




# Grayslake

Community Data Snapshot

Municipality Series

July 2023 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 on the CMAP website at [cmap.illinois.gov/data/community-snapshots](http://cmap.illinois.gov/data/community-snapshots). The data is also available in table format at 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 of the municipality's population, as of the 2020 decennial census.

### 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 Assessed 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.

### Comparing ACS Data Across Past Community Data Snapshots

When using multiple releases of the CDS, please take care not to compare overlapping ACS 5-year estimates. The Census Bureau provides [specific guidance](#) for when it is appropriate to compare ACS data across time. Please contact CMAP staff at [info@cmap.illinois.gov](mailto:info@cmap.illinois.gov) if you have additional questions.

## Population and Households

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

### General Population Characteristics, 2020

	Grayslake	Lake County	CMAP Region
<b>Total Population</b>	21,248	714,342	8,577,735
<b>Total Households</b>	8,122	253,386	3,266,741
<b>Average Household Size</b>	2.6	2.7	2.6
<b>Percent Population Change, 2010-20</b>	1.4	1.5	1.7
<b>Percent Population Change, 2000-20</b>	14.8	10.9	5.3

Source: 2000, 2010 and 2020 Census.

### Race and Ethnicity, 2017-2021

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>White (Non-Hispanic)</b>	15,003	72.0	428,289	59.9	4,289,683	50.1
<b>Hispanic or Latino (of Any Race)</b>	2,041	9.8	159,640	22.3	2,005,239	23.4
<b>Black (Non-Hispanic)</b>	1,428	6.9	46,346	6.5	1,402,691	16.4
<b>Asian (Non-Hispanic)</b>	1,234	5.9	58,331	8.2	636,825	7.4
<b>Other/Multiple Races (Non-Hispanic)</b>	1,121	5.4	21,878	3.1	236,095	2.8

Source: 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Total population

### Age Cohorts, 2017-2021

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Under 5</b>	1,387	6.7	39,917	5.6	502,928	5.9
<b>5 to 19</b>	3,933	18.9	154,954	21.7	1,662,052	19.4
<b>20 to 34</b>	4,248	20.4	129,356	18.1	1,774,853	20.7
<b>35 to 49</b>	4,260	20.5	138,658	19.4	1,724,098	20.1
<b>50 to 64</b>	4,486	21.5	148,709	20.8	1,659,323	19.4
<b>65 to 74</b>	1,589	7.6	62,704	8.8	746,030	8.7
<b>75 to 84</b>	678	3.3	27,445	3.8	347,665	4.1
<b>85 and Over</b>	246	1.2	12,741	1.8	153,584	1.8
<b>Median Age</b>	37.7		38.5		37.9	

Source: 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Total population

**Educational Attainment\*, 2017-2021**

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than High School Diploma	428	3.1	43,130	9.2	630,588	10.8
High School Diploma or Equivalent	1,718	12.3	94,568	20.1	1,303,071	22.2
Some College, No Degree	2,560	18.3	83,838	17.9	1,090,002	18.6
Associate's Degree	943	6.7	30,472	6.5	418,936	7.1
Bachelor's Degree	5,028	35.9	126,816	27.0	1,443,539	24.6
Graduate or Professional Degree	3,335	23.8	90,635	19.3	978,676	16.7

Source: 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.  
\*Highest degree or level of school completed by an individual.

Universe: Population 25 years and older

**Nativity, 2017-2021**

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Native	18,405	88.4	581,208	81.3	6,938,399	81.0
Foreign Born	2,422	11.6	133,276	18.7	1,632,134	19.0

