




Sugar Grove

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 Sugar Grove, 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 Sugar Grove.

General Population Characteristics, 2015-2019

	Sugar Grove	Kane County	CMAP Region
Total Population	9,689	531,376	8,483,267
Total Households	3,371	179,637	3,123,330
Average Household Size	2.9	2.9	2.7
Percent Population Change, 2010-19	7.7	3.1	0.6
Percent Population Change, 2000-19	147.9	31.5	4.1

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

Race and Ethnicity, 2015-2019

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
White (Non-Hispanic)	7,712	79.6	303,165	57.1	4,331,282	51.1
Hispanic or Latino (of Any Race)	781	8.1	169,364	31.9	1,952,500	23.0
Black (Non-Hispanic)	645	6.7	28,109	5.3	1,406,500	16.6
Asian (Non-Hispanic)	510	5.3	21,320	4.0	610,365	7.2
Other/Multiple Races (Non-Hispanic)	41	0.4	9,418	1.8	182,620	2.2

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

Universe: Total population

Age Cohorts, 2015-2019

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Under 5	328	3.4	34,078	6.4	518,065	6.1
5 to 19	2,116	21.8	117,579	22.1	1,644,152	19.4
20 to 34	1,288	13.3	97,492	18.3	1,794,152	21.1
35 to 49	2,374	24.5	109,507	20.6	1,701,494	20.1
50 to 64	2,260	23.3	102,770	19.3	1,635,766	19.3
65 to 74	910	9.4	42,350	8.0	691,947	8.2
75 to 84	319	3.3	20,313	3.8	346,833	4.1
85 and Over	94	1.0	7,287	1.4	150,858	1.8
Median Age	43.1		37.3		37.5	

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

Universe: Total population

Educational Attainment*, 2015-2019

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than High School Diploma	221	3.3	53,281	15.4	663,242	11.5
High School Diploma or Equivalent	1,816	27.3	78,727	22.7	1,314,011	22.8
Some College, No Degree	1,338	20.1	73,311	21.2	1,100,596	19.1
Associate's Degree	554	8.3	26,071	7.5	404,417	7.0
Bachelor's Degree	1,733	26.0	73,838	21.3	1,377,160	23.9
Graduate or Professional Degree	993	14.9	40,845	11.8	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

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Native	8,930	92.2	438,430	82.5	6,857,014	80.8
Foreign Born	759	7.8	92,946	17.5	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

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
English Only	8,195	87.5	340,940	68.6	5,462,068	68.6
Spanish	468	5.0	128,443	25.8	1,469,511	18.4
Slavic Languages	148	1.6	5,062	1.0	275,630	3.5
Chinese	0	0.0	902	0.2	90,487	1.1
Tagalog	0	0.0	3,741	0.8	73,562	0.9
Arabic	0	0.0	1,442	0.3	61,851	0.8
Korean	0	0.0	659	0.1	36,522	0.5
Other Asian Languages	373	4.0	4,985	1.0	109,161	1.4
Other Indo-European Languages	177	1.9	9,874	2.0	329,735	4.1
Other/Unspecified Languages	0	0.0	1,250	0.3	56,675	0.7
TOTAL NON-ENGLISH	1,166	12.5	156,358	31.4	2,503,134	31.4
Speak English Less than "Very Well"*	558	6.0	60,332	12.1	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

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
1-Person Household	683	20.3	39,305	21.9	907,247	29.0
2-Person Household	1,115	33.1	56,047	31.2	962,910	30.8
3-Person Household	454	13.5	29,003	16.1	487,229	15.6
4-or-More-Person Household	1,119	33.2	55,282	30.8	765,944	24.5

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Type, 2015-2019

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Family	2,622	77.8	131,759	73.3	2,020,927	64.7
Single Parent with Child	146	4.3	15,565	8.7	255,505	8.2
Non-Family	749	22.2	47,878	26.7	1,102,403	35.3

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Income, 2015-2019

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than \$25,000	156	4.6	22,682	12.6	529,858	17.0
\$25,000 to \$49,999	325	9.6	31,846	17.7	567,834	18.2
\$50,000 to \$74,999	360	10.7	30,202	16.8	490,586	15.7
\$75,000 to \$99,999	448	13.3	24,073	13.4	395,676	12.7
\$100,000 to \$149,999	917	27.2	35,554	19.8	533,771	17.1
\$150,000 and Over	1,165	34.6	35,280	19.6	605,605	19.4
Median Income	\$118,638		\$79,394		\$73,572	
Per Capita Income*	\$51,351		\$36,270		\$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

