Chapter VII

POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD, AND EMPLOYMENT PROJECTIONS

INTRODUCTION

The future demand for land, housing, transportation facilities and services, and other community facilities that the comprehensive plan must address is directly related to future population, household, and employment levels. The projection of future population, household, and employment levels is, therefore, an essential step in the comprehensive planning process. This chapter presents projections of population, households, and employment through the year 2035 that are intended to serve as a basis for preparing the multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan.

This chapter begins with an overview of the projections of population, households, and employment for Racine County prepared by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) for the year 2035. The SEWRPC projections are intended to provide a frame of reference for Racine County and the cities, villages, and towns participating in the multi-jurisdictional planning effort in their the selection of population, household, and employment projections for the plan. The second part of this chapter presents community-level projections of population, households, and employment ultimately selected by each of the cities, villages, and towns in Racine County.

SEWRPC PROJECTIONS FOR RACINE COUNTY

In 2004, the Regional Planning Commission prepared a set of population, household, and employment projections for the Southeastern Wisconsin Region and its seven counties, looking ahead to the year 2035. As in prior projection efforts, the Commission prepared a range of projections: low, intermediate, and high. The intermediate projection is considered to be the most likely to be achieved; it was used as the basis for the preparation of the year 2035 regional land use plan. The high and low projections are intended to provide an indication of population, household, and employment levels that could conceivably be achieved under significantly higher and lower, but nevertheless plausible, growth scenarios. This section presents the SEWRPC population, household, and employment projections for Racine County, with primary focus on the intermediate-level projections.

Current and historic trend data which provide part of the basis for the projections are presented for Racine County and cities, villages, and towns in the County in Chapter II of this report.
SEWRPC County-Level Population Projections

The SEWRPC intermediate population projection envisions that there will be relatively stable birth rates and a modest increase in life expectancy in Racine County in the coming decades. The intermediate projection envisions that Racine County and the Region overall would experience a relatively stable migration pattern, similar to that which is estimated to have occurred during the early 2000s. The migration assumptions for the intermediate projection reflect the conclusion—from a concurrent SEWRPC economic study—that, overall, the economy of the Region would not likely significantly increase or decrease in strength relative to other areas of the State or Nation.2

The SEWRPC high and low population projections reflect different assumptions about the future strength of the regional economy. The high population projection assumes a significantly more competitive regional economy, with increased population in-migration in response to a heightened demand for workers. The low projection assumes a stagnating regional economy, resulting in population out-migration as workers move to areas experiencing stronger economic growth.

The SEWRPC population projections for Racine County are presented in Table VII-1. Under the intermediate projection, the County population would increase by 24,800 persons, or 13 percent, over the 35-year projection period, from 188,800 persons in 2000 to 213,600 persons in 2035. Under the high projection, the County population would increase by 54,700 persons, or 29 percent, to 243,500 persons in 2035. Under the low projection, the County population would increase by 12,000 persons, or 6 percent, to 200,800 persons in 2035. For comparison purposes, the State of Wisconsin Department of Administration (DOA) has developed county level population and household projections for the year 2030. The DOA population projection of 214,900 is slightly higher than the SEWRPC intermediate projection of 210,600 for the year 2030 as shown in Table VII-1.

SEWRPC projections indicate that changes may be expected in the age composition of the population in the coming decades. The projected age composition under an intermediate growth scenario for Racine County is presented in Table VII-2. Particularly noteworthy is the expected influence of the large baby-boom generation on the future age structure. By 2030, all baby-boomers will be 65 years of age or older. Persons age 65 and over would account for 20 percent of the County population in 2035, compared to 12 percent in 2000. Changes in age composition of the population may be expected to have many impacts, ranging from impacts on housing needs to impacts on the available labor force, particularly as baby-boomers move into their retirement years.

SEWRPC County-Level Household Projections

SEWRPC projections of households for Racine County to the year 2035 were derived from the population projections described above, along with projections of future household size and the proportion of the total population living in housing units as opposed to group quarters. Commission projections indicate that the average size of households throughout the Region including Racine County may be expected to continue to decrease in the years ahead, though not as rapidly as in the past. In Racine County, the average household size is projected to decrease by 5 percent, from 2.59 persons per household in 2000 to 2.46 in 2035. The decrease in household size is anticipated as a result of a number of factors, including a continued change in household types, as well as the projected increase in the older population age groups for which average household sizes tend to be smaller than for the total population. The proportion of the population living in group quarters, as opposed to the population living in households, is projected to increase slightly.