Source: 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Total population

**Language Spoken at Home and Ability to Speak English, 2017-2021**

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
English Only	16,188	83.3	477,010	70.7	5,533,398	68.6
Spanish	1,258	6.5	117,740	17.5	1,479,334	18.3
Slavic Languages	298	1.5	19,613	2.9	289,350	3.6
Chinese	70	0.4	7,894	1.2	90,587	1.1
Tagalog	343	1.8	6,761	1.0	73,710	0.9
Arabic	0	0.0	1,706	0.3	63,720	0.8
Korean	99	0.5	5,007	0.7	37,671	0.5
Other Asian Languages	373	1.9	11,445	1.7	113,684	1.4
Other Indo-European Languages	665	3.4	24,626	3.7	328,784	4.1
Other/Unspecified Languages	146	0.8	2,765	0.4	57,367	0.7
<b>TOTAL NON-ENGLISH</b>	<b>3,252</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>197,557</b>	<b>29.3</b>	<b>2,534,207</b>	<b>31.4</b>
Speak English Less than "Very Well"*	785	4.0	65,001	9.6	940,619	11.7

Source: 2017-2021 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, 2017-2021

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
1-Person Household	1,960	25.1	58,195	23.0	948,087	29.4
2-Person Household	2,370	30.3	83,739	33.1	993,509	30.8
3-Person Household	1,602	20.5	41,705	16.5	503,236	15.6
4-or-More-Person Household	1,885	24.1	69,092	27.3	775,919	24.1

Source: 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Type, 2017-2021

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Family	5,432	69.5	182,704	72.3	2,062,968	64.1
Single Parent with Child	399	5.1	19,068	7.5	257,853	8.0
Non-Family	2,385	30.5	70,027	27.7	1,157,783	35.9

Source: 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Income, 2017-2021

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than \$25,000	747	9.6	28,546	11.3	486,172	15.1
\$25,000 to \$49,999	841	10.8	35,725	14.1	532,670	16.5
\$50,000 to \$74,999	834	10.7	34,553	13.7	491,960	15.3
\$75,000 to \$99,999	1,178	15.1	30,814	12.2	407,959	12.7
\$100,000 to \$149,999	1,619	20.7	47,055	18.6	575,992	17.9
\$150,000 and Over	2,598	33.2	76,038	30.1	725,998	22.5
Median Income	\$109,975		\$97,127		\$81,102	
Per Capita Income*	\$50,354		\$49,440		\$43,128	

Source: 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

\*Universe: Total population

Household Computer and Internet Access, 2017-2021

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
One or More Computing Devices	7,500	95.9	241,664	95.6	3,019,317	93.7
Smartphone(s) Only	175	2.2	14,179	5.6	240,075	7.5
No Computing Devices	317	4.1	11,067	4.4	201,434	6.3
Internet Access	7,346	94.0	237,827	94.1	2,935,545	91.1
Broadband Subscription	7,231	92.5	233,300	92.3	2,855,152	88.6
No Internet Access	471	6.0	14,904	5.9	285,206	8.9

Source: 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

**Housing Occupancy and Tenure, 2017-2021**

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Occupied Housing Units</b>	7,817	95.9	252,731	94.1	3,220,751	92.3
Owner-Occupied*	5,759	73.7	186,542	73.8	2,075,416	64.4
Renter-Occupied*	2,058	26.3	66,189	26.2	1,145,335	35.6
<b>Vacant Housing Units</b>	332	4.1	15,777	5.9	267,011	7.7

Source: 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Housing units  
\*Universe: Occupied housing units

**Housing Costs as a Percentage of Household Income\*, 2017-2021**

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Less than \$20,000</b>	595	7.7	17,930	7.2	315,268	10.1
Less than 20 Percent	0	0.0	624	0.3	7,772	0.2
20 to 29 Percent	118	1.5	1,130	0.5	22,358	0.7
30 Percent or More	477	6.2	16,176	6.5	285,138	9.1
<b>\$20,000 to \$49,999</b>	945	12.2	42,123	17.0	632,790	20.2
Less than 20 Percent	55	0.7	4,399	1.8	69,735	2.2
20 to 29 Percent	134	1.7	8,173	3.3	123,043	3.9
30 Percent or More	756	9.8	29,551	11.9	440,012	14.0
<b>\$50,000 to \$74,999</b>	834	10.8	34,110	13.8	486,707	15.5
Less than 20 Percent	250	3.2	9,517	3.8	139,609	4.5
20 to 29 Percent	329	4.3	12,656	5.1	171,702	5.5
30 Percent or More	255	3.3	11,937	4.8	175,396	5.6
<b>\$75,000 or More</b>	5,345	69.2	153,297	61.9	1,701,200	54.2
Less than 20 Percent	3,671	47.6	103,715	41.9	1,134,826	36.2
20 to 29 Percent	1,245	16.1	34,961	14.1	422,329	13.5
30 Percent or More	429	5.6	14,621	5.9	144,045	4.6

