,448	26.8	170,843	31.0	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

	Grayslake		Lake County		6-County Region**	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Private Sector Employment	5,832	N/A	288,487	N/A	3,574,346	N/A
Job Change, 2010-20	613	11.7	30,532	11.8	441,295	14.1
Job Change, 2002-20	643	12.4	17,454	6.4	215,986	6.4
Private Sector Jobs per Household***	0.75		1.17		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 Grayslake Residents*, 2018

TOP INDUSTRY SECTORS	Count	Percent
1. Manufacturing	1,413	14.1
2. Education	1,171	11.7
3. Health Care	1,052	10.5
4. Retail Trade	1,024	10.2
5. Professional	816	8.2
TOP EMPLOYMENT LOCATIONS		
1. Chicago	859	8.6
2. Grayslake	746	7.5
3. Libertyville	497	5.0
4. Waukegan	477	4.8
5. Gurnee	390	3.9

Employment in Grayslake*, 2018

TOP INDUSTRY SECTORS	Count	Percent
1. Education	2,136	26.1
2. Transportation	1,207	14.8
3. Health Care	885	10.8
4. Manufacturing	637	7.8
5. Accommodation and Food Service	579	7.1
TOP RESIDENCE LOCATIONS		
1. Grayslake	746	9.1
2. Waukegan	438	5.4
3. Round Lake Beach	433	5.3
4. Gurnee	293	3.6
5. Chicago	281	3.4

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 Grayslake.

General Land Use, 2015

	Acres	Percent
Single-Family Residential	1,873.7	26.2
Multi-Family Residential	78.0	1.1
Commercial	392.3	5.5
Industrial	170.3	2.4
Institutional	574.2	8.0
Mixed Use	6.3	0.1
Transportation and Other	1,279.4	17.9
Agricultural	1,512.4	21.1
Open Space	473.5	6.6
Vacant	804.7	11.2
TOTAL	7,164.9	100.0

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

Park Access, 2015

	Grayslake	Lake County	CMAP Region
Accessible Park Acreage per 1,000 Residents*	12.66	9.49	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

	Grayslake	Lake County	CMAP Region
High Walkability	0.0%	1.4%	40.5%
Moderate Walkability	47.6%	31.6%	23.8%
Low Walkability	52.4%	67.0%	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 Grayslake revenues based on sales and current land use.

General Merchandise Retail Sales, 2020

	Grayslake	Lake County	CMAP Region
General Merchandise	\$155,262,374	\$9,754,620,433	\$93,778,223,174
Total Retail Sales	\$217,551,411	\$11,935,965,091	\$122,031,206,863
Total Sales per Capita*	\$10,500	\$17,016	\$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

Residential	\$477,288,823
Commercial	\$97,594,856
Industrial	\$22,542,894
Railroad	\$486,077
Farm	\$1,613,118
Mineral	\$0
TOTAL	\$599,525,768

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)	88.0	82.6	73.6
Hispanic or Latino (of Any Race)	5.0	7.2	12.4
Black (Non-Hispanic)	1.6	2.4	2.8
Asian (Non-Hispanic)	4.2	6.0	7.0
Other/Multiple Races (Non-Hispanic)	1.2	1.8	4.2

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	34.9	32.4	25.6
20 to 34	21.5	17.3	21.5
35 to 49	29.7	29.4	20.9
50 to 64	9.3	13.5	21.4
65 and Over	4.5	7.3	10.6
Median Age	32.2	35.2	36.7

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	5.4	4.1	3.7
High School Diploma or Equivalent	15.4	15.4	12.5
Some College, No Degree	22.0	19.4	22.1
Associate's Degree	6.5	7.1	7.1
Bachelor's Degree	33.3	34.5	33.7
Graduate or Professional Degree	17.5	19.6	21.0

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
Native	87.8	86.9
Foreign Born	12.2	13.1

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
English Only	84.9	79.7
Spanish	5.6	10.1
Slavic Languages	2.5	1.5
Chinese	0.7	0.3
Tagalog	1.0	2.4
Arabic	0.0	0.1
Korean	0.7	2.1
Other Asian Languages	2.1	1.3
Other Indo-European Languages	2.2	2.1
Other/Unspecified Languages	0.2	0.4
TOTAL NON-ENGLISH	15.1	20.3
Speak English Less than "Very Well"*	4.7	5.6

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	23.6	24.6
2-Person Household	27.6	32.5
3-Person Household	16.4	18.9
4-or-More-Person Household	32.4	24.1

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	67.8
Single Parent with Child	6.8	7.2
Non-Family	28.3	32.2