SEWRPC household projections for Racine County are presented in Table VII-3. Under the intermediate projection, the number of households in Racine County would increase by 13,200, or 19 percent, over the 35-year projection period, from 70,800 households in 2000 to 84,000 households in 2035. Under the high projection, the number of households would increase by 24,900, or 35 percent, to 95,700 households in 2035. Under the low projection, the number of households would increase by 8,100, or 11 percent, to 78,900 households in 2035. This
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compares to the DOA 2030 projection of 85,400 households in 2030, which is slightly higher than the 84,000 under the SEWRPC intermediate projection for that same year (see Table VII-3). In percentage terms, the increase in households under the high, intermediate, and low projections is somewhat greater than the corresponding projected increase in population.

**SEWRPC County-Level Employment Projections**

The Commission used an approach to the preparation of employment projections involving the explicit consideration of employment in major industry groups and the preparation of projections for those groups. The projection for each industry group was developed based upon a consideration of past industry trends and available indicators of future trends nationally and within the State and Region. Still another important consideration in the preparation of the employment projections was the future available labor force in the Region. Regional Planning Commission population projections suggest that a leveling-off in the regional labor force may be expected as much of the baby-boom generation reaches retirement age; this may be expected to moderate the number of jobs that may be accommodated.  

Similar to the population and household projections, the Regional Planning Commission projected a range of future employment levels—high, medium, and low—for the year 2035. In general, the intermediate employment projection assumes that the Southeastern Wisconsin Region would maintain its competitive position relative to the rest of the State and Nation. In comparison to the intermediate projection, the high projection assumes a significantly more competitive economy, while the low projection assumes a stagnating economy, with workers moving to other regions that are experiencing stronger economic growth.

Employment projections for Racine County prepared by the Regional Planning Commission are presented in Table VII-4. Under the intermediate projection, total employment in the County would increase by 12,200 jobs, or 13 percent, from 94,400 jobs in 2000 to 106,600 jobs in 2035. Under the high projection, employment in the County would increase by 20,300 jobs, or 22 percent, to 114,700 jobs in 2035. Under the low projection, employment in the County would increase by 1,900 jobs, or 2 percent, to 96,300 jobs in 2035.

Commission projections indicate that a change may be expected in the types of jobs available in the years ahead for the County and the Region. In Racine County, the largest increases are projected to be in the service sector (business, health, social, recreational, and other services), with service sector employment projected to increase by 51 percent under an intermediate growth scenario. Employment in the industrial sector—including manufacturing, wholesaling activities, and construction jobs—is projected to decrease by 12 percent (see Table VII-5). This compares to a projected increase of 45 percent in service sector jobs, and a projected decrease of 28 percent in industrial sector jobs in the Region.

**COMMUNITY-LEVEL PROJECTIONS**

The preparation of the local components of the multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan requires population, household, and employment projections for each town participating in the multi-jurisdictional planning effort. To assist the cities, villages, and towns in this matter, two alternative sets of projections were prepared. Each of the cities, villages, and towns in Racine County was asked to review the alternative projections and to select a set of projections from among the alternatives presented—or, to provide a set of projections of its own.

**Community-Level Population and Household Projections**

Within most communities, growth in the resident population is closely related to the growth in the number of households, although—even given the expected trend of declining household sizes—the percentage increase in households can generally be expected to exceed, at least slightly, the increase in population. Because population and household levels are closely related, the projection of future population and households must be properly coordinated.

---

Under the comprehensive planning effort, two alternative sets of inter-related population and household projections were presented for consideration by each participating town. The first is based upon the intermediate growth projections from the year 2035 regional land use plan. The second represents an extrapolation of historic trends in each community. The alternative projections are described further below.

- **Local Population and Household Projections from the Year 2035 Regional Land Use Plan**
  The Regional Planning Commission’s local population and household projections are essentially sub-county allocations of the Commission’s county-level intermediate population and household projections, developed as part of the year 2035 regional land use plan. These allocations were based upon a consideration of past trends in population and households, existing local land use and master plans, and input received from local planning officials as the regional plan was prepared. The allocations reflect the basic regional plan concept that the vast majority of new residential development should be accommodated in urban service areas that provide sanitary sewer and other urban services. The projections assume that new development anticipated within a planned city or village sewer service area would be annexed by the city or village, unless there is a boundary agreement in place that provides for the area to remain in the town. For purposes of the comprehensive plan, the year 2035 population and household levels originally set forth in the regional land use plan were adjusted upward, where warranted, to reflect actual growth estimated to have occurred through 2006.