Source: 2017-2021 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>	34	42
<b>Transportation Costs</b>	23	24
<b>TOTAL H+T COSTS</b>	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, 2017-2021

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Single Family, Detached	4,743	58.2	179,154	66.7	1,745,022	50.0
Single Family, Attached	1,609	19.7	27,293	10.2	259,184	7.4
2 Units	86	1.1	7,056	2.6	239,727	6.9
3 or 4 Units	123	1.5	8,495	3.2	274,341	7.9
5 to 9 Units	412	5.1	9,693	3.6	270,594	7.8
10 to 19 Units	554	6.8	12,074	4.5	155,969	4.5
20 or More Units	603	7.4	20,154	7.5	513,327	14.7
Mobile Home/Other*	19	0.2	4,589	1.7	29,598	0.8

Source: 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.  
 \*"Other" includes boats, recreational vehicles (RVs), vans, etc.

Universe: Housing units

### Housing Size, 2017-2021

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
0 or 1 Bedroom	928	11.4	23,819	8.9	566,228	16.2
2 Bedrooms	1,841	22.6	63,626	23.7	973,190	27.9
3 Bedrooms	2,620	32.2	91,059	33.9	1,156,700	33.2
4 Bedrooms	2,460	30.2	70,350	26.2	612,171	17.6
5 or More Bedrooms	300	3.7	19,654	7.3	179,473	5.1
Median Number of Rooms*	6.5		6.3		6.0	

Source: 2017-2021 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, 2017-2021

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Built 2000 or Later	1,720	21.1	48,510	18.1	509,505	14.6
Built 1970 to 1999	5,111	62.7	133,264	49.6	1,189,334	34.1
Built 1940 to 1969	971	11.9	62,896	23.4	1,048,502	30.1
Built Before 1940	347	4.3	23,838	8.9	740,421	21.2
Median Year Built	1994		1981		1969	

Source: 2017-2021 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, 2017-2021

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>No Vehicle Available</b>	276	3.5	12,524	5.0	405,467	12.6
<b>1 Vehicle Available</b>	2,393	30.6	70,262	27.8	1,152,274	35.8
<b>2 Vehicles Available</b>	3,816	48.8	110,695	43.8	1,119,802	34.8
<b>3 or More Vehicles Available</b>	1,332	17.0	59,250	23.4	543,208	16.9

Source: 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

### Mode of Travel to Work, 2017-2021

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Work at Home*</b>	1,484	13.3	45,081	12.6	486,188	11.5
<b>Drive Alone</b>	8,223	73.8	258,310	72.1	2,743,345	64.9
<b>Carpool</b>	860	7.7	29,443	8.2	321,231	7.6
<b>Transit</b>	425	3.8	13,453	3.8	465,784	11.0
<b>Walk or Bike</b>	91	0.8	8,012	2.2	151,257	3.6
<b>Other</b>	53	0.5	4,026	1.1	62,008	1.5
<b>TOTAL COMMUTERS</b>	9,652	86.7	313,244	87.4	3,743,625	88.5
<b>Mean Commute Time (Minutes)</b>	30.3		29.7		31.7	

Source: 2017-2021 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\*, 2021

	Grayslake	Lake County	CMAP Region
<b>Average Vehicle Miles Traveled per Year</b>	19,448	19,459	15,653

Source: Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning analysis of 2021 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
<b>High Transit Availability</b>	0.6%	13.1%	53.9%
<b>Moderate Transit Availability</b>	51.6%	34.9%	20.6%
<b>Low Transit Availability</b>	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, 2017-2021

	Grayslake		Lake County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>In Labor Force</b>	12,170	73.4	386,409	68.4	4,614,158	67.3
Employed†*	11,101	91.2	355,739	92.1	4,306,443	93.3
Unemployed*	913	7.5	20,605	5.3	295,199	6.4
<b>Not in Labor Force</b>	4,406	26.6	178,248	31.6	2,237,246	32.7

