
The Proximity of Underground Mines to Urban and Developed Lands in Illinois

Christopher P. Korose, Andrew G. Louchios, and Scott D. Elrick



Circular 575 2009



Institute of Natural Resource Sustainability
ILLINOIS STATE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Disclaimer

The maps and digital files used for this study were compiled from data obtained from a variety of public and private sources and have varying degrees of completeness and accuracy. These results are not intended for use in site-specific screening or decision-making, and the use of this document does not eliminate the need for detailed studies to fully understand the geology and/or land cover classification of a specific site.

The Illinois State Geological Survey, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and the State of Illinois make no guarantee, expressed or implied, regarding the correctness of the interpretations presented in this document and accept no liability for the consequences of decisions made by others on the basis of the information presented here.

Front Cover: Map showing the relationship of Zones 1 and 2 to mined areas and urban land cover classifications.

The Proximity of Underground Mines to Urban and Developed Lands in Illinois

Christopher P. Korose, Andrew G. Louchios, and Scott D. Elrick

Circular 575 2009



Institute of Natural Resource Sustainability William W. Shilts, Executive Director ILLINOIS STATE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY E. Donald McKay III, Interim Director 615 East Peabody Drive Champaign, Illinois 61820-6964 217-333-4747 www.isgs.illinois.edu

CONTENTS

Ab	stract	1
In	troduction	1
	sessment of Mine Proximity to Urban and Developed Lands Coal Mines	1 2
	Mines Producing Industrial Minerals and Metals Zones of Mine Proximity	2
	Land Cover	5
	Number of Housing Units	5
Re	sults	6
	Distribution of Undermined Land within Illinois	6
	Distribution of Undermined Land within Counties	6
	Additional Factors Related to Subsidence Potential	10
Co	onclusions	11
Ac	knowledgments	11
Re	ferences	12
Аp	ppendices	12
	Detailed GIS Calculation Methodology	13
2	County Map Series Showing Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining	14
Fig	gures	
	Map showing the relationship of Zones 1 and 2 to mined areas and urban land	
	cover classifications	3
2	Cross section illustrating angle of draw, measured from depth of the mine	4
3	extent boundary Low-medium density developed acreage in Zone 1, by county	4
	Comparison of low-medium density developed acreage in Zone 1 with the	U
	total low-medium density developed acreage in select counties.	10
Ta	bles	
	Similarities and differences in data and methodology between the Treworgy	
	and Hindman (1991) study and the present study	2
2	Original map scale, date, and source of digital data used to evaluate the	
0	proximity of urban and developed areas to underground mines	2
3	Underground mines producing industrial minerals and metals, compiled by county and commodity, 2008	3
4	Width of Zone 2 assigned to industrial mineral and metal mines	5 5
	Acreage and percentage of land in Zone 1, by county and land use category	7
	Acreage and percentage of land in Zone 2, by county and land use category	8
7	Acreage and percentage of land in Zones 1 and 2 combined, by county and	
_	land use category	9
8	Ranking of the top 15 mining counties, by total acreage and estimated number of housing units in Zone 1	10
9	Longwall mines and underground mines, by county	10 11
0		- 1

Abstract

Mine subsidence is the downward movement of the ground surface after a failure of support in an underground mine. Mine subsidence can take place gradually or quickly and can happen over a large area or as a pit that opens at the surface. Both types of downward movement can cause damage to overlying structures and subsequent loss of property value. Although most mine subsidence events in Illinois are related to coal mines due to the extensive area underlain by these mines, subsidence can occur over other mine types as well. It is important that planners. developers, local government officials, and landowners are made aware of the general locations of undermined areas and their potential impact on existing communities and future development.

This study, an update of Treworgy and Hindman (1991), provides statistics on the proximity of urban areas to coal and non-coal underground-mined areas in Illinois. This present report reflects newly available data and improved assessment methodology. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software is used to spatially overlay and combine zones of underground mine proximity with recent land cover maps and U.S. Census Bureau data. Additionally, GIS is used to calculate the resulting statistics, tables, and maps. This information provides the most detailed view to date of the exposure of housing units and developed land areas to the potential of mine subsidence.

Results of this study found that an estimated 333,000 housing units, representing a population of roughly 875,000, (average 2.63 people per household; U.S. Census Bureau 2008b) are located in close proximity to underground mines and may potentially be exposed to subsidence. Approximately 201,000 acres of urban and developed lands overlie or are immediately adjacent to underground mines. Of these, 65% (130,000 acres) falls within Zone 1 (land in Illinois overlying or immediately adjacent to underground mines) and 35% (71,000 acres) in Zone 2 (additional area to reflect potential mine boundary uncertainties). Similarly, of the total housing units, 65% (219,000

units) is located within Zone 1 and 35% (114,000 units) within Zone 2.

Introduction

Mine subsidence—the sinking of the land surface due to the failure of pillars, floor, or roof strata in an underground mine—can take place gradually or suddenly; it may develop as a sag over a large area or open up as a pit at the surface (Bauer 2006). The ground movement may result in damage to overlying structures and reduced property values.

Since 1810, more than 3,800 underground coal mines have operated in Illinois; all but 12 have been abandoned at the time of this report. An additional 363 known underground mines have extracted industrial minerals and metals, including clay, fluorspar, lead, zinc, dolomite, limestone, ganister, and tripoli; all but 10 of these industrial mines have been abandoned at the time of this report. Although subsidence has occurred over all types of mines in Illinois, most subsidence is related to coal mines because of the extensive areas underlain by these mines. However, one of the state's largest subsidence events occurred near Galena over a lead and zinc mine (Touseull and Rich 1980).

Damage caused by ground movement is not insured under conventional property insurance. In 1979, Illinois became the second state in the nation to pass legislation (the Mine Subsidence Insurance Act) ensuring the availability of insurance for mine subsidence damage to structures. The Illinois Mine Subsidence Insurance Fund (IMSIF) monitors subsidence claims and reimburses private insurance companies for claims paid for mine subsidence damage.

Although the presence of underground mines in an area does not mean that subsidence will or could take place, owners of property in the vicinity of mines should review their insurance coverage or consult with experts who can assess the potential for subsidence at that specific location (Bauer 2006).

This study revises and updates the numbers of acres and housing units

potentially affected by underground mining in Illinois. Although this report is a revision of the study by Treworgy and Hindman (1991), it has been substantially modified to reflect new data and to document assessment assumptions, procedures, and improvements made to the previous assessment methodology. It is important to note that a direct comparison to the results in the 1991 study is inappropriate, due to differences in land use classifications, census data resolution, and GIS calculation methodologies. A listing of similarities and differences in data and methodology between the two studies can be found in Table 1.

Assessment of Mine Proximity to Urban and Developed Lands

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software was used to assess the proximity of underground mines to urban and developed areas in Illinois. Geospatial map layers for underground coal and industrial mines, land cover, and U.S. census blocks were spatially combined, and GIS was used (1) to spatially apply zones of specific distance from the mines to individual mine-extent boundaries, and (2) to calculate and tabulate statistics on the acreages and numbers of housing units within each zone and land cover classification. The data used in this study are described herein, and technical details of the GIS-based assessment methodology are provided in Appendix 1. The data used in this study come from a variety of digital and paper sources (Table 2) and are best suited for regional assessments rather than site-specific evaluations.

The accuracy of geospatial data depends on the resolution of data collection or the scale of the source material and the standards, equipment, and procedures used to compile the information. In general, the larger the native scale of the data or source map material, the more accurate the positions of features are on the final map product. However, accuracy can vary widely between maps of the same scale. For example, old maps of underground mines can be particularly inac-

Table 1 Similarities and differences in data and methodology between the Treworgy and Hindman (1991) study and the present study.

