




University Park

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 University Park, 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 University Park.

General Population Characteristics, 2015-2019

	University Park	Will County	CMAP Region
Total Population	6,947	689,315	8,483,267
Total Households	2,455	229,498	3,123,330
Average Household Size	2.8	3.0	2.7
Percent Population Change, 2010-19	-2.6	1.7	0.6
Percent Population Change, 2000-19	4.3	37.2	4.1

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

Race and Ethnicity, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
White (Non-Hispanic)	471	6.8	438,965	63.7	4,331,282	51.1
Hispanic or Latino (of Any Race)	266	3.8	119,765	17.4	1,952,500	23.0
Black (Non-Hispanic)	5,892	84.8	76,586	11.1	1,406,500	16.6
Asian (Non-Hispanic)	15	0.2	37,434	5.4	610,365	7.2
Other/Multiple Races (Non-Hispanic)	303	4.4	16,565	2.4	182,620	2.2

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

Universe: Total population

Age Cohorts, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Under 5	738	10.6	40,632	5.9	518,065	6.1
5 to 19	1,430	20.6	152,328	22.1	1,644,152	19.4
20 to 34	1,721	24.8	125,380	18.2	1,794,152	21.1
35 to 49	1,225	17.6	147,318	21.4	1,701,494	20.1
50 to 64	1,152	16.6	136,743	19.8	1,635,766	19.3
65 to 74	448	6.4	53,074	7.7	691,947	8.2
75 to 84	204	2.9	24,377	3.5	346,833	4.1
85 and Over	29	0.4	9,463	1.4	150,858	1.8
Median Age	31.3		37.9		37.5	

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

Universe: Total population

Educational Attainment*, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than High School Diploma	186	4.2	40,481	9.0	663,242	11.5
High School Diploma or Equivalent	965	22.0	121,538	26.9	1,314,011	22.8
Some College, No Degree	1,429	32.6	96,777	21.4	1,100,596	19.1
Associate's Degree	579	13.2	37,993	8.4	404,417	7.0
Bachelor's Degree	844	19.2	100,578	22.3	1,377,160	23.9
Graduate or Professional Degree	385	8.8	54,298	12.0	906,665	15.7

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

Universe: Population 25 years and older

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

Nativity, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Native	6,770	97.5	604,385	87.7	6,857,014	80.8
Foreign Born	177	2.5	84,930	12.3	1,626,253	19.2

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

Universe: Total population

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

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
English Only	5,822	93.8	515,531	79.5	5,462,068	68.6
Spanish	162	2.6	80,948	12.5	1,469,511	18.4
Slavic Languages	0	0.0	10,033	1.5	275,630	3.5
Chinese	0	0.0	2,798	0.4	90,487	1.1
Tagalog	26	0.4	5,334	0.8	73,562	0.9
Arabic	0	0.0	4,008	0.6	61,851	0.8
Korean	0	0.0	1,310	0.2	36,522	0.5
Other Asian Languages	0	0.0	7,518	1.2	109,161	1.4
Other Indo-European Languages	40	0.6	18,350	2.8	329,735	4.1
Other/Unspecified Languages	159	2.6	2,853	0.4	56,675	0.7
TOTAL NON-ENGLISH	387	6.2	133,152	20.5	2,503,134	31.4
Speak English Less than "Very Well"*	71	1.1	51,140	7.9	946,875	11.9

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

Universe: Population 5 years and older

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

Household Size, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
1-Person Household	733	29.9	48,755	21.2	907,247	29.0
2-Person Household	622	25.3	69,980	30.5	962,910	30.8
3-Person Household	468	19.1	39,263	17.1	487,229	15.6
4-or-More-Person Household	632	25.7	71,500	31.2	765,944	24.5

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Type, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Family	1,627	66.3	171,227	74.6	2,020,927	64.7
Single Parent with Child	460	18.7	17,466	7.6	255,505	8.2
Non-Family	828	33.7	58,271	25.4	1,102,403	35.3

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Household Income, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than \$25,000	497	20.2	25,208	11.0	529,858	17.0
\$25,000 to \$49,999	672	27.4	35,461	15.5	567,834	18.2
\$50,000 to \$74,999	661	26.9	37,173	16.2	490,586	15.7
\$75,000 to \$99,999	195	7.9	33,370	14.5	395,676	12.7
\$100,000 to \$149,999	292	11.9	49,071	21.4	533,771	17.1
\$150,000 and Over	138	5.6	49,215	21.4	605,605	19.4
Median Income	\$52,250		\$86,961		\$73,572	
Per Capita Income*	\$22,874		\$36,524		\$39,058	