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	\$107,585	\$97,265

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	97.9	95.3	97.4
Owner-Occupied*	78.5	83.4	68.2
Renter-Occupied*	21.5	16.6	31.8
Vacant Housing Units	2.1	4.7	2.6

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
Less than \$20,000	7.2	10.4
Less than 20 Percent	0.2	0.0
20 to 29 Percent	1.8	1.2
30 Percent or More	5.3	9.2
\$20,000 to \$49,999	15.3	13.2
Less than 20 Percent	0.3	0.8
20 to 29 Percent	3.3	2.7
30 Percent or More	11.8	9.8
\$50,000 to \$74,999	15.1	12.5
Less than 20 Percent	2.5	2.9
20 to 29 Percent	4.3	5.9
30 Percent or More	8.4	3.7
\$75,000 or More	62.0	63.9
Less than 20 Percent	28.8	40.0
20 to 29 Percent	24.2	17.9
30 Percent or More	9.0	6.1

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	60.0	58.3
Single Family, Attached	22.3	19.3
2 Units	0.2	1.0
3 or 4 Units	3.2	0.6
5 or More Units	14.3	20.8
Mobile Home/Other*	0.0	0.1

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	8.2	12.4
2 Bedrooms	27.2	24.2
3 Bedrooms	36.9	33.4
4 Bedrooms	26.3	26.7
5 or More Bedrooms	1.4	3.3
Median Number of Rooms*	6.3	6.2

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	19.7	19.4
Built 1970 to 1999	64.0	63.9
Built 1940 to 1969	11.4	13.2
Built Before 1940	4.8	3.5
Median Year Built	1994	1993

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	2.6	5.6
1 Vehicle Available	28.1	26.3
2 Vehicles Available	52.2	50.1
3 or More Vehicles Available	17.2	18.0

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*	4.8	9.2
Drive Alone	82.1	78.8
Carpool	6.0	5.0
Transit	5.7	4.6
Walk or Bike	1.0	1.7
Other	0.4	0.6
TOTAL COMMUTERS	95.2	90.8
Mean Commute Time (Minutes)	35.4	30.6

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
In Labor Force	77.3	73.2
Employed ^{†*}	95.1	94.0
Unemployed*	4.5	5.3
Not in Labor Force	22.7	26.8

Source: 2006-2010 and 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

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 Grayslake*

Primary Water Source: Lake Michigan**

	2003 MGD***	2013 MGD***	Percent Change
Total Water Withdrawals****	1.40	1.37	-2.4
Residential Sector	1.19	1.19	0.7
Non-Residential Sector	0.21	0.17	-19.7

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

	Grayslake			CMAP Region		
	2003	2013	Percent Change	2003	2013	Percent Change
Residential* (GPCD**)	60.7	56.8	-6.3	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
Drinking Water	\$4.87	\$7.10	45.9	3.9
Sewer	\$4.64	\$8.68	87.0	6.5
Combined** (if Applicable)	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: Grayslake

	2017
Nonrevenue Water (Millions of Gallons per Day)**	0.12
Annual Cost of Nonrevenue Water	\$542,991
Percent of Nonrevenue Water to Water Supplied***	9.3

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 to learn more.

Plan Chapter	Indicator	Grayslake	CMAP Region		Source
		Current	Current	2050 Target	
Community	Population located in highly walkable areas	0.0%	41.5%	45.2%	CMAP, 2015
	Jobs located in highly walkable areas	0.0%	38.2%	45.2%	CMAP, 2015
Prosperity	Population aged 25+ with an associate’s degree or higher	61.8%	46.6%	64.9%	ACS, 2015-2019
	Workforce participation rate among population aged 20-64	85.2%	80.8%	83.4%	ACS, 2015-2019
Environment	Population with park access of 4+ acres per 1,000 residents	89.6%	41.8%	65.0%	CMAP, 2015
	Population with park access of 10+ acres per 1,000 residents	63.4%	16.3%	40.0%	CMAP, 2015
	Impervious acres per household	0.23	0.18	0.15	USGS NLCD, 2016
	Daily residential water demand per capita (gallons)	56.8	87.5	65.2	ISWS IWIP, 2013
Governance	State revenue disbursement per capita	\$298.96	\$324.17*	N/A**	CMAP, 2020
	Is per capita disbursement at least 80% of regional median?	Yes	Yes for 78% of municipalities	Yes for 100% of municipalities	CMAP, 2020
Mobility	Population with at least moderately high transit availability	0.8%	53.2%	65.0%	CMAP, 2017
	Jobs with at least moderately high transit availability	0.0%	55.2%	58.0%	CMAP, 2017
	Percent of trips to work via non-single occupancy vehicle modes	20.5%	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.