Data	1001 study	2009 undata
	1991 study	2008 update
Zone 1 width		
Coal mines	500 feet	Mine depth, rule-based method
Non-coal mines	500 feet	500 feet
Zone 2 width	1 000 foot	1 000 foot
Coal mines Non-coal mines	1,000 feet Based on Zone 2 width table	1,000 feet Based on Zone 2 width table
Land use	Based on Zone 2 width table	Based on Zone 2 width table
Source	USGS Land Use/	IDNR ¹ Satellite Imagery
Oddice	Land Cover	Land Cover
	Lana Covor	Land Gover
Date	1969–1981	1999–2000
Class	Residential	Low-medium density developed
	Other Urban	High density developed
	Nonurban	Urban open space
		Nonurban
Urban buffer	Incorporated	
Census		
Scale	Tracts, block groups,	Blocks
5 .	enumeration districts	0000
Date	1980	2000
Application	Housing unit summation and	Even distribution of housing
	distribution by township, 90%	units across census block area
	of the total evenly distributed across residential areas; 10%	
	evenly distributed across the	
	remaining lands	
	Torrida in 19 Idildo	

¹Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

Table 2 Original map scale, date, and source of digital data used to evaluate the proximity of urban and developed areas to underground mines.

Data set	Scale	Date	Source
Coal mines	1:1,200-1:120,000	January 2007	Illinois State Geological Survey
Other mines	1:1,200-1:63,500	January 2008	Illinois State Geological Survey
Land cover	1:100,000 30-m resolution	1999–2000	Illinois Department of Natural Resources
Census blocks Census statistics	1:100,000 Tabular data	2000 2000	U.S. Census Bureau (2000b) U.S. Census Bureau (2000a)

curate because the surveyors had few locational control points and generally worked under difficult conditions. Once a mine is abandoned, there is no easy, inexpensive method of verifying its boundaries below the surface.

Additionally, the process of digitizing source maps or translating scanned paper source maps to real-world geographic coordinates can introduce locational errors. For example, for

maps at a scale of 1:24,000, features could be offset 100 feet or more from their true position. On maps at a less-detailed 1:250,000 scale, features could be offset by as much as 500 feet.

Coal Mines

The Illinois State Geological Survey (ISGS) maintains a digital database containing the location and extent of underground coal mines. The most

detailed (largest-scale) source map available (generally 1:1,200 to 1:24,000) for each mine has been used to make additions and revisions to the database, and active mines are updated annually. In addition, 102 quadrangle maps (1:24,000) have been completed since 1999, and these revised map areas have also been incorporated into the database. Where quadrangles have not been studied in detail, map areas contain the original digital mine outline data, which were hand-drawn on base maps at a scale of 1:62,500 and digitized in the early 1980s.

The geospatial mine data used in this project reflect all known underground mining as of January 2007. Map points (mine entrances and uncertain underground mine locations) and map polygons (definite and indefinite underground mine boundaries) are included. Unmined blocks of coal within the mine perimeter are delineated if they cover an area of at least 16,000 square feet.

In Fulton, Grundy, Jackson, Knox, Peoria, Stark, and Williamson Counties, some shallow underground mines have been mined through by subsequent surface mining and no longer exist. However, all underground coal mines were included in this study due to the difficulty of identifying such cases in which underground mines may have been mined through by surface methods. In all cases, these re-mined areas involve small mines in rural areas and have no significant effect on the study results.

Mines Producing Industrial Minerals and Metals

In their 1991 study, Treworgy and Hindman collected information on 356 industrial mineral and metal mines and compiled a database containing information about these mines from mine maps and other sources including reports, field notes, and topographic maps. Refer to their work for more detailed information regarding the development of the database. Seven additional underground industrial mineral mines have opened since the 1991 study (Table 3; Z. Lasemi, personal communication 2008), and

point representations for these mines were added to the geospatial database using location information and aerial photography.

Zones of Mine Proximity

The potential for mine subsidence in an area depends on many factors, but a key factor is the proximity of the area to underground mines. We used GIS software to define and spatially apply two zones around each mine (Figure 1). Zone 1 includes the land over or adjacent to mines that, on the basis of the mapped extent and general depth of the mine, could be affected by subsidence. Zone 2, which surrounds Zone 1, represents additional land that could be affected due to uncertainty about




Table 3 Underground mines producing industrial minerals and metals, compiled by county and commodity, 2008.

County	Mineral (number of mines)	Total
Adams	limestone (4)	4
Alexander	ganister (2); tripoli (4)1; clay1	6
Calhoun	clay (5)	5
Carroll	lead (2)	2
Cook	dolomite (1)	1
DuPage	dolomite (1)	1
Greene	limestone (1)	1
Hardin	fluorspar (130)2; lead (1)2; zinc2	131
Henderson	limestone (1)	1
Jackson	clay (1)	1
Jo Daviess	lead (93) ³ ; zinc (9) ³	102
Johnson	limestone (1)	1
Kane	dolomite (2)	2
La Salle	clay (6); limestone (2)	8
Livingston	clay (1)	1
McDonough	clay (3)	3
Madison	clay (2); limestone (2)	4
Marshall	clay (1)	1
Monroe	limestone (2)	2
Pike	limestone (3)	
Pope	fluorspar (51)4; lead (7)4; zinc4; barite (4)4	58
Randolph	limestone (3)	3
Rock Island	clay (1)	1
Saline	fluorspar (2)5; lead5	2
Scott	clay (1)	1
Union	clay (12); tripoli (2)	14
Will	dolomite (4)	4

¹ Two of the tripoli mines also mined clay.

Figure 1 Map showing the relationship of Zones 1 and 2 to mined areas and urban land cover classifications. Zone 1 includes land directly over the mapped extent of the mine plus some adjacent land. Zone 2 includes additional land adjacent to the mine, beyond the Zone 1 boundary.

the exact location of the mine and the extent of its workings. These zones are associated only with known underground mines. Areas outside these two zones also could be undermined. Old, undocumented mine openings have been discovered in many parts of the state, even in areas not known to contain minable deposits. Although the potential for subsidence exists in these places, most undocumented mines were prospect pits or short-term operations that undermined only a few acres.

Zone 1 Zone 1 is defined as the area directly over the mapped extent of the mines and the adjacent land extending some distance beyond the mine boundaries. Land adjacent to a mine is included in this zone because subsidence resulting from the collapse of an underground mine can spread sideways as it moves upward to the land surface. Lateral propagation of subsidence, a function of the depth to the mine, the local geology, and other factors, is not highly predictable. Bauer and Hunt (1982) state that the distance subsidence can propagate laterally

²Twenty-nine of the fluorspar mines also produced lead; 10 produced zinc; and 4 produced lead and zinc.

³ Fifty-four of the lead mines also produced zinc.

⁴Twenty-five of the fluorspar mines also produced lead; 3 produced zinc; 2 produced lead and zinc; and 1 produced barite.

⁵ One fluorspar mine also produced lead.

from a mine is generally much less than the depth from the land surface to the mine.

The present study's methodology uses a rule-based approach to assign areas that have the potential to be affected by subsidence from underground coal mines. That is, the horizontal distance outside the mine edge (collapsed area) that may be affected is dependent on the depth of mining (Figure 2). For underground coal mines, Zone 1 for this study is based on a 30-degree angle of draw from the depth of the mine-edge boundary. Bauer and Hunt (1982) found from subsidence case histories in Illinois that the angles of draw range from 12 to 26 degrees and that the regional composition of roof rock material seems to have less influence on the angle of draw than does the proximity of geologic structures (faults and monoclines) to the mines.

Because an assessment of geologic structures in close proximity to all underground coal mines was beyond the scope of this study, a conservative angle of draw of 30 degrees was used for all coal mine data assessed. The angle of draw was applied to coal seam depth information for each specific mine location and is measured from the mine's outer boundary. As an example, this methodology produces a 173-foot-wide zone (outward from the boundary of the mine) for a mine at a depth of 300 feet and a 520-foot-wide zone for a mine at a depth of 900 feet. This angle of draw is viewed as conservative as it defines a point where no vertical subsidence occurs. The damaging differential movements that would affect a structure are well inside this point, closer to the edge of the mine (i.e., the collapsed area underground).

The angle of draw approach based on mine depth is a more robust tool for delineating areas potentially affected by subsidence than uniform handling. Instead of a constant buffer distance of 500 feet (Treworgy and Hindman 1991), the new methodology equates to 0.57 times the depth of the mine. This angle of draw results in a Zone 1 buffer distance ranging from less than 50 feet to more than 500 feet, when all mines in the state are considered. The application of the new rule-based Zone




Figure 2 Cross section illustrating angle of draw, measured from the depth of the mine extent boundary (Peug and Chiang 1984, New South Whales Coal Association 1989, Bauer 2008).