Source: 2017-2021 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\*, 2022

	Grayslake		Lake County		6-County Region**	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Private Sector Employment</b>	5,661	N/A	279,856	N/A	3,497,215	N/A
<b>Job Change, 2012-22</b>	88	1.6	7,020	2.6	235,962	7.2
<b>Job Change, 2002-22</b>	472	9.1	8,823	3.3	138,855	4.1
<b>Private Sector Jobs per Household***</b>	0.72		1.11		1.09	

Source: Illinois Department of Employment Security, Where Workers Work report (2022).

\*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 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

### Employment of Grayslake Residents\*, 2019

TOP INDUSTRY SECTORS	Count	Percent
1. Manufacturing	1,401	14.6
2. Health Care	1,030	10.8
3. Retail Trade	1,030	10.8
4. Education	996	10.4
5. Professional	766	8.0
TOP EMPLOYMENT LOCATIONS		
1. Chicago	800	8.4
2. Grayslake	640	6.7
3. Libertyville	501	5.2
4. Waukegan	426	4.5
5. Gurnee	424	4.4

### Employment in Grayslake\*, 2019

TOP INDUSTRY SECTORS	Count	Percent
1. Education	1,711	23.2
2. Transportation	1,209	16.4
3. Retail Trade	617	8.4
4. Accommodation and Food Service	617	8.4
5. Health Care	578	7.9
TOP RESIDENCE LOCATIONS		
1. Grayslake	640	8.7
2. Round Lake Beach	363	4.9
3. Waukegan	340	4.6
4. Gurnee	253	3.4
5. Chicago	245	3.3

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics program (2019).

\*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, 2018

	Acres	Percent
Single-Family Residential	1,870.0	26.1
Multi-Family Residential	78.4	1.1
Commercial	442.0	6.2
Industrial	208.4	2.9
Institutional	566.5	7.9
Mixed Use	3.7	0.1
Transportation and Other	1,259.0	17.6
Agricultural	1,594.9	22.2
Open Space	460.8	6.4
Vacant	690.0	9.6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,173.6</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning analysis of the 2018 [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\*, 2018

	Grayslake	Lake County	CMAP Region
High Walkability	0.0%	5.1%	44.7%
Moderate Walkability	26.5%	28.1%	24.8%
Low Walkability	73.5%	66.8%	30.5%

Source: Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning analysis of the 2018 [Walkability Layer](#).

\*The CMAP Walkability Layer is based on several factors: the presence/absence of sidewalks; the number of amenities within walking distance; population/employment density; bicycle/pedestrian crashes and fatalities; and physical characteristics (e.g., tree cover, block length). This table reports the share of residents plus jobs whose home and workplace locations, respectively, are within each Walkability Layer category.

## Tax Base

The tax base tables include retail sales and equalized assessed values for Grayslake.

### General Merchandise Retail Sales, 2022

	Grayslake	Lake County	CMAP Region
<b>General Merchandise</b>	\$241,000,160	\$13,737,052,234	\$137,918,287,566
<b>Total Retail Sales</b>	\$302,920,509	\$16,333,189,023	\$168,382,810,939
<b>Total Sales per Capita*</b>	\$14,545	\$22,860	\$19,647

Source: Illinois Department of Revenue, 2022.

\*Per capita calculations based on population from 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

### Equalized Assessed Value, 2021

<b>Residential</b>	\$498,618,554
<b>Commercial</b>	\$109,402,045
<b>Industrial</b>	\$38,525,161
<b>Railroad</b>	\$480,201
<b>Farm</b>	\$2,041,938
<b>Mineral</b>	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$649,067,899

Sources: Illinois Department of Revenue, 2021.

## Change Over Time

The time series tables include comparisons of current 2017-2021 ACS estimates to historic year estimates from the 2000 Census and 2007-2011 ACS. Historic data may not be available for municipalities that were incorporated after 2000.