- **Trend-Based Local Population and Household Projections**
  The trend-based projections assume that the number of households in each community would continue to grow as it has in the past, looking back to 1980. In extrapolating future household levels for each community, the historic change in households between 2000 and 2006 was weighted more heavily than the change during the 1990s; and, similarly, the change in households during the 1990s was weighted more heavily than the change during the 1980s. The related population projection is based upon the projected number of households and the projected household size for the community, along with an allowance for population living in group quarters.

The alternative household projections and alternative population projections are presented in Tables VII-6 and VII-7, respectively. For most of the communities in Racine County, the trend-based population and household projections are higher than the projections from the year 2035 regional land use plan.

During the course of the comprehensive planning effort, each of the cities, villages, and towns in Racine County chose a set of population and household projections for use in preparing the local components of the comprehensive plan. The population and household projections selected by the cities, villages, and towns are presented in Table VII-8. As indicated in that table, 10 of the communities selected the population and household projections from the regional land use plan; three selected the trend-based population and household projections; and four selected a locally-derived alternative set of population and household projections.

In combination, the community-level population projections that are to be used in the preparation of the comprehensive plan, as presented in Table VII-8, sum to a total of 224,300 persons for the County overall. This figure is between the SEWRPC year 2035 intermediate population projection for the County (213,000 persons) and the SEWRPC year 2035 high population projection for the County (243,500 persons), previously presented in Table VII-1. The community-level household projections that are to be used in the preparation of the

---

4This assumption reflects the fact that most cities and villages require land to be annexed before providing sewer and other urban services. It should be recognized that cities and villages and adjacent towns may enter into boundary or other cooperative agreements under which the city or village provides sewer service and other services within town areas without annexation.

5For this purpose, the projected year 2035 average household size for each community indicated under the regional land use plan was applied to the trend-based projection of households to obtain the year 2035 household population. The year 2035 group quarters population from the regional land use plan was added to obtain the total population.
comprehensive plan sum to a total of 88,200 households for the County overall. This figure is between the SEWRPC year 2035 intermediate household projection for the County (84,000 households) and the SEWRPC year 2035 high household projection for the County (95,700 households), previously presented in Table VII-3.

Community-Level Employment Projections
Under the comprehensive planning process, two alternative employment projections were presented for consideration by each city, village, and town in Racine County. The first set of projections is based upon the intermediate growth projections from the year 2035 regional land use plan; the second represents an extrapolation of historic trends in each community. The alternative community-level employment projections are described further below.

- **Local Employment Projections from the Year 2035 Regional Land Use Plan**
  The Regional Planning Commission’s local employment projections are essentially sub-county allocations of the Commission’s county-level intermediate employment projections, developed as part of the year 2035 regional land use plan. These allocations were based upon a consideration of past trends in employment, existing local land use and master plans, and input received from local planning officials as the regional plan was prepared. The allocations also reflect the basic regional plan concept that the vast majority of new jobs should be accommodated in urban service areas that provide sanitary sewer and other urban services. The projections assume that new development anticipated within a planned city or village sewer service area would be annexed by the city or village, unless there is a boundary agreement in place that provides for the area to remain in the Town.\(^6\) Given these assumptions, the regional plan envisions some employment increases in towns that have their own sewerage systems. In the Town of Raymond, the only town in Racine County without a sewerage system, the regional plan does not envision any employment increase.

- **Trend-Based Employment Projections**
  The trend-based projection assumes a continuation of past employment change in each city, village, and town between 1980 and 2000. Consistent with the methodology used for the trend-based population and household projections, the change for more recent years weighted more heavily than change for earlier years.

The alternative employment projections are presented in Table VII-9. For most of the communities in Racine County, the trend-based employment projection is higher than the projection from the year 2035 regional land use plan.

Following a review of the alternative employment projections presented in Table VII-9, each of the cities, villages, and towns in Racine County chose an employment projection for use in preparing the local components of the comprehensive plan. The employment projections selected by the cities, villages, and towns are presented in Table VII-10. As indicated in that table, 10 of the communities selected the employment projection from the regional land use plan, five selected the trend-based employment projection, and two selected a locally-derived alternative employment projection.