1 buffers decreases the total potentially affected housing units by approximately 7% (compared with the constant Zone 1) and offers a more realistic damage assessment result related to potential subsidence near coal mines.

As in the 1991 study, mines other than coal mines received a conservative

Zone 1 distance of 500 feet, although mines for some of the industrial minerals tend to have more competent workings than coal mines due to the nature of the rock material they are in. Thus, the subsidence-related Zone 1 buffer distance of 500 feet is likely unrealistically high; however, adjustment of this

distance was beyond the scope of our study and would require an assessment of the type of rock mined and the mining method, among other factors.

Zone 2 Zone 2 represents areas outside the mapped extent of the mines but within a distance that could be affected by subsidence if the mine boundaries are inaccurate or uncertain. Uncertainties about the positions of mine boundaries arise from two sources: (1) incomplete or imprecise maps of mine workings and (2) errors in compilation and digitizing.

In the 1991 study, it was assumed that, in all coal mines and in many industrial mineral and metal mines, errors from these two sources generally would not exceed 1,000 feet. For most mines, Zone 2 is defined as the area extending 1,000 feet beyond Zone 1. Zone 2 was expanded for certain industrial mineral and metal mines that were located on the basis of small-scale source maps. When only a general location description (e.g., "3 miles west of town") was available for a mine, Zone 2 was centered on the approximate location indicated and was enlarged according to the general quality of the description (Table 4).

Designation of an area as Zone 1 or Zone 2 cannot be directly translated into subsidence risk. Although the potential for mine subsidence is generally higher in Zone 1 than in the adjacent Zone 2, the potential for subsidence may be low in some areas designated Zone 1 and high in others. Other factors in addition to proximity to and depth of the mine include coal thickness, the geology of the roof and floor,

the size and placement of the mine pillars, and previous subsidence at the site. All of these factors help determine the potential for mine subsidence in an area. Precise estimates of the subsidence potential cannot be made until the interaction of these factors is better understood.

Land Cover

Due to the discontinuation of updates to the U.S. Geological Survey land use and land cover data (U.S. Geological Survey 1986, Price et al. 2006), which were last collected and characterized in the 1980s, those data are now deemed "historical." To continue to use this outdated data set's classification scheme would introduce serious error into estimates of potentially affected lands, especially for metropolitan areas and other rapidly expanding urban areas.

The satellite imagery-based Land Cover of Illinois data set used in this study represents land cover in Illinois from the years 1999–2000 (Illinois Department of Natural Resources et al. 2003). The data are shown at a scale of 1:100,000 with a native resolution (pixel size) of 30 m. Unfortunately, the new classification schema is not directly comparable to the 1980s data; the main practical difference is the discontinuation of the term "Residential Areas."

The land cover classification schema distinguishes between several types of developed land cover (i.e., "built-up" land containing man-made structures) and non-developed (i.e., vegetated, barren, or water-covered) lands. Some

of those classifications were combined for the purpose of this study. The classification scheme used in the 1999–2000 Land Cover of Illinois data set uses the following *urban* area land cover classifications:

- Low-medium density developed:
 Up to 50% of the land surface is
 covered with man-made structures,
 intermixed with other cover such
 as urban open space and forest &
 partial forest/savanna lands. These
 structures include surfaces that have
 been developed—or "built-up"—
 such as buildings, roadways, parking
 lots, driveways, and other impervious surfaces.
- High density developed: All, or nearly all, of the land surface is covered with man-made structures.
- Urban open space: Parks, golf courses, cemeteries, and other grassland-like cover within urban and developed areas are included in this classification. Areas of lowmedium density developed lands are intermixed with urban open space (Illinois Department of Natural Resources et al. 2003).

In this report, the term *developed* land is used preferentially to the term *built-up* land. The classification *low-medium density* developed land may serve as a gross proxy for the *Residential* areas used in the 1991 study, but the terms and the areas they represent are not directly comparable. Other land cover classes not listed were reclassified to the *non-urban* category. Surface waters were omitted from the areal calculations.

Number of Housing Units

Census block outlines and statistical data on housing units (U.S. Census Bureau 2000b) were used to estimate the number of housing units in close proximity to underground mines. A census block (subdivision of a census tract) is the smallest geographic area used by the Census Bureau in the tabulation of housing unit-level survey data. Census blocks provide for a finer resolution of study than the data available for the 1991 report. That report was based on a mixed scale of census

Table 4 Width of Zone 2 assigned to industrial mineral and metal mines (Treworgy and Hindman 1991).

Source of mine outline or location	Width of Zone 2 (feet)
Original mine map; four reference points	1,000
Original mine map; registered using landmarks	1,000
Topographic map (mine shafts)	1,000
Map with topography or with scale larger than 1:24,000	1,000
Map without topography and scale smaller than 1:24,000	2,320
Legal description with footages or good landmarks	1,000
Legal description of a 10-acre parcel within a section	1,660
Legal description of a 40-acre parcel within a section	2,320
Legal description of a 160-acre parcel within a section	3,640

tracts, block groups, and enumeration districts. In urban areas, census blocks often represent individual street-bounded city blocks but may include larger areas; blocks may be up to many square miles in area, especially in rural locations. Nationwide census block coverage was first established during the 1990 Census (U.S. Census Bureau 2008a).

Housing units are defined as any residential unit (house, apartment, mobile home, etc.) intended for use as separate living quarters. Census block data do not contain information about commercial or industrial structures (U.S. Census Bureau 2008a). A count of housing units per block is provided in the census data, although the spatial distribution of housing units was not known. Thus, for our study, a uniform distribution of housing units over the entire census block area was assumed.

The calculated housing unit density per block was spatially merged with the data on land cover and undermined areas and was used to calculate the approximate number of homes in Zone 1 and 2 areas. This value, then, is a calculated estimate and not an actual count of residences in these zones. Because the census blocks tend to be smaller in urban areas, the census block represents a fairly accurate boundary for calculating housing density and tabulating housing units for Zones 1 and 2 in these areas. In rural areas, although the census blocks tend to be larger, the low density of housing units is less affected by spatial merging, and the census blocks are appropriate for regional calculations in these areas.

Results

Distribution of Undermined Land within Illinois

This study found that approximately 1,676,000 acres in Illinois are in close proximity to underground mines, including 201,000 acres of urban and developed lands that may be exposed to subsidence. Of these urban areas, 90,000 acres are within low-medium density developed areas (predominantly residential), another 49,000 acres are within high density developed areas, and 62,000 acres are within other urban areas.

Approximately 130,000 acres of urban and developed lands fall within Zone 1 (undermined areas or lands within a 30-degree angle of draw from the depth of the mine-edge boundary) and 71,000 acres are in Zone 2 (additional area to reflect potential mine boundary uncertainties). An estimated 333,000 housing units are within these zones; approximately 219,000 housing units are in Zone 1, and 114,000 housing units are in Zone 2.

Of the 79 counties studied, 7% of the low-medium density developed land in these counties is within Zone 1; the range is from 0 to 63% in individual counties. St. Clair County has the most acres of low-medium density developed land in Zone 1 (Figure 3); its

nearly 10,000 acres represent approximately 17% of the statewide total.

Distribution of Undermined Land within Counties

The acreages of each county in Zone 1 and Zone 2 are listed in Tables 5 and 6, respectively, as subdivided by land cover classification. For example, 273 acres (8.2%) of the low-medium density developed land in Bond County are in Zone 1 (Table 5), and 92 acres (2.8%) are in Zone 2 (Table 6). Table 7 shows the land-classified acreage of Zones 1 and 2 combined. In Bond County, an estimated 5,275 acres (2.2% of the total county acreage) and an estimated 795 housing units (11.9% of the county housing total) are within Zones 1 and 2.




Figure 3 Low-medium density developed acreage in Zone 1, by county (only counties having at least 100 acres of low-medium density developed land in Zone 1 are shown).