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
One or More Computing Devices	3,301	97.9	168,135	93.6	2,844,477	91.1
Smartphone(s) Only	165	4.9	10,476	5.8	189,503	6.1
No Computing Devices	70	2.1	11,502	6.4	278,853	8.9
Internet Access	3,311	98.2	161,944	90.2	2,741,960	87.8
Broadband Subscription	3,196	94.8	157,941	87.9	2,640,864	84.6
No Internet Access	60	1.8	17,693	9.8	381,370	12.2

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Housing Occupancy and Tenure, 2015-2019

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Occupied Housing Units	3,371	98.9	179,637	95.6	3,123,330	91.6
Owner-Occupied*	3,044	90.3	132,690	73.9	1,996,297	63.9
Renter-Occupied*	327	9.7	46,947	26.1	1,127,033	36.1
Vacant Housing Units	38	1.1	8,330	4.4	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

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than \$20,000	66	2.0	15,026	8.5	346,898	11.4
Less than 20 Percent	0	0.0	462	0.3	8,867	0.3
20 to 29 Percent	12	0.4	1,031	0.6	25,618	0.8
30 Percent or More	54	1.6	13,533	7.7	312,413	10.3
\$20,000 to \$49,999	415	12.3	37,141	21.0	684,002	22.5
Less than 20 Percent	132	3.9	4,494	2.5	77,326	2.5
20 to 29 Percent	39	1.2	8,058	4.6	145,913	4.8
30 Percent or More	244	7.2	24,589	13.9	460,763	15.1
\$50,000 to \$74,999	360	10.7	30,006	17.0	485,439	15.9
Less than 20 Percent	87	2.6	9,298	5.3	151,167	5.0
20 to 29 Percent	51	1.5	11,101	6.3	173,246	5.7
30 Percent or More	222	6.6	9,607	5.4	161,026	5.3
\$75,000 or More	2,530	75.1	94,543	53.5	1,527,241	50.2
Less than 20 Percent	1,795	53.2	61,917	35.0	1,022,835	33.6
20 to 29 Percent	573	17.0	26,030	14.7	382,768	12.6
30 Percent or More	162	4.8	6,596	3.7	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	41	51
Transportation Costs	25	27
TOTAL H+T COSTS	66	78

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 Sugar Grove.

Housing Type, 2015-2019

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Single Family, Detached	2,520	73.9	130,612	69.5	1,710,011	50.1
Single Family, Attached	581	17.0	20,430	10.9	254,103	7.5
2 Units	37	1.1	7,464	4.0	237,977	7.0
3 or 4 Units	79	2.3	6,660	3.5	268,945	7.9
5 to 9 Units	85	2.5	7,041	3.7	270,643	7.9
10 to 19 Units	36	1.1	4,863	2.6	151,076	4.4
20 or More Units	71	2.1	9,705	5.2	490,331	14.4
Mobile Home/Other*	0	0.0	1,192	0.6	27,004	0.8

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey five-year estimates.
 *"Other" includes boats, recreational vehicles (RVs), vans, etc.

Universe: Housing units

Housing Size, 2015-2019

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
0 or 1 Bedroom	74	2.2	15,758	8.4	548,002	16.1
2 Bedrooms	631	18.5	46,272	24.6	965,749	28.3
3 Bedrooms	1,159	34.0	65,649	34.9	1,133,210	33.2
4 Bedrooms	1,325	38.9	49,666	26.4	597,921	17.5
5 or More Bedrooms	220	6.5	10,622	5.7	165,208	4.8
Median Number of Rooms*	7.7		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

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Built 2000 or Later	1,907	55.9	46,128	24.5	463,304	13.6
Built 1970 to 1999	1,194	35.0	74,025	39.4	1,161,616	34.1
Built 1940 to 1969	246	7.2	39,756	21.2	1,044,859	30.6
Built Before 1940	62	1.8	28,058	14.9	740,311	21.7
Median Year Built	2001		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 Sugar Grove.

Vehicles Available per Household, 2015-2019

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
No Vehicle Available	115	3.4	8,123	4.5	399,783	12.8
1 Vehicle Available	774	23.0	47,699	26.6	1,111,243	35.6
2 Vehicles Available	1,533	45.5	77,698	43.3	1,098,207	35.2
3 or More Vehicles Available	949	28.2	46,117	25.7	514,097	16.5

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Mode of Travel to Work, 2015-2019

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Work at Home*	322	6.1	14,568	5.5	226,183	5.4
Drive Alone	4,570	87.1	209,068	79.6	2,865,893	68.4
Carpool	195	3.7	25,192	9.6	323,457	7.7
Transit	73	1.4	6,430	2.4	557,002	13.3
Walk or Bike	58	1.1	3,871	1.5	164,065	3.9
Other	30	0.6	3,488	1.3	53,525	1.3
TOTAL COMMUTERS	4,926	93.9	248,049	94.5	3,963,942	94.6
Mean Commute Time (Minutes)	27.5		29.1		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

	Sugar Grove	Kane County	CMAP Region
Average Vehicle Miles Traveled per Year	N/A	22,219	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

	Sugar Grove	Kane County	CMAP Region
High Transit Availability	0.0%	19.7%	53.9%
Moderate Transit Availability	0.0%	32.2%	20.6%
Low Transit Availability	100.0%	48.0%	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 Sugar Grove.