### Race and Ethnicity, Over Time

	2000 Percent	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
<b>White (Non-Hispanic)</b>	88.0	80.7	72.0
<b>Hispanic or Latino (of Any Race)</b>	5.0	7.0	9.8
<b>Black (Non-Hispanic)</b>	1.6	3.2	6.9
<b>Asian (Non-Hispanic)</b>	4.2	7.0	5.9
<b>Other/Multiple Races (Non-Hispanic)</b>	1.2	2.1	5.4

Source: 2000 Census; 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Total population

### Age Cohorts, Over Time

	2000 Percent	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
<b>19 and Under</b>	34.9	32.8	25.5
<b>20 to 34</b>	21.5	16.7	20.4
<b>35 to 49</b>	29.7	28.0	20.5
<b>50 to 64</b>	9.3	15.5	21.5
<b>65 and Over</b>	4.5	6.9	12.1
<b>Median Age</b>	32.2	35.3	37.7

Source: 2000 Census; 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Total population

### Educational Attainment\*, Over Time

	2000 Percent	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
<b>Less than High School Diploma</b>	5.4	2.8	3.1
<b>High School Diploma or Equivalent</b>	15.4	15.6	12.3
<b>Some College, No Degree</b>	22.0	19.8	18.3
<b>Associate's Degree</b>	6.5	7.1	6.7
<b>Bachelor's Degree</b>	33.3	34.8	35.9
<b>Graduate or Professional Degree</b>	17.5	20.0	23.8

Source: 2000 Census; 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 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

	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
<b>Native</b>	88.3	88.4
<b>Foreign Born</b>	11.7	11.6

Source: 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Total population

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

	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
<b>English Only</b>	86.2	83.3
<b>Spanish</b>	5.3	6.5
<b>Slavic Languages</b>	1.8	1.5
<b>Chinese</b>	0.7	0.4
<b>Tagalog</b>	1.3	1.8
<b>Arabic</b>	0.0	0.0
<b>Korean</b>	0.4	0.5
<b>Other Asian Languages</b>	2.3	1.9
<b>Other Indo-European Languages</b>	2.0	3.4
<b>Other/Unspecified Languages</b>	0.0	0.8
<b>TOTAL NON-ENGLISH</b>	13.8	16.7
Speak English Less than "Very Well"*	4.3	4.0

Source: 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 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

	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
1-Person Household	24.0	25.1
2-Person Household	26.9	30.3
3-Person Household	15.9	20.5
4-or-More-Person Household	33.3	24.1

Source: 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Type, Over Time

	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
Family	71.5	69.5
Single Parent with Child	7.6	5.1
Non-Family	28.5	30.5

Source: 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Income, Over Time

	2007-2011 (2021 Dollars)	2017-2021 (2021 Dollars)
Median Income	\$114,521	\$109,975

Source: 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Housing Occupancy and Tenure, Over Time

	2000 Percent	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
Occupied Housing Units	97.9	96.0	95.9
Owner-Occupied*	78.5	81.5	73.7
Renter-Occupied*	21.5	18.5	26.3
Vacant Housing Units	2.1	4.0	4.1

Source: 2000 Census; 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Housing units

\*Universe: Occupied housing units

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

	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
<b>Less than \$20,000</b>	7.8	7.7
Less than 20 Percent	0.2	0.0
20 to 29 Percent	2.0	1.5
30 Percent or More	5.6	6.2
<b>\$20,000 to \$49,999</b>	14.3	12.2
Less than 20 Percent	0.3	0.7
20 to 29 Percent	3.6	1.7
30 Percent or More	10.4	9.8
<b>\$50,000 to \$74,999</b>	15.1	10.8
Less than 20 Percent	3.4	3.2
20 to 29 Percent	4.1	4.3
30 Percent or More	7.6	3.3
<b>\$75,000 or More</b>	62.3	69.2
Less than 20 Percent	28.2	47.6
20 to 29 Percent	25.0	16.1
30 Percent or More	9.1	5.6

Source: 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 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

	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
Single Family, Detached	59.3	58.2
Single Family, Attached	22.4	19.7
2 Units	0.9	1.1
3 or 4 Units	2.9	1.5
5 or More Units	14.5	19.3
Mobile Home/Other*	0.1	0.2

Source: 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.  
\*“Other” includes boats, recreational vehicles (RVs), vans, etc.