Table 5 Acreage and percentage of land in Zone 1, by county and land use category. 1, 2

County	Low-medium (acres)	m density (%)	High-de (acres)	nsity (%)	Urban oper (acres)	n space (%)	Rural ar	ea (%)	Total ar	ea (%)	Housing ι (units)	units (%)
Adams	38	0.6	55	0.7	2	0.0	524	0.1	619	0.1	66	0.2
Alexander Bond	0 273	0.0 8.2	7 51	0.5 3.6	0 175	0.0 17.0	125 2,491	0.1 1.1	132 2,990	0.1 1.2	1 706	0.0 10.6
Brown	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2,431	0.0	2,330	0.0	0	0.0
Bureau	913	21.0	411	9.0	896	20.3	6,687	1.2	8,907	1.6	3,468	22.6
Calhoun Carroll	6 0	0.2 0.0	1 0	0.4 0.0	0 0	0.0 0.0	74 36	0.0 0.0	81 36	0.1 0.0	1 0	0.0
Cass	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	0.0	7	0.0	0	0.0
Champaign	6	0.1	19	0.1	1	0.0	10	0.0	36	0.0	5	0.0
Christian	2,681 1,009	50.3 19.8	1,262 692	27.5 17.6	664 512	40.1 30.5	54,160	12.4 6.2	58,767	13.1 6.7	7,567 3,021	50.7 22.0
Clinton Coles	1,009	0.2	11	0.2	0	0.0	17,736 0	0.0	19,950 22	0.0	40	0.2
Cook	5	0.0	7	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	0.0	7	0.0
Crawford	2	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	250	0.1	252	0.1	2	0.0
Cumberland Douglas	5 18	0.3 0.9	2 88	0.5 2.0	0 0	0.0 0.0	38 9,454	0.0 3.7	45 9,560	0.0 3.6	4 38	0.1 0.5
DuPage	113	0.1	74	0.3	44	0.1	30	0.1	262	0.1	304	0.1
Edgar	4	0.2	8	0.4	0	0.0	1,578	0.4	1,590	0.4	9	0.1
Edwards Franklin	0 2,359	0.0 63.4	0 1,113	0.0 52.6	0 5,137	0.0 76.4	157 99,754	0.1 40.7	157 108,363	0.1 42.1	1 11,741	0.0 65.4
-ulton	450	11.1	296	11.1	833	16.3	26,922	5.1	28,500	5.3	1,896	11.8
Gallatin	298	11.5	94	9.3	69	5.4	18,200	9.2	18,661	9.2	181	6.0
Greene	25 1,926	0.7 26.2	12 672	1.4 26.1	5 1 110	0.3 36.8	1,175 10,363	0.3 4.1	1,217 14.080	0.4 5.3	39 5.723	0.6 38.4
Grundy Hamilton	1,926 89	26.2	672 38	26.1 4.8	1,119 0	0.0	10,363 6,118	4.1 2.3	14,080 6,245	5.3 2.3	5,723 43	38.4
Hancock	2	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	190	0.0	192	0.0	0	0.0
Hardin	178	7.4	88	8.4	103	20.1	3,786	3.5	4,155	3.7	177	7.2
Henderson Henry	0 218	0.0 4.3	0 225	0.0 3.5	0 379	0.0 7.8	18 4,232	0.0 0.8	18 5,053	0.0 1.0	0 1,080	0.0 5.1
Jackson	364	11.8	237	7.9	932	12.9	13,401	3.8	14,934	4.1	2,623	10.0
Jasper	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	188	0.1	188	0.1	2	0.0
Jefferson Jersev	610 2	10.8 0.0	477 0	15.8 0.0	178 0	6.1 0.0	29,024 73	8.4 0.0	30,289 75	8.5 0.0	1,383 3	8.2 0.0
Jo Daviess	25	1.1	53	1.3	33	1.7	2,720	0.0	2,831	0.0	132	1.1
Johnson	5	0.4	1	0.2	17	0.6	528	0.2	551	0.3	11	0.2
Kane	9 1	0.0	32	0.3	1	0.0	0	0.0	42	0.0	4	0.0
Kankakee Knox	55	0.0 1.0	0 37	0.0 0.7	0 12	0.0 0.2	338 7,099	0.1 1.6	339 7,203	0.1 1.6	62 88	0.2 0.4
La Salle	3,444	20.1	1,386	24.0	1,963	19.8	8,224	1.2	15,017	2.1	14,795	32.0
_awrence	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	575	0.3	575	0.2	2	0.0
Livingston Logan	145 491	2.7 17.3	258 714	2.6 9.5	48 477	2.6 29.2	1,439 10,620	0.2 2.8	1,890 12,302	0.3 3.1	820 2,254	5.4 19.0
Macon	737	6.9	441	3.3	204	2.9	609	0.2	1,991	0.5	3,185	6.4
Macoupin	4,012	45.8	1,705	35.9	1,537	50.2	66,538	12.6	73,792	13.5	9,973	47.6
Madison Marion	5,468 1.340	15.6 22.7	1,935 690	10.4 21.6	2,153 619	13.2 22.4	24,324 6,095	6.3 1.7	33,879 8,744	7.4 2.4	18,558 4,047	17.1 22.5
Marshall	233	13.9	247	7.1	158	16.6	2,901	1.2	3,539	1.4	978	16.6
McDonough	23	1.0	12	0.4	50	1.2	1,242	0.3	1,327	0.4	113	0.8
McLean	181	1.9	355	1.7	101 219	1.5	256	0.0	893	0.1	695	1.2
Menard Mercer	104 68	7.8 4.1	179 52	5.8 2.6	219 91	31.0 4.5	2,935 6,670	1.5 1.9	3,436 6,881	1.7 1.9	641 297	12.2 4.2
Monroe	6	0.2	13	0.4	12	0.5	513	0.2	544	0.2	48	0.4
Montgomery	1,602	29.0	1,046	23.0	769	34.9	39,805	9.2	43,221	9.7	3,924	31.4
Morgan Moultrie	0 108	0.0 8.2	0 71	0.0 2.5	0 57	0.0 7.8	13 435	0.0 0.2	14 670	0.0 0.3	0 438	0.0 7.7
Peoria	1,079	7.5	840	6.2	933	11.8	18,440	5.2	21,292	5.5	5,213	6.7
Perry	657	23.4	346	16.3	884	26.1	30,190	11.4	32,078	11.7	2,792	29.9
Pike Pope	1 15	0.0 0.4	3 2	0.1 0.3	3 3	0.1 1.1	78 1,317	0.0 0.6	85 1,337	0.0 0.6	2 16	0.0 0.7
Putnam	181	17.3	23	5.3	424	26.5	1,652	1.7	2,279	2.2	583	20.3
Randolph	425	13.2	229	7.4	740	11.5	29,516	8.4	30,910	8.5	1,261	9.5
Rock Island	329	2.9	218	1.6	437	5.3	4,042	1.7	5,025	1.9	2,028	3.2
Saline Sangamon	2,963 8,095	49.8 45.7	832 7,585	54.7 34.3	2,487 4,221	63.0 37.2	69,654 50,602	30.6 10.2	75,935 70,503	31.8 12.8	7,324 39,769	59.8 46.6
Schuyler	6,093	0.2	7,363 5	0.4	4,221	1.0	881	0.3	70,303 898	0.3	39,709 7	0.2
Scott	6	0.6	12	8.0	11	0.9	175	0.1	204	0.1	9	0.4
Shelby	154	4.7	144	5.2	157	14.3	3,135	0.7	3,589	0.8	631	6.4
St. Clair Stark	9,836 1	29.3 0.1	3,316 0	20.2 0.1	3,384 0	23.1 0.0	37,142 208	10.5 0.1	53,677 209	12.9 0.1	37,087 2	35.6 0.1
Tazewell	982	8.0	411	2.3	661	8.2	2,555	0.7	4,609	1.1	4,281	8.1
Jnion	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	219	0.1	219	0.1	3	0.0
/ermilion Vabash	1,112 181	13.8 10.0	1,031 64	10.2 13.6	785 3	10.9 0.5	29,355 13,497	5.4 9.8	32,284 13,746	5.7 9.8	4,535 130	12.6 2.3
Narren	101	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	610	0.2	611	0.2	5	0.1
Vashington	184	6.5	228	9.8	124	6.8	10,948	3.1	11,485	3.2	353	5.5
White	68	1.3	67	3.7	24	2.0	15,312	5.1	15,471	5.0	125	1.7
Nill Nilliamson	959 1,345	1.7 28.6	211 495	1.3 16.8	1,042 4,376	1.9 34.4	2,508 65,566	0.6 27.1	4,720 71,782	0.9 27.4	2,119 8,515	1.2 31.3
Woodford	129	4.1	291	4.1	131	5.8	1,704	0.5	2,255	0.7	618	4.6
Total ²	58,366	7.0	31,519	6.1	40,412	7.8	879,985	3.5	1,010,282	3.7	218,600	5.2

¹ For example, in Bond County, the 273 acres of low-medium density developed land in Zone 1 represents 8.2% of the total low-medium density developed land in the county. ² Note: figures have been rounded.