The employment projections selected by each of the communities in Racine County correspond to the potential for significant development/redevelopment of land in commercial and industrial/business uses as identified in local and neighborhood land use plans. In the City of Racine where the number of jobs in 2000 is the same as the projected number of jobs in 2035 (44,200), the projected number of jobs represents a substantial recovery from the reduced levels of the early 2000s.

In combination, the community-level employment projections that are to be used in the preparation of the comprehensive plan, as presented in Table VII-10, sum to a total of 115,100 jobs for the County overall. This projection is essentially the same as the SEWRPC year 2035 high employment projection for the County (114,700 jobs), previously presented in Table VII-4.

\(^6\) See footnote No.4.
CONCLUSION

The long-range projections of population, household, and employment presented in Tables VII-8 and VII-10 are an important consideration in the preparation of the multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan. Under these projections, the total County population would increase by 35,500 persons, or 19 percent, from 188,800 persons in 2000 to 224,300 persons in 2035. The number of households in the County would increase by 17,400, or 25 percent, from 70,800 households in 2000 to 88,200 households in 2035. Total employment in the County would increase by 20,700 jobs, or 22 percent, from 94,400 jobs in 2000 to 115,100 jobs in 2035. The county-level household, population, and employment projections are shown graphically on Figures VII-1, VII-2, and VII-3, respectively.

The projected levels of households, population, and jobs developed as part of this multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan represent a higher rate of development in Racine County as compared to SEWRPC intermediate projections used as the basis for the year 2035 regional land use plan. The year 2035 projected levels of households and population are 5 percent higher than the regional plan and the projected level of jobs is 8 percent higher than the regional plan.
### Table VII-1

**SEWRPC POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR RACINE COUNTY: 2000-2035**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>High Projection</th>
<th>Intermediate Projection</th>
<th>Low Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Change from Preceding Year</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Population: 2000</td>
<td>188,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Population</td>
<td>197,100</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>205,400</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>213,100</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>220,900</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>229,000</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>236,400</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>243,500</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change: 2000-2035</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54,700</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The Regional Planning Commission projected a range of population levels: low, intermediate, and high. The intermediate projection is considered to be the most likely to be achieved; it was used as the basis for the preparation of the year 2035 regional land use plan. The high and low projections are intended to provide an indication of population levels that could be achieved under significantly higher and lower, but nevertheless plausible, growth scenarios.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.

### Table VII-2

**SEWRPC PROJECTION OF POPULATION BY AGE FOR RACINE COUNTY: 2000-2035**

(Intermediate Projection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 19</td>
<td>55,964</td>
<td>55,827</td>
<td>55,374</td>
<td>55,444</td>
<td>56,070</td>
<td>57,110</td>
<td>58,018</td>
<td>58,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>10,602</td>
<td>12,293</td>
<td>12,840</td>
<td>12,944</td>
<td>12,766</td>
<td>12,609</td>
<td>12,686</td>
<td>13,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>11,116</td>
<td>9,908</td>
<td>11,582</td>
<td>12,152</td>
<td>12,252</td>
<td>12,107</td>
<td>11,952</td>
<td>12,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>15,886</td>
<td>13,754</td>
<td>12,044</td>
<td>10,830</td>
<td>12,714</td>
<td>13,371</td>
<td>13,501</td>
<td>13,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64</td>
<td>16,118</td>
<td>15,822</td>
<td>13,774</td>
<td>12,102</td>
<td>10,880</td>
<td>12,815</td>
<td>13,476</td>
<td>13,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69</td>
<td>6,147</td>
<td>6,278</td>
<td>7,350</td>
<td>9,137</td>
<td>8,206</td>
<td>9,349</td>
<td>9,790</td>
<td>10,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74</td>
<td>5,859</td>
<td>5,273</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td>6,409</td>
<td>8,206</td>
<td>9,349</td>
<td>9,790</td>
<td>10,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79</td>
<td>5,052</td>
<td>4,797</td>
<td>4,375</td>
<td>4,548</td>
<td>5,397</td>
<td>6,964</td>
<td>7,957</td>
<td>9,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84</td>
<td>3,329</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>3,635</td>
<td>3,361</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>5,006</td>
<td>6,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and older</td>
<td>2,846</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>4,103</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,432</td>
<td>5,048</td>
<td>6,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal 65 and older</td>
<td>23,233</td>
<td>23,373</td>
<td>24,589</td>
<td>27,793</td>
<td>31,951</td>
<td>37,192</td>
<td>41,487</td>
<td>43,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188,831</td>
<td>191,879</td>
<td>195,198</td>
<td>199,185</td>
<td>203,154</td>
<td>207,204</td>
<td>210,556</td>
<td>213,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Age groups which approximate the "baby boom" generation (persons born from 1946 through 1964) are shaded gray.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.
## Table VII-3
SEWRPC HOUSEHOLD PROJECTIONS FOR RACINE COUNTY: 2000-2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>High Projection</th>
<th>Intermediate Projection</th>
<th>Low Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Change from Preceding Year</td>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Households: 2000</td>
<td>70,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>75,100</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>78,900</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>82,500</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>85,800</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>89,600</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>92,700</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>95,700</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change: 2000-2035</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The Regional Planning Commission projected a range of household levels: low, intermediate, and high. The intermediate projection is considered to be the most likely to be achieved; it was used as the basis for the preparation of the year 2035 regional land use plan. The high and low projections are intended to provide an indication of the number of households that could be achieved under significantly higher and lower, but nevertheless plausible, growth scenarios.