Employment Status, 2015-2019

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
In Labor Force	5,692	72.3	282,187	68.7	4,546,758	67.3
Employed†*	5,441	95.6	268,488	95.1	4,260,595	93.7
Unemployed*	251	4.4	13,589	4.8	274,246	6.0
Not in Labor Force	2,185	27.7	128,442	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

	Sugar Grove		Kane County		6-County Region**	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Private Sector Employment	2,085	N/A	174,075	N/A	3,574,346	N/A
Job Change, 2010-20	310	17.5	18,410	11.8	441,295	14.1
Job Change, 2002-20	825	65.5	9,736	5.9	215,986	6.4
Private Sector Jobs per Household***	0.62		0.97		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 Sugar Grove Residents*, 2018

TOP INDUSTRY SECTORS	Count	Percent
1. Education	563	11.4
2. Health Care	558	11.3
3. Retail Trade	505	10.2
4. Manufacturing	477	9.7
5. Professional	403	8.2
TOP EMPLOYMENT LOCATIONS		
1. Aurora	634	12.8
2. Chicago	572	11.6
3. Naperville	216	4.4
4. Batavia	177	3.6
5. Sugar Grove	158	3.2

Employment in Sugar Grove*, 2018

TOP INDUSTRY SECTORS	Count	Percent
1. Education	752	27.9
2. Manufacturing	359	13.3
3. Accommodation and Food Service	321	11.9
4. Wholesale Trade	287	10.7
5. Retail Trade	168	6.2
TOP RESIDENCE LOCATIONS		
1. Aurora	361	13.4
2. Sugar Grove	158	5.9
3. Montgomery	89	3.3
4. Naperville	88	3.3
5. Oswego	85	3.2

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 Sugar Grove.

General Land Use, 2015

	Acres	Percent
Single-Family Residential	1,274.3	19.2
Multi-Family Residential	1.7	0.0
Commercial	112.5	1.7
Industrial	132.4	2.0
Institutional	110.8	1.7
Mixed Use	1.6	0.0
Transportation and Other	1,409.1	21.2
Agricultural	2,461.0	37.1
Open Space	315.0	4.7
Vacant	815.4	12.3
TOTAL	6,633.6	100.0

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

Park Access, 2015

	Sugar Grove	Kane County	CMAP Region
Accessible Park Acreage per 1,000 Residents*	7.40	9.87	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

	Sugar Grove	Kane County	CMAP Region
High Walkability	0.0%	6.2%	40.5%
Moderate Walkability	0.0%	31.6%	23.8%
Low Walkability	100.0%	62.2%	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 Sugar Grove revenues based on sales and current land use.

General Merchandise Retail Sales, 2020

	Sugar Grove	Kane County	CMAP Region
General Merchandise	\$68,463,719	\$5,596,096,893	\$93,778,223,174
Total Retail Sales	\$105,530,194	\$7,294,449,545	\$122,031,206,863
Total Sales per Capita*	\$10,892	\$13,727	\$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	\$285,353,101
Commercial	\$22,042,950
Industrial	\$16,117,371
Railroad	\$242,100
Farm	\$2,935,381
Mineral	\$0
TOTAL	\$326,690,903

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)	92.8	80.8	79.6
Hispanic or Latino (of Any Race)	4.4	10.9	8.1
Black (Non-Hispanic)	1.4	2.5	6.7
Asian (Non-Hispanic)	0.5	3.5	5.3
Other/Multiple Races (Non-Hispanic)	0.9	2.2	0.4

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	34.7	32.4	25.2
20 to 34	16.0	15.7	13.3
35 to 49	29.1	26.9	24.5
50 to 64	15.4	19.2	23.3
65 and Over	4.7	5.7	13.7
Median Age	34.6	36.4	43.1

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	2.7	2.5	3.3
High School Diploma or Equivalent	28.2	22.0	27.3
Some College, No Degree	28.2	20.9	20.1
Associate's Degree	7.7	9.8	8.3
Bachelor's Degree	24.0	31.9	26.0
Graduate or Professional Degree	9.2	13.0	14.9