Table 6 Acreage and percentage of land in Zone 2, by county and land use category. 1, 2

County	Low-mediu		High-de		Urban oper		Rural a	rea (%)	Total ar	ea	Housing u	inits (%)
Adams	(acres) 129	2.0	(acres)	1.2	(acres)	1.8	(acres) 767	0.1	1,091	0.2	(units) 433	1.5
Alexander	20	2.0	15	1.1	0	0.0	6,409	4.4	6,444	4.3	61	1.3
Bond Brown	92 1	2.8 0.1	26 1	1.8 0.1	31 0	3.0 0.0	2,136 1,537	0.9 0.8	2,285 1,539	1.0 0.8	89 9	1.3 0.4
Bureau	121	2.8	72	1.6	180	4.1	7,092	1.3	7,465	1.4	227	1.5
Calhoun	23	1.0	6	1.8	0	0.0	1,373	0.9	1,403	0.9	21	0.8
Carroll Cass	3 8	0.2 0.5	1 18	0.0 1.1	0 21	0.0 1.6	694 893	0.3 0.4	698 941	0.2 0.4	10 15	0.1 0.3
Champaign	83	0.7	108	0.6	12	0.2	85	0.0	288	0.0	517	0.7
Christian Clinton	801 681	15.0 13.4	543 442	11.8 11.3	230 209	13.9 12.5	14,077 8,891	3.2 3.1	15,651 10,224	3.5 3.4	2,960 2,104	19.8 15.3
Coles	75	1.6	63	1.1	10	0.5	91	0.0	238	0.1	334	1.5
Cook	24	0.0	12	0.0	23	0.0	18	0.0	77	0.0	55	0.0
Crawford Cumberland	8 15	0.3 0.9	1 7	0.1 1.4	0 0	0.0 0.0	1,092 237	0.4 0.1	1,101 258	0.4 0.1	13 20	0.1 0.4
Douglas	20	1.0	27	0.6	0	0.0	3,470	1.4	3,517	1.3	56	0.7
DuPage	290	0.4	36	0.2	30 0	0.0	40	0.1	396	0.2	1,111 22	0.3
Edgar Edwards	11 0	0.4 0.0	21 0	0.9 0.0	0	0.0 0.0	3,036 331	0.8 0.2	3,067 331	0.8 0.2	1	0.3
Franklin	393	10.6	307	14.5	529	7.9	11,387	4.6	12,616	4.9	2,076	11.6
Fulton Gallatin	1,040 341	25.7 13.2	588 136	22.1 13.5	1,538 176	30.1 13.8	49,539 13,441	9.4 6.8	52,705 14.094	9.8 6.9	4,581 385	28.5 12.7
Gallatill	82	2.2	23	2.7	31	1.9	4,408	1.3	4,545	1.3	138	2.2
Grundy	814	11.1	326	12.7	529	17.4	8,443	3.4	10,113	3.8	2,383	16.0
Hamilton Hancock	40 3	1.3 0.1	5 2	0.7 0.1	0	0.0 0.0	2,518 1,193	0.9 0.2	2,563 1,197	0.9 0.2	20 3	0.5 0.0
Hardin	443	18.4	67	6.4	136	26.4	18,181	16.8	18,827	16.8	563	22.9
Henderson	21	1.5	24 270	2.0 4.2	0	0.0	507	0.2	553	0.2	3	0.1
Henry Jackson	241 323	4.8 10.5	123	4.2 4.1	355 498	7.3 6.9	11,270 12,691	2.2 3.6	12,136 13,634	2.3 3.7	855 2,551	4.0 9.7
Jasper	3	0.2	1	0.1	0	0.0	878	0.3	883	0.3	16	0.4
Jefferson Jersey	166 15	3.0 0.5	105 2	3.5 0.2	62 2	2.1 0.2	5,592 1.117	1.6 0.5	5,925 1,136	1.7 0.5	691 48	4.1 0.5
Jersey Jo Daviess	264	12.2	341	0.2 8.6	284	15.0	23,434	6.3	24,324	6.4	1,135	9.5
Johnson	12	1.0	8	1.3	72	2.7	1,680	0.8	1,772	0.8	32	0.7
Kane Kankakee	107 1	0.3 0.0	84 0	0.9 0.0	65 0	0.2 0.0	64 695	0.0 0.2	320 696	0.1 0.2	59 78	0.0 0.2
Knox	122	2.2	106	2.0	98	1.8	13,939	3.2	14,265	3.2	317	1.3
La Salle	1,292	7.5	637	11.0	1,152	11.6	14,682	2.1	17,762	2.5	3,596	7.8
Lawrence Livingston	0 226	0.0 4.3	0 243	0.0 2.4	0 125	0.0 6.8	803 3,258	0.3 0.5	804 3,852	0.3 0.6	3 916	0.0 6.0
Logan	420	14.8	669	8.9	233	14.3	4,828	1.3	6,149	1.6	1,972	16.6
Macon Macoupin	629 909	5.9 10.4	371 590	2.8 12.4	121 278	1.7 9.1	663 24,828	0.2 4.7	1,784 26,606	0.5 4.9	3,435 2,607	6.9 12.5
Madison	4,446	12.7	1,379	7.4	1,436	8.8	17,382	4.7	24,642	5.4	15,050	13.9
Marion	451	7.7	190	5.9	214	7.7	3,010	0.9	3,865	1.1	1,551	8.6
Marshall McDonough	110 133	6.6 5.7	151 79	4.3 3.0	136 206	14.2 5.1	4,829 9,298	2.0 2.6	5,226 9,716	2.1 2.6	439 688	7.4 5.2
McLean	244	2.5	198	0.9	157	2.3	556	0.1	1,155	0.2	1,173	2.0
Menard Mercer	208 101	15.6 6.1	238 47	7.7 2.4	182 142	25.8 7.1	6,141 9,766	3.2 2.8	6,768 10,057	3.4 2.8	882 470	16.8 6.7
Monroe	23	0.6	25	0.8	24	1.0	1,827	0.8	1,900	0.8	38	0.4
Montgomery	821	14.9	401	8.8	230	10.4	15,245	3.5	16,697	3.8	2,272	18.2
Morgan Moultrie	30 22	0.8 1.7	15 2	0.3 0.1	34 10	1.1 1.4	1,511 541	0.4 0.3	1,589 575	0.4 0.3	69 91	0.5 1.6
Peoria	822	5.7	746	5.5	679	8.6	22,279	6.3	24,526	6.3	3,768	4.8
Perry	812	28.9	525	24.7	1,314	38.7	18,857	7.1	21,508	7.9	3,438	36.9
Pike Pope	4 332	0.1 8.7	5 74	0.2 13.3	24 125	0.8 47.4	454 14,822	0.1 6.5	487 15,352	0.1 6.6	14 564	0.2 24.2
Putnam	57	5.4	24	5.6	52	3.3	1,454	1.5	1,587	1.6	151	5.3
Randolph Rock Island	503 528	15.6 4.7	305 497	9.8 3.6	1,022 554	15.9 6.7	13,430 6,925	3.8 2.9	15,259 8,504	4.2 3.2	1,872 2,950	14.1 4.6
Saline	1,099	18.5	331	21.8	752	19.0	26,320	11.6	28,501	3.∠ 11.9	2,950 2,539	20.7
Sangamon	2,298	13.0	2,127	9.6	1,119	9.9	24,602	4.9	30,145	5.5	10,352	12.1
Schuyler Scott	74 29	5.0 2.5	34 12	2.9 0.8	58 83	6.7 6.3	7,884 1,000	2.9 0.6	8,051 1,124	2.9 0.7	92 58	2.8 2.4
Shelby	189	5.8	187	6.8	77	7.1	8,162	1.7	8,614	1.8	584	5.9
St. Cláir	4,768	14.2	1,555	9.5	1,728	11.8	24,429	6.9	32,480	7.8	15,447	14.8
Stark Tazewell	34 660	4.9 5.4	27 402	4.0 2.2	2 666	0.2 8.3	2,247 1,959	1.2 0.5	2,310 3,687	1.3 0.9	20 3,258	0.7 6.2
Union	5	0.3	1	0.1	0	0.0	3,959	1.6	3,964	1.5	76	1.0
Vermilion Wahash	866 76	10.8	1,071	10.6	708	9.8 3.1	19,591 5 621	3.6 4.1	22,235 5 727	3.9 4.1	3,737 161	10.4
Wabash Warren	76 2	4.2 0.1	8 5	1.6 0.2	22 0	3.1 0.0	5,621 2,747	4.1 0.8	5,727 2,754	4.1 0.8	161 20	2.8 0.3
Washington	248	8.8	139	6.0	172	9.3	4,653	1.3	5,212	1.5	672	10.6
White Will	99 218	1.9 0.4	13 163	0.7 1.0	49 180	4.0 0.3	4,493 1,225	1.5 0.3	4,654 1,786	1.5 0.3	189 255	2.6 0.1
Williamson	784	16.7	407	13.8	1,792	14.1	24,566	10.2	27,549	10.5	4,618	17.0
Woodford	73	2.3	66	0.9	53	2.4	1,203	0.4	1,395	0.4	288	2.2
Total ²	31,488	3.8	17,974	3.5	21,120	4.1	595,282	2.3	665,874	2.4	114,367	2.7
¹ For example, in	D 10 1 11					7 0	10.00/ 111					