**Source:** U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.

## Table VII-4
SEWRPC EMPLOYMENT PROJECTIONS FOR RACINE COUNTY: 2000-2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>High Projection</th>
<th>Intermediate Projection</th>
<th>Low Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>Change from Preceding Year</td>
<td>Jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Employment: 2000</td>
<td>94,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>92,400</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>97,900</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>103,100</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>106,900</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>109,300</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>111,900</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>114,700</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change: 2000-2035</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The Regional Planning Commission projected a range of employment levels: low, intermediate, and high. The intermediate projection is considered to be the most likely to be achieved; it was used as the basis for the preparation of the year 2035 regional land use plan. The high and low projections are intended to provide an indication of employment levels that could be achieved under significantly higher and lower, but nevertheless plausible, growth scenarios.

**Source:** U.S. Bureau of the Economic Analysis and SEWRPC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industriala</td>
<td>32,700</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>28,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicesb</td>
<td>31,400</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>47,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Communication, and Utilities</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmentalc</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherd</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94,400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>106,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*Includes manufacturing, wholesale trade, and construction.

*b*Includes all service employment, including business, health, social, and other services.

*c*Includes all government employment and public education.

*d*Includes agriculture, agricultural services, forestry, and mining.

Source: SEWRPC.
### Table VII-6

**ALTERNATIVE HOUSEHOLD PROJECTIONS FOR COMMUNITIES IN RACINE COUNTY: 2035**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Actual Households</th>
<th>Alternative Household Projections: 2035</th>
<th>SEWRPC Regional Land Use Plan (Intermediate Growth Scenario)</th>
<th>Trend Based&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>3,346</td>
<td>3,838</td>
<td>4,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>31,744</td>
<td>31,767</td>
<td>31,449</td>
<td>31,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia</td>
<td>6,328</td>
<td>7,058</td>
<td>8,549</td>
<td>9,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood Park</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>6,438</td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td>9,453</td>
<td>10,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturtevant</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>1,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Grove</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>1,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>1,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Point</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>2,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>2,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>2,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkville</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>59,418</td>
<td>63,736</td>
<td>70,819</td>
<td>75,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>These projections are based upon the year 2035 regional land use plan. The regional land use plan recommends that much of the future increase in households and population within the County be accommodated in urban service areas that provide sanitary sewer and other urban services. The projections assume that new development within a planned city or village sewer service area would be annexed by the city or village.<br><br><sup>b</sup>The trend-based projection assumes a continuation of the past change in households in each community since 1980, with the change for more recent years weighted more heavily than the change for earlier years. In developing this projection, the change in households between 2000 and 2006 was weighted more heavily than the change during the 1990s; and, similarly, the change in households during the 1990s was weighted more heavily than the change during the 1980s.<br><br><sup>c</sup>The Town and Village of Rochester were consolidated as the Village of Rochester in December 2008. Consequently, the community-level data for the original Village and Town of Rochester have been combined in this table.<br><br>Source: SEWRPC.
Table VII-7
ALTERNATIVE POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR COMMUNITIES IN RACINE COUNTY: 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>8,385</td>
<td>8,851</td>
<td>9,936</td>
<td>10,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>85,725</td>
<td>84,298</td>
<td>81,655</td>
<td>80,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia</td>
<td>20,940</td>
<td>20,999</td>
<td>23,614</td>
<td>24,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood Park</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>19,340</td>
<td>20,084</td>
<td>23,142</td>
<td>25,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochesterc</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>3,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturtevant</td>
<td>4,130</td>
<td>3,803</td>
<td>5,287</td>
<td>6,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Grove</td>
<td>3,517</td>
<td>3,669</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>4,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>4,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Point</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>1,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>5,629</td>
<td>5,833</td>
<td>6,384</td>
<td>6,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>3,631</td>
<td>3,908</td>
<td>4,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>4,619</td>
<td>5,493</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>8,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>3,516</td>
<td>3,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td>5,938</td>
<td>6,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkville</td>
<td>3,162</td>
<td>2,901</td>
<td>3,291</td>
<td>3,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>173,132</td>
<td>175,034</td>
<td>188,831</td>
<td>194,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a These projections are based upon the year 2035 regional land use plan. The regional land use plan recommends that much of the future increase in population and households within the County be accommodated in urban service areas that provide sanitary sewer and other urban services. The projections assume that new development within a planned city or village sewer service area would be annexed by the city or village.