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	96.2	92.2
Foreign Born	3.8	7.8

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	91.2	87.5
Spanish	3.1	5.0
Slavic Languages	1.1	1.6
Chinese	0.5	0.0
Tagalog	0.1	0.0
Arabic	0.0	0.0
Korean	0.0	0.0
Other Asian Languages	1.3	4.0
Other Indo-European Languages	2.3	1.9
Other/Unspecified Languages	0.5	0.0
TOTAL NON-ENGLISH	8.8	12.5
Speak English Less than "Very Well"*	1.3	6.0

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	7.9	20.3
2-Person Household	39.7	33.1
3-Person Household	12.6	13.5
4-or-More-Person Household	39.8	33.2

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	86.9	77.8
Single Parent with Child	4.1	4.3
Non-Family	13.1	22.2

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	\$119,856	\$118,638

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	98.1	96.2	98.9
Owner-Occupied*	87.6	88.8	90.3
Renter-Occupied*	12.4	11.2	9.7
Vacant Housing Units	1.9	3.8	1.1

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	1.3	2.0
Less than 20 Percent	0.0	0.0
20 to 29 Percent	0.0	0.4
30 Percent or More	1.3	1.6
\$20,000 to \$49,999	9.8	12.3
Less than 20 Percent	0.0	3.9
20 to 29 Percent	1.7	1.2
30 Percent or More	8.0	7.2
\$50,000 to \$74,999	14.3	10.7
Less than 20 Percent	2.3	2.6
20 to 29 Percent	3.8	1.5
30 Percent or More	8.2	6.6
\$75,000 or More	73.9	75.1
Less than 20 Percent	28.4	53.2
20 to 29 Percent	29.7	17.0
30 Percent or More	15.8	4.8

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	76.9	73.9
Single Family, Attached	19.1	17.0
2 Units	2.0	1.1
3 or 4 Units	2.1	2.3
5 or More Units	0.0	5.6
Mobile Home/Other*	0.0	0.0

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	1.3	2.2
2 Bedrooms	12.9	18.5
3 Bedrooms	41.2	34.0
4 Bedrooms	36.3	38.9
5 or More Bedrooms	8.2	6.5
Median Number of Rooms*	7.7	7.7

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	51.0	55.9
Built 1970 to 1999	33.8	35.0
Built 1940 to 1969	10.6	7.2
Built Before 1940	4.6	1.8
Median Year Built	2000	2001

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	0.4	3.4
1 Vehicle Available	10.9	23.0
2 Vehicles Available	64.0	45.5
3 or More Vehicles Available	24.6	28.2

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*	6.7	6.1
Drive Alone	84.1	87.1
Carpool	4.6	3.7
Transit	2.5	1.4
Walk or Bike	0.3	1.1
Other	1.8	0.6
TOTAL COMMUTERS	93.3	93.9
Mean Commute Time (Minutes)	35.4	27.5

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	76.0	72.3
Employed ^{†*}	95.5	95.6
Unemployed*	4.5	4.4
Not in Labor Force	24.0	27.7

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

CMAAP 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. CMAAP'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 Sugar Grove*

Primary Water Source: Sandstone Groundwater**

	2003 MGD***	2013 MGD***	Percent Change
Total Water Withdrawals****	0.67	0.95	40.9
Residential Sector	0.58	0.82	40.8
Non-Residential Sector	0.10	0.14	42.0

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

	Sugar Grove			CMAAP Region		
	2003	2013	Percent Change	2003	2013	Percent Change
Residential* (GPCD**)	100.1	89.5	-10.6	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	\$2.87	\$4.88	69.8	5.4
Sewer	\$2.89	\$4.90	69.8	5.4
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: nan

	2017
Nonrevenue Water (Millions of Gallons per Day)**	N/A
Annual Cost of Nonrevenue Water	N/A
Percent of Nonrevenue Water to Water Supplied***	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 to learn more.

Plan Chapter	Indicator	Sugar Grove	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	49.3%	46.6%	64.9%	ACS, 2015-2019
	Workforce participation rate among population aged 20-64	84.4%	80.8%	83.4%	ACS, 2015-2019
Environment	Population with park access of 4+ acres per 1,000 residents	69.1%	41.8%	65.0%	CMAP, 2015
	Population with park access of 10+ acres per 1,000 residents	28.5%	16.3%	40.0%	CMAP, 2015
	Impervious acres per household	0.32	0.18	0.15	USGS NLCD, 2016
	Daily residential water demand per capita (gallons)	89.5	87.5	65.2	ISWS IWIP, 2013
Governance	State revenue disbursement per capita	\$278.72	\$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	0.0%	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	12.3%	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.