¹ For example, in Bond County, the 92 acres of low-medium density developed land in Zone 2 represent 2.8% of the total low-medium density developed land in the county. ² Note: figures have been rounded.

Table 7 Acreage and percentage of land in Zones 1 and 2 combined, by county and land use category. 1, 2

County (acres) (%) Adams 168 2.6 Alexander 20 2.0 Bond 365 11.0 Brown 1 0.1 Bureau 1,034 23.8 Calhoun 29 1.2 Carroll 3 0.2 Carss 9 0.5 Champaign 89 0.8 Christian 3,482 65.4 Clinton 1,690 33.2 Coles 85 1.8 Cook 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Could as 38 1.8 Cook 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Cumberland 20 1.1 Douglas 38 1.8 DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0 Franklin 2,752 73.9	High-density	Urban open space	Rural area	Total area	Housing units
Alexander 20 2.0 Bond 365 11.0 Brown 1 0.1 Bureau 1,034 23.8 Calhoun 29 1.2 Carroll 3 0.2 Carss 9 0.5 Champaign 89 0.8 Christian 3,482 65.4 Clinton 1,690 33.2 Coles 85 1.8 Cook 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Coles 85 1.8 Cook 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Cumberland 20 1.1 Douglas 38 1.8 DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0.0 Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7	(acres) (%	(acres) (%)	(acres) (%)	(acres) (%) 1,709 0.3	(units) (%) 498 1.7
Brown 1 0.1 Bureau 1,034 23.8 Calhoun 29 1.2 Carroll 3 0.2 Cass 9 0.5 Champaign 89 0.8 Christian 3,482 65.4 Clinton 1,690 33.2 Coles 85 1.8 Cook 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Cow 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Cumberland 20 1.1 Douglas 38 1.8 DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0.0 Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 <td>22 1.</td> <td>0 0.0</td> <td>6,534 4.5</td> <td>6,576 4.4</td> <td>62 1.4</td>	22 1.	0 0.0	6,534 4.5	6,576 4.4	62 1.4
Bureau 1,034 23.8 Calhoun 29 1.2 Carroll 3 0.2 Carss 9 0.5 Champaign 89 0.8 Christian 3,482 65.4 Clinton 1,690 33.2 Coles 85 1.8 Cook 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Cumberland 20 1.1 Douglas 38 1.8 DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0.0 Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hardillon 621 25.8 Henry 459 9.1 Jackson 687	76 5. 1 0.	207 20.0 0 0.0	4,627 2.0 1.538 0.8	5,275 2.2 1.540 0.8	795 11.9 9 0.4
Calhoun 29 1.2 Carroll 3 0.2 Cass 9 0.5 Champaign 89 0.8 Christian 3,482 65.4 Clinton 1,690 33.2 Coles 85 1.8 Cook 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Cumberland 20 1.1 Douglas 38 1.8 DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0.0 Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Greene 108 2.9 Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hardiin 621 25.8 Henry 459 9.1	483 10.	0 0.0 1,076 24.4	1,538 0.8 13,778 2.6	1,540 0.8 16,372 3.0	9 0.4 3,695 24.1
Cass 9 0.5 Champaign 89 0.8 Christian 3,482 65.4 Clinton 1,690 33.2 Coles 85 1.8 Cook 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Cumberland 20 1.1 Douglas 38 1.8 DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0.0 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Handrin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Henderson 22 1.5 Henderson 22 1.5 Jackson 687 22.3 Jaesper 3 0.2 Jefferson 7777	8 2.	0 0.0	1,447 0.9	1,483 0.9	22 0.8
Champaign 89 0.8 Christian 3,482 65.4 Clinton 1,690 33.2 Coles 85 1.8 Cook 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Cumberland 20 1.1 Douglas 38 1.8 DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0.0 Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hardiin 621 2	1 0. 18 1.	0 0.0 21 1.6	730 0.3 899 0.4	734 0.3 947 0.4	10 0.1 15 0.3
Christian 3,482 65.4 Clinton 1,690 33.2 Coles 85 1.8 Cook 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Cumberland 20 1.1 Douglas 38 1.8 DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0.0 Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hancock 4 0.1 Hardin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Henry 459 9.1 Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jessey 16 <	128 0.	13 0.2	95 0.0	324 0.1	522 0.7
Coles 85 1.8 Cook 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Cumberland 20 1.1 Douglas 38 1.8 DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0.0 Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hardin 621 25.8 Hardin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Jackson 687 22.3 Jackson 687 22.3 Jefferson 777	1,805 39.	894 54.0	68,237 15.6	74,419 16.6	10,526 70.6
Cook 29 0.0 Crawford 10 0.3 Cumberland 20 1.1 Douglas 38 1.8 DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0.0 Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hancock 4 0.1 Hardin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Henry 459 9.1 Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 <td< td=""><td>1,135 28. 74 1.</td><td>722 43.0 10 0.5</td><td>26,627 9.3 91 0.0</td><td>30,174 10.1 260 0.1</td><td>5,125 37.4 374 1.6</td></td<>	1,135 28. 74 1.	722 43.0 10 0.5	26,627 9.3 91 0.0	30,174 10.1 260 0.1	5,125 37.4 374 1.6
Cumberland 20 1.1 Douglas 38 1.8 DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0.0 Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hancock 4 0.1 Hardin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Henderson 687 22.3 Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankake 2 0.0 Knox 177 <t< td=""><td>19 0.</td><td>23 0.0</td><td>18 0.0</td><td>89 0.0</td><td>62 0.0</td></t<>	19 0.	23 0.0	18 0.0	89 0.0	62 0.0
Douglas DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0.0 Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Harcock 4 0.1 Hardin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Henderson 22 1.5 Henry 459 9.1 Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankakee 2	1 0. 9 1.	0 0.0 0 0.0	1,342 0.5	1,352 0.5	15 0.2 24 0.5
DuPage 403 0.5 Edgar 15 0.6 Edwards 0 0.0 Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hardin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Henry 459 9.1 Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 2 0.0 Knox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 <t< td=""><td>9 1. 115 2.</td><td>0 0.0 0 0.0</td><td>275 0.1 12,923 5.1</td><td>303 0.1 13,077 5.0</td><td>94 1.2</td></t<>	9 1. 115 2.	0 0.0 0 0.0	275 0.1 12,923 5.1	303 0.1 13,077 5.0	94 1.2
Edwards 0 0.0 Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hancock 4 0.1 Hardin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Henderson 22 1.5 Henderson 687 22.3 Jackson 687 22.3 Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jackson 177 1.4 Kane 117	111 0.	74 0.1	70 0.2	658 0.3	1,415 0.4
Franklin 2,752 73.9 Fulton 1,490 36.8 Gallatin 639 24.7 Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hancock 4 0.1 Hardin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Hendry 459 9.1 Jasper 3 0.2 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kane 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankakee 2 0.0 Knox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 La Salle 4,736 27.6 La Salle 4,736	29 1. 0 0.	0 0.0 0 0.0	4,614 1.2 489 0.4	4,657 1.2 489 0.3	32 0.4 1 0.0
Gallatin 639 24.7 Greenee 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hancock 4 0.1 Harcon 22 1.5 Henderson 22 1.5 Henderson 22 1.5 Henry 459 9.1 Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jasper 1 0.5 Jankee 2 0.0	1,420 67.	5,667 84.3	111,141 45.4	120,979 47.0	13,818 76.9
Greene 108 2.9 Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hancock 4 0.1 Hardin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Henry 459 9.1 Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankakee 2 0.0 Konox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Marishall 343 20.5 Marshall 343 20.5 McLean 424	883 33.	2,372 46.4	76,461 14.5	81,205 15.1	6,477 40.3
Grundy 2,741 37.2 Hamilton 129 4.1 Hancock 4 0.1 Hardin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Henry 459 9.1 Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankakee 2 0.0 Knox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Macison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Mshashall 343 20.5 McLean 424	230 22. 36 4.	245 19.2 36 2.2	31,641 16.0 5,583 1.7	32,755 16.1 5,762 1.7	566 18.7 177 2.8
Hancock 4 0.1 Hardin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Henry 459 9.1 Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankakee 2 0.0 Konox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macoon 1,367 12.7 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Marishall 343 20.5 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Montgomery 2,423	998 38.	1,648 54.2	18,806 7.5	24,193 9.1	8,106 54.3
Hardin 621 25.8 Henderson 22 1.5 Henry 459 9.1 Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankakee 2 0.0 Knox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 La Sall	43 5. 2 0.	0 0.0 0 0.0	8,636 3.2 1,382 0.3	8,808 3.2 1,389 0.3	63 1.6 4 0.0