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

*Universe: Total population

Household Computer and Internet Access, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
One or More Computing Devices	2,187	89.1	215,300	93.8	2,844,477	91.1
Smartphone(s) Only	208	8.5	10,872	4.7	189,503	6.1
No Computing Devices	268	10.9	14,198	6.2	278,853	8.9
Internet Access	2,075	84.5	209,127	91.1	2,741,960	87.8
Broadband Subscription	2,027	82.6	204,546	89.1	2,640,864	84.6
No Internet Access	380	15.5	20,371	8.9	381,370	12.2

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Housing Occupancy and Tenure, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Occupied Housing Units	2,455	86.4	229,498	94.1	3,123,330	91.6
Owner-Occupied*	1,320	53.8	186,528	81.3	1,996,297	63.9
Renter-Occupied*	1,135	46.2	42,970	18.7	1,127,033	36.1
Vacant Housing Units	386	13.6	14,409	5.9	286,760	8.4

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

Universe: Housing units
*Universe: Occupied housing units

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

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Less than \$20,000	434	17.8	16,014	7.1	346,898	11.4
Less than 20 Percent	0	0.0	261	0.1	8,867	0.3
20 to 29 Percent	22	0.9	976	0.4	25,618	0.8
30 Percent or More	412	16.9	14,777	6.6	312,413	10.3
\$20,000 to \$49,999	716	29.4	41,684	18.5	684,002	22.5
Less than 20 Percent	119	4.9	5,668	2.5	77,326	2.5
20 to 29 Percent	99	4.1	9,018	4.0	145,913	4.8
30 Percent or More	498	20.4	26,998	12.0	460,763	15.1
\$50,000 to \$74,999	661	27.1	36,753	16.3	485,439	15.9
Less than 20 Percent	340	14.0	11,315	5.0	151,167	5.0
20 to 29 Percent	231	9.5	13,182	5.8	173,246	5.7
30 Percent or More	90	3.7	12,256	5.4	161,026	5.3
\$75,000 or More	625	25.7	131,125	58.1	1,527,241	50.2
Less than 20 Percent	433	17.8	84,288	37.4	1,022,835	33.6
20 to 29 Percent	171	7.0	35,818	15.9	382,768	12.6
30 Percent or More	21	0.9	11,019	4.9	121,638	4.0

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

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

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

	Median-Income Family**	Moderate-Income Family***
Housing Costs	25	32
Transportation Costs	22	24
TOTAL H+T COSTS	47	55

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 University Park.

Housing Type, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Single Family, Detached	1,336	47.0	182,200	74.7	1,710,011	50.1
Single Family, Attached	539	19.0	29,263	12.0	254,103	7.5
2 Units	15	0.5	4,908	2.0	237,977	7.0
3 or 4 Units	274	9.6	5,232	2.1	268,945	7.9
5 to 9 Units	132	4.6	4,699	1.9	270,643	7.9
10 to 19 Units	30	1.1	5,898	2.4	151,076	4.4
20 or More Units	515	18.1	8,346	3.4	490,331	14.4
Mobile Home/Other*	0	0.0	3,361	1.4	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

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
0 or 1 Bedroom	377	13.3	13,880	5.7	548,002	16.1
2 Bedrooms	545	19.2	47,835	19.6	965,749	28.3
3 Bedrooms	1,313	46.2	98,733	40.5	1,133,210	33.2
4 Bedrooms	450	15.8	69,437	28.5	597,921	17.5
5 or More Bedrooms	156	5.5	14,022	5.7	165,208	4.8
Median Number of Rooms*	5.8		6.5		6.0	

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

Universe: Housing units

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

Housing Age, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Built 2000 or Later	259	9.1	71,367	29.3	463,304	13.6
Built 1970 to 1999	1,877	66.1	112,348	46.1	1,161,616	34.1
Built 1940 to 1969	628	22.1	42,423	17.4	1,044,859	30.6
Built Before 1940	77	2.7	17,769	7.3	740,311	21.7
Median Year Built	1975		1991		1968	

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

Universe: Housing units

Transportation

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

Vehicles Available per Household, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
No Vehicle Available	242	9.9	8,483	3.7	399,783	12.8
1 Vehicle Available	1,194	48.6	57,750	25.2	1,111,243	35.6
2 Vehicles Available	750	30.5	100,163	43.6	1,098,207	35.2
3 or More Vehicles Available	269	11.0	63,102	27.5	514,097	16.5

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Mode of Travel to Work, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Work at Home*	90	3.2	16,687	4.8	226,183	5.4
Drive Alone	2,048	73.0	287,635	83.3	2,865,893	68.4
Carpool	224	8.0	20,759	6.0	323,457	7.7
Transit	326	11.6	13,360	3.9	557,002	13.3
Walk or Bike	29	1.0	3,136	0.9	164,065	3.9
Other	88	3.1	3,550	1.0	53,525	1.3
TOTAL COMMUTERS	2,715	96.8	328,440	95.2	3,963,942	94.6
Mean Commute Time (Minutes)	37.6		33.0		32.5	

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

Universe: Workers 16 years and older

*Not included in total commuters or mean commute time.

Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled per Household*, 2017

	University Park	Will County	CMAP Region
Average Vehicle Miles Traveled per Year	21,743	24,988	17,165

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

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

Transit Availability of Resident and Job Locations*, 2017

	University Park	Will County	CMAP Region
High Transit Availability	0.0%	5.3%	53.9%
Moderate Transit Availability	47.7%	26.4%	20.6%
Low Transit Availability	52.3%	68.3%	25.5%

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

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

Employment

The employment tables include general workforce characteristics for University Park.

Employment Status, 2015-2019

	University Park		Will County		CMAP Region	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
In Labor Force	3,212	62.5	368,652	68.7	4,546,758	67.3
Employed†*	2,923	91.0	351,095	95.2	4,260,595	93.7
Unemployed*	289	9.0	17,294	4.7	274,246	6.0
Not in Labor Force	1,926	37.5	168,120	31.3	2,213,132	32.7

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

Universe: Population 16 years and older

†Does not include employed population in the Armed Forces.

*Universe: In labor force

Private Sector Employment*, 2020

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

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

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

**Data is not available for Kendall County.

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

Employment of University Park Residents*, 2018

TOP INDUSTRY SECTORS	Count	Percent
1. Health Care	568	19.8
2. Transportation	331	11.5
3. Retail Trade	304	10.6
4. Education	251	8.7
5. Accommodation and Food Service	224	7.8
TOP EMPLOYMENT LOCATIONS		
1. Chicago	569	19.8
2. Chicago Heights	117	4.1
3. Joliet	85	3.0
4. University Park	83	2.9
5. Tinley Park	58	2.0

Employment in University Park*, 2018

TOP INDUSTRY SECTORS	Count	Percent
1. Manufacturing	1,695	32.2
2. Education	986	18.7
3. Professional	934	17.7
4. Wholesale Trade	649	12.3
5. Transportation	343	6.5
TOP RESIDENCE LOCATIONS		
1. Chicago	345	6.5
2. Park Forest	172	3.3
3. Tinley Park	148	2.8
4. Chicago Heights	147	2.8
5. Monee	115	2.2

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 University Park.

General Land Use, 2015

	Acres	Percent
Single-Family Residential	426.6	6.2
Multi-Family Residential	64.2	0.9
Commercial	46.2	0.7
Industrial	947.8	13.7
Institutional	573.0	8.3
Mixed Use	9.4	0.1
Transportation and Other	785.9	11.4
Agricultural	2,098.9	30.4
Open Space	1,324.5	19.2
Vacant	619.8	9.0
TOTAL	6,896.5	100.0

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

Park Access, 2015

	University Park	Will County	CMAP Region
Accessible Park Acreage per 1,000 Residents*	13.31	9.23	5.78

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

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

Walkability of Resident and Job Locations*, 2015

	University Park	Will County	CMAP Region
High Walkability	0.0%	2.6%	40.5%
Moderate Walkability	0.0%	13.5%	23.8%
Low Walkability	100.0%	83.9%	35.8%

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

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

Revenue

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

General Merchandise Retail Sales, 2020

	University Park	Will County	CMAP Region
General Merchandise	\$32,261,994	\$8,586,391,452	\$93,778,223,174
Total Retail Sales	\$32,298,391	\$10,573,047,453	\$122,031,206,863
Total Sales per Capita*	\$4,649	\$15,338	\$14,385

Source: Illinois Department of Revenue, 2020.

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

Equalized Assessed Value, 2019

Residential	\$53,929,600
Commercial	\$19,022,013
Industrial	\$52,902,005
Railroad	\$168,811
Farm	\$624,127
Mineral	\$0
TOTAL	\$126,646,556

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)	11.5	6.3	6.8
Hispanic or Latino (of Any Race)	1.8	3.1	3.8
Black (Non-Hispanic)	83.5	85.8	84.8
Asian (Non-Hispanic)	0.3	1.2	0.2
Other/Multiple Races (Non-Hispanic)	2.9	3.6	4.4

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	36.6	38.2	31.2
20 to 34	20.5	19.7	24.8
35 to 49	21.5	18.6	17.6
50 to 64	14.4	16.3	16.6
65 and Over	7.0	7.3	9.8
Median Age	29.8	28.0	31.3

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

Universe: Total population

Educational Attainment*, Over Time

	2000 Percent	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
Less than High School Diploma	7.9	4.0	4.2
High School Diploma or Equivalent	20.9	24.3	22.0
Some College, No Degree	37.8	39.4	32.6
Associate's Degree	7.9	9.6	13.2
Bachelor's Degree	15.7	13.4	19.2
Graduate or Professional Degree	9.7	9.3	8.8