Universe: Housing units

Housing Size, Over Time

	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
0 or 1 Bedroom	8.6	11.4
2 Bedrooms	26.6	22.6
3 Bedrooms	37.1	32.2
4 Bedrooms	26.4	30.2
5 or More Bedrooms	1.3	3.7
Median Number of Rooms*	6.4	6.5

Source: 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 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

	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
Built 2000 or Later	18.7	21.1
Built 1970 to 1999	65.4	62.7
Built 1940 to 1969	10.6	11.9
Built Before 1940	5.3	4.3
Median Year Built	1993	1994

Source: 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Housing units



Vehicles Available per Household, Over Time

	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
No Vehicle Available	3.2	3.5
1 Vehicle Available	30.3	30.6
2 Vehicles Available	48.6	48.8
3 or More Vehicles Available	17.8	17.0

Source: 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Universe: Occupied housing units

Mode of Travel to Work, Over Time

	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
Work at Home*	5.0	13.3
Drive Alone	81.0	73.8
Carpool	7.4	7.7
Transit	5.3	3.8
Walk or Bike	1.0	0.8
Other	0.4	0.5
<b>TOTAL COMMUTERS</b>	<b>95.0</b>	<b>86.7</b>
<b>Mean Commute Time (Minutes)</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>30.3</b>

Source: 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 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

	2007-2011 Percent	2017-2021 Percent
<b>In Labor Force</b>	<b>77.9</b>	<b>73.4</b>
Employed <sup>†*</sup>	95.1	91.2
Unemployed*	4.6	7.5
<b>Not in Labor Force</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>26.6</b>

Source: 2007-2011 and 2017-2021 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 Grayslake\*

Primary Water Source: Lake Michigan\*\*

	2003 MGD***	2013 MGD***	Percent Change
<b>Total Water Withdrawals****</b>	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
<b>Residential* (GPCD**)</b>	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.

### Residential Water and Wastewater Price Trends\*

MONTHLY COST PER 5,000 GALLONS**	2014	2020	Percent Change	Annualized Percent Change
	(2021 Dollars)	(2021 Dollars)		
<b>Drinking Water</b>	\$33.99	\$76.70	125.6	14.5
<b>Sewer</b>	\$32.45	\$45.44	40.0	5.8
<b>Combined***</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 prices were adjusted for inflation using the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U).

\*\*Monthly water bills are calculated as:  $monthly\ base\ charge + ((5,000\ gallons - water\ provision\ included\ in\ base\ charge) \times \$/1,000\ gallons)$ . Note that actual billing calculation practices may vary across communities.

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

**Water Loss\***

Reporting utility: Grayslake

	<b>2017</b>
<b>Nonrevenue Water (Millions of Gallons per Day)**</b>	0.12
<b>Annual Cost of Nonrevenue Water</b>	\$542,991
<b>Percent of Nonrevenue Water to Water Supplied***</b>	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 and updated in 2022. 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	Grayslake	CMAP Region		Source
		Current	Current	2050 Target	
Community	Population located in highly walkable areas	0.0%	46.1%	53.6%	CMAP, 2018
	Jobs located in highly walkable areas	0.0%	41.9%	46.0%	CMAP, 2018
Prosperity	Population aged 25+ with an associate’s degree or higher	66.4%	48.4%	64.9%	ACS, 2017-2021
	Workforce participation rate among population aged 20-64	86.6%	81.2%	83.4%	ACS, 2017-2021
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	0.26	0.19	0.17	USGS NLCD, 2019
	Daily residential water demand per capita (gallons)	56.8	87.5	65.2	ISWS IWIP, 2013
Governance	State revenue disbursement per capita	\$336.38	\$379.91*	N/A**	CMAP, 2021
	Is per capita disbursement at least 80% of regional median?	Yes	Yes for 79% of municipalities	Yes for 100% of municipalities	CMAP, 2021
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	25.7%	33.7%	37.3%	ACS, 2017-2021

\*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.