Henderson 22 1.5 Henry 459 9.1 Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankakee 2 0.0 Knox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macon 1,367 12.7 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Madison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 <td>155 14.</td> <td>239 46.5</td> <td>21,967 20.3</td> <td>22,982 20.5</td> <td>740 30.1</td>	155 14.	239 46.5	21,967 20.3	22,982 20.5	740 30.1
Jackson 687 22.3 Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankakee 2 0.0 Knox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macon 1,367 12.7 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Morgan 30	24 2.	0 0.0	525 0.2	571 0.2	3 0.1
Jasper 3 0.2 Jefferson 777 13.8 Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankakee 2 0.0 Knox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macon 1,367 12.7 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Madison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Monroe 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Morgan 30	495 7. 360 12.	734 15.1 1,429 19.9	15,501 3.1 26,091 7.4	17,189 3.3 28,568 7.8	1,935 9.1 5,175 19.6
Jersey 16 0.5 Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankakee 2 0.0 Knox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macoon 1,367 12.7 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Madison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Montgen 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan <td< td=""><td>1 0.</td><td>0 0.0</td><td>1,066 0.3</td><td>1,071 0.3</td><td>18 0.4</td></td<>	1 0.	0 0.0	1,066 0.3	1,071 0.3	18 0.4
Jo Daviess 289 13.4 Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankakee 2 0.0 Knox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macoon 1,367 12.7 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Madison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Montone 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1	582 19.	239 8.2	34,616 10.0	36,214 10.1	2,074 12.3
Johnson 17 1.4 Kane 117 0.3 Kankakee 2 0.0 Knox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macoon 1,367 12.7 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Madison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Meroer 170 10.2 Monroe 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Morgan 30	2 0. 395 10.	2 0.2 317 16.8	1,190 0.5 26,154 7.0	1,211 0.5 27,154 7.1	50 0.6 1,267 10.6
Kankakee 2 0.0 Knox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macon 1,367 12.7 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Madison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Montore 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237	10 1.	89 3.4	2,208 1.0	2,323 1.1	42 0.9
Knox 177 3.2 La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macon 1,367 12.7 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Madison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Montgomerd 2,423 43.8 Mortgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island <t< td=""><td>116 1. 0 0.</td><td>66 0.2 0 0.0</td><td>64 0.0 1,033 0.3</td><td>363 0.1 1,035 0.2</td><td>62 0.0 141 0.3</td></t<>	116 1. 0 0.	66 0.2 0 0.0	64 0.0 1,033 0.3	363 0.1 1,035 0.2	62 0.0 141 0.3
La Salle 4,736 27.6 Lawrence 1 0.0 Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macon 1,367 12.7 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Madison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6	142 2.	111 2.0	21,039 4.8	21,468 4.8	404 1.7
Livingston 371 7.0 Logan 911 32.1 Macon 1,367 12.7 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Madison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Monroe 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon <t< td=""><td>2,023 35.</td><td>3,115 31.4</td><td>22,906 3.3</td><td>32,779 4.6</td><td>18,391 39.8</td></t<>	2,023 35.	3,115 31.4	22,906 3.3	32,779 4.6	18,391 39.8
Logan 911 32.1 Macoon 1,367 12.7 Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Madison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Monroe 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Scott <t< td=""><td>0 0. 501 5.</td><td>0 0.0 173 9.5</td><td>1,378 0.6 4,697 0.7</td><td>1,379 0.6 5,742 0.9</td><td>5 0.1 1,736 11.4</td></t<>	0 0. 501 5.	0 0.0 173 9.5	1,378 0.6 4,697 0.7	1,379 0.6 5,742 0.9	5 0.1 1,736 11.4
Macoupin 4,921 56.2 Madison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Montore 30 0.8 Mortgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14	1,383 18.	710 43.5	15,448 4.1	18,451 4.7	4,225 35.6
Madison 9,914 28.2 Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Monroe 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Washington 432 15.3 Warlington 432 15	811 6.	325 4.6	1,271 0.4	3,775 1.0 100,398 18.4	6,620 13.2
Marion 1,792 30.4 Marshall 343 20.5 McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Monroe 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schulyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35	2,296 48. 3,313 17.	1,815 59.3 3,589 21.9	91,366 17.3 41,706 10.8	100,398 18.4 58,522 12.8	12,580 60.1 33,608 31.0
McDonough 156 6.7 McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Monroe 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5	880 27.	833 30.1	9,104 2.6	12,609 3.5	5,598 31.2
McLean 424 4.4 Menard 311 23.4 Mercer 170 10.2 Monroe 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Washington 432	398 11. 91 3.	293 30.8 256 6.4	7,730 3.2 10,540 2.9	8,765 3.6 11,042 3.0	1,417 24.0 801 6.0
Mercer 170 10.2 Monroe 30 0.8 Montgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 <td>553 2.</td> <td>258 3.9</td> <td>813 0.1</td> <td>2,048 0.3</td> <td>1,868 3.1</td>	553 2.	258 3.9	813 0.1	2,048 0.3	1,868 3.1
Monroe 30 0.8 Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Warshington 432 15.3 White 167	417 13.	401 56.8	9,076 4.7	10,205 5.1	1,523 29.0
Montgomery 2,423 43.8 Morgan 30 0.8 Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Warshington 432 15.3 White 16	99 5. 38 1.	232 11.7 36 1.5	16,436 4.7 2,340 1.0	16,938 4.8 2.444 1.0	767 10.9 85 0.8
Moultrie 130 9.9 Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Bock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Warshington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	1,446 31.	998 45.3	55,050 12.7	59,918 13.5	6,197 49.6
Peoria 1,902 13.3 Perry 1,469 52.2 Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warrier 3 0.2 Warshington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	16 0. 72 2.	34 1.1 68 9.2	1,524 0.4 976 0.5	1,603 0.4 1,245 0.6	70 0.5 530 9.3
Pike 6 0.1 Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	1,586 11.	1,611 20.4	40,719 11.5	45,817 11.8	8,980 11.5
Pope 347 9.1 Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warrien 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	872 40.	2,198 64.8	49,048 18.5	53,586 19.6	6,230 66.8
Putnam 237 22.7 Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	8 0.	27 0.9	532 0.1	573 0.1	17 0.2
Randolph 928 28.8 Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warrien 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	76 13.	128 48.5	16,139 7.1	16,689 7.2	580 24.9
Rock Island 857 7.6 Saline 4,062 68.2 Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	47 10. 533 17.	476 29.7 1,762 27.4	3,106 3.2 42,946 12.3	3,866 3.8 46,168 12.7	734 25.5 3,133 23.7
Sangamon 10,393 58.6 Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	715 5.	991 12.0	10,967 4.7	13,529 5.0	4,978 7.8
Schuyler 77 5.3 Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	1,162 76.	3,239 82.0	95,974 42.2	104,437 43.7	9,862 80.6
Scott 35 3.1 Shelby 342 10.5 St. Clair 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	9,712 43. 39 3.	5,340 47.1 67 7.7	75,204 15.1 8,766 3.2	100,648 18.3 8,949 3.2	50,121 58.8 99 3.0
St. Cláir 14,604 43.5 Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	24 1.	94 7.1	1,175 0.8	1,328 0.8	67 2.7
Stark 35 5.1 Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	331 12. 4,871 29.	234 21.4 5,111 34.8	11,297 2.4 61,570 17.5	12,204 2.6 86,157 20.6	1,215 12.3 52,534 50.5
Tazewell 1,643 13.4 Union 5 0.3 Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	4,871 29. 28 4.	2 0.2	2,455 1.4	86,157 20.6 2,519 1.4	52,534 50.5 22 0.8
Vermilion 1,978 24.6 Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	813 4.	1,327 16.5	4,514 1.2	8,296 2.0	7,540 14.3
Wabash 258 14.2 Warren 3 0.2 Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	1 0. 2,102 20.	0 0.0 1,493 20.7	4,178 1.6 48,946 9.1	4,184 1.6 54,519 9.7	79 1.0 8,273 23.0
Washington 432 15.3 White 167 3.2	71 15.	25 3.6	19,118 13.9	19,472 13.8	291 5.1
White 167 3.2	5 0.	0 0.0	3,358 1.0	3,366 1.0	25 0.3
	367 15. 80 4.	296 16.1 74 6.0	15,602 4.5 19,804 6.6	16,697 4.7 20,125 6.5	1,025 16.1 314 4.3
Will 1,177 2.0	373 2.	1,222 2.2	3,734 0.9	6,506 1.2	2,373 1.4
Williamson 2,129 45.3 Woodford 202 6.5	901 30. 357 5.	6,168 48.5 184 8.2	90,132 37.3 2,907 0.9	99,330 37.9 3,650 1.1	13,132 48.3 906 6.8
Total ² 89,853 10.8	49,493 9.		1,475,278 5.8	1,676,156 6.1	332,968 8.0

¹ For example, in Bond County, the 365 acres of low-medium density developed land in Zones 1 and 2 represent 11% of the total low-medium density developed land in the county.

² Note: figures have been rounded. Urban and developed lands constitute low-medium density, high density, and urban open space classifications. Combined total is 200,878 potentially affected acres.

Table 8 shows a comparison of the ranking of counties by total acreage and by estimated housing units in Zone 1. The magnitude of potential mine subsidence damage to structures in a county is related to the amount of development over underground mines. For example, Franklin County has the most total acreage in Zone 1, but, because the county has relatively little urban development, it has significantly fewer housing units in Zone 1 than do four counties having larger urban areas (Sangamon, St. Clair, Madison, and La Salle). La Salle County, which ranks nineteenth in acreage in Zone 1 (less than one-fifth the Zone 1 acreage of Franklin County), ranks ahead of Franklin County in number of housing units in Zone 1.

A closer examination of the top 15 counties from Figure 3 shows several counties that have relatively higher percentages of the total county's lowmedium density developed land falling within Zone 1 (Figure 4). Three of these counties (Franklin, Christian, and Saline) have 50% or more of their low-medium density developed land in Zone 1, and nine additional counties have 20% or more of these lands in Zone 1. This situation is typically due to counties having either (1) relatively larger undermined acreages with relatively smaller towns in these areas (e.g., "rural" counties with mining, such as Saline or Franklin), or (2) larger acreages of developed land with mines located primarily within these areas (e.g., "urban" counties with mining, such as Sangamon County, which contains the city of Springfield, or St. Clair, which contains the St. Louis Metro East area).

Mined areas within typical "mining" counties often disproportionately underlie developed areas rather than adjacent rural areas. Most of the oldest mining operations in the state were located in and around populated areas because the towns served both as a source of labor and a market for the coal, and some mines were started along railroad lines to be near this transportation source and/or to supply passing trains. As the population increased over the years, the towns generally grew outward, over, and around these mines—and many towns

continue to expand. See Appendix 2 for a series of maps, by county, that illustrate areas potentially affected by underground mining and their relationship to generalized urban areas.

Additional Factors Related to Subsidence Potential

Factors other than the proximity to or depth of mines must be consid-

Table 8 Ranking of the top 15 mining counties, by total acreage and estimated number of housing units in Zone 1.

		Acreage			Housing units
Rank	County	in Zone 1	Rank	County	in Zone 1
1	Franklin	108,363	1	Sangamon	39,769
2	Saline	75,921	2	St. Clair	37,087
3	Macoupin	73,792	3	Madison	18,558
4	Williamson	71,782	4	La Salle	14,795
5	Sangamon	70,503	5	Franklin	11,741
6	Christian	58,767	6	Macoupin	9,973
7	St. Clair	53,677	7	Williamson	8,515
8	Montgomery	43,221	8	Christian	7,567
9	Madison	33,879	9	Saline	7,323
10	Vermilion	32,284	10	Grundy	5,723
11	Perry	32,078	11	Peoria	5,213
12	Randolph	30,910	12	Vermilion	4,535
13	Jefferson	30,289	13	Tazewell	4,281
14	Fulton	28,500	14	Marion	4,047
15	Peoria	21,292	15	Montgomery	3,924




Figure 4 Comparison of low-medium density developed acreage in Zone 1 (red bar) with the total low-medium density developed acreage in select counties (gray bar). Only counties having a minimum of 1,000 acres of low-medium density developed land in Zone 1 are shown.

Table 9 Longwall mines and underground mines, by county.

	Longwall	Underground
County	mines (no.)	mines (no.)
Bureau	9	38
Christian	1	17
Crawford	1 ¹	9
Franklin	6	35
Grundy	47	232
Hamilton	2 ¹	3
Jackson	1	143
Jefferson	31	5
Kankakee	6	9
Knox	1	42
La Salle	27	256
Livingston	3	44
Logan	1	9
Macon	3	5
Macoupin	4	69
Marshall	4	53
McDonough		143
McLean	3	6
Montgomer	y 2	20
Peoria	1	133
Putnam	4	4
Saline	2	164
Will	26	42
Williamson	4 ¹	321
Woodford	2	4

¹ Includes mines that use high-extractionretreat room-and-pillar methods.

ered in assessing the potential risk of subsidence in an area. For instance, the mining method used determines the amount of coal left in the mine (e.g., pillars) to support the overburden. Some form of room-and-pillar mining—in which 40 to 60% of the coal is commonly left in place to support the mine roof—was used in most Illinois mines. Over time, these pillars of coal may fail, but it is generally impossible to predict if and when failure will occur.

Two other mining techniques used in Illinois are longwall mining and high-extraction retreat room-and-pillar mining. With these techniques, most or all of the coal is removed from sections of the mine, causing planned subsidence of the ground surface very shortly after mining. Once ground movement ceases, there is little future risk of subsidence over these mine sections. The effects of specific mining methods

on the subsidence potential must be evaluated on a site-by-site basis; these effects were not considered in this study. Longwall methods have been used in only a small percentage of the more than 3,800 underground mines in Illinois. Table 9 lists the total number of longwall mines and the total number of underground mines in each county assessed in this study.

Although a 10-foot-thick coal seam will be more likely to propagate more displacement at the surface than, for example, a 4-foot-thick coal seam, no attempt was made to differentiate subsidence