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	98.0	97.5
Foreign Born	2.0	2.5

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	96.5	93.8
Spanish	1.5	2.6
Slavic Languages	0.0	0.0
Chinese	0.0	0.0
Tagalog	0.0	0.4
Arabic	0.0	0.0
Korean	0.0	0.0
Other Asian Languages	0.0	0.0
Other Indo-European Languages	2.0	0.6
Other/Unspecified Languages	0.0	2.6
TOTAL NON-ENGLISH	3.5	6.2
Speak English Less than "Very Well"*	1.4	1.1

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	27.6	29.9
2-Person Household	30.3	25.3
3-Person Household	12.5	19.1
4-or-More-Person Household	29.5	25.7

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	66.4	66.3
Single Parent with Child	24.2	18.7
Non-Family	33.6	33.7

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	\$54,028	\$52,250

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

Universe: Occupied housing units

Housing Occupancy and Tenure, Over Time

	2000 Percent	2006-2010 Percent	2015-2019 Percent
Occupied Housing Units	94.7	88.0	86.4
Owner-Occupied*	58.8	57.0	53.8
Renter-Occupied*	41.2	43.0	46.2
Vacant Housing Units	5.3	12.0	13.6

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	20.6	17.8
Less than 20 Percent	0.6	0.0
20 to 29 Percent	0.8	0.9
30 Percent or More	19.3	16.9
\$20,000 to \$49,999	28.0	29.4
Less than 20 Percent	1.2	4.9
20 to 29 Percent	5.2	4.1
30 Percent or More	21.6	20.4
\$50,000 to \$74,999	18.0	27.1
Less than 20 Percent	3.7	14.0
20 to 29 Percent	5.0	9.5
30 Percent or More	9.3	3.7
\$75,000 or More	30.3	25.7
Less than 20 Percent	15.9	17.8
20 to 29 Percent	11.4	7.0
30 Percent or More	2.9	0.9

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	47.8	47.0
Single Family, Attached	15.0	19.0
2 Units	1.4	0.5
3 or 4 Units	10.1	9.6
5 or More Units	25.6	23.8
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	16.8	13.3
2 Bedrooms	18.8	19.2
3 Bedrooms	41.4	46.2
4 Bedrooms	18.4	15.8
5 or More Bedrooms	4.5	5.5
Median Number of Rooms*	5.8	5.8

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	14.4	9.1
Built 1970 to 1999	56.2	66.1
Built 1940 to 1969	25.6	22.1
Built Before 1940	3.8	2.7
Median Year Built	1976	1975

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	12.4	9.9
1 Vehicle Available	39.4	48.6
2 Vehicles Available	37.9	30.5
3 or More Vehicles Available	10.3	11.0

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*	3.0	3.2
Drive Alone	77.7	73.0
Carpool	7.7	8.0
Transit	7.5	11.6
Walk or Bike	2.5	1.0
Other	1.6	3.1
TOTAL COMMUTERS	97.0	96.8
Mean Commute Time (Minutes)	39.5	37.6

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	64.2	62.5
Employed ^{†*}	77.0	91.0
Unemployed*	22.2	9.0
Not in Labor Force	35.8	37.5

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 University Park*

Primary Water Source: Shallow Groundwater**

	2003 MGD***	2013 MGD***	Percent Change
Total Water Withdrawals****	1.97	1.26	-35.9
Residential Sector	0.80	0.74	-7.6
Non-Residential Sector	1.17	0.52	-55.3

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

	University Park			CMAAP Region		
	2003	2013	Percent Change	2003	2013	Percent Change
Residential* (GPCD**)	113.3	104.1	-8.2	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	N/A	\$7.57	N/A	N/A
Sewer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
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	University Park	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	41.2%	46.6%	64.9%	ACS, 2015-2019
	Workforce participation rate among population aged 20-64	74.5%	80.8%	83.4%	ACS, 2015-2019
Environment	Population with park access of 4+ acres per 1,000 residents	88.9%	41.8%	65.0%	CMAP, 2015
	Population with park access of 10+ acres per 1,000 residents	50.0%	16.3%	40.0%	CMAP, 2015
	Impervious acres per household	0.58	0.18	0.15	USGS NLCD, 2016
	Daily residential water demand per capita (gallons)	104.1	87.5	65.2	ISWS IWIP, 2013
Governance	State revenue disbursement per capita	\$254.33	\$324.17*	N/A**	CMAP, 2020
	Is per capita disbursement at least 80% of regional median?	No	Yes for 78% of municipalities	Yes for 100% of municipalities	CMAP, 2020
Mobility	Population with at least moderately high transit availability	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	23.9%	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.