b These projections reflect the trend-based projections of households from Table VII-6. They were derived from the projected number of households and the anticipated household size for each community, along with an allowance for the population living in group quarters.

c The Town and Village of Rochester were consolidated as the Village of Rochester in December 2008. Consequently, the community-level data for the original Village and Town of Rochester have been combined in this table.

Source: SEWRPC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual 2000</td>
<td>Projected 2035</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>3,838</td>
<td>4,832</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>31,449</td>
<td>32,366</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia</td>
<td>8,549</td>
<td>11,731</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood Park</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>9,453</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>5,347</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturtevant</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Grove</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>2,289</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Point</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>2,854</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>3,074</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>3,741</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkville</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>70,825</td>
<td>88,227</td>
<td>17,402</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aWhile data from the U.S. Census Bureau reports that there were 91 households and 95 housing units in the Village of North Bay in 2000, there are actually 97 housing units in the Village. Consequently, Village officials requested that, for the purposes of this analysis, the number of households in the Village should be 97.

*bThe Town and Village of Rochester were consolidated as the Village of Rochester in December 2008. Consequently, the community-level projections selected by the original Village and Town of Rochester have been combined in this table.

Source: SEWRPC.
### Table VII-9

**ALTERNATIVE EMPLOYMENT PROJECTIONS FOR COMMUNITIES IN RACINE COUNTY: 2035**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>1980 Census</th>
<th>1990 Census</th>
<th>2000 Census</th>
<th>SEWRPC Regional Land Use Plan (Intermediate Growth Scenario)*</th>
<th>Trend Based*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEWRPC Jobs</td>
<td>Change 2000-2035</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>SEWRPC Jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>13,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-4,200</td>
<td>-9.5</td>
<td>34,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>7,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood Park</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>25,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td>-c</td>
<td>-c</td>
<td>-c</td>
<td>-c</td>
<td>-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester²</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturtevant</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Grove</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Point</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkville</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County*</td>
<td>81,200</td>
<td>106,600</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>116,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These projections are based upon the year 2035 regional land use plan. The regional land use plan recommends that much of the future increase in employment within the County be accommodated in urban service areas that provide sanitary sewer and other urban services. The projections assume that new development within a planned city or village sewer service area would be annexed by the city or village.

²The trend-based projection assumes a continuation of past employment change in each community since 1980, with the change for more recent years weighted more heavily than change for earlier years. In developing this projection, employment change between 1990 and 2000 was weighted more heavily than the employment change during the 1980s.

²Less than 50.

²The Town and Village of Rochester were consolidated as the Village of Rochester in December 2008. Consequently, the community-level data for the original Village and Town of Rochester have been combined in this table.

²Includes 200 jobs in 1980 and 900 jobs in 1990 that cannot be allocated to a civil division.

Source: SEWRPC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Actual 2000</th>
<th>Projected 2035</th>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Change Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>44,200</td>
<td>44,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Villages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood Park</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester (^b)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturtevant</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Grove</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Point</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Towns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkville</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
<td>94,400</td>
<td>115,100</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Less than 50.

\(^b\)The Town and Village of Rochester were consolidated as the Village of Rochester in December 2008. Consequently, the community-level projections selected by the original Village and Town of Rochester have been combined in this table.

Source: SEWRPC.
Figure VII-1

HOUSEHOLDS PROJECTIONS FOR THE RACINE COUNTY
MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: 2035
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Figure VII-2

POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR THE RACINE COUNTY
MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: 2035
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Figure VII-3

EMPLOYMENT PROJECTIONS FOR THE RACINE COUNTY
MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: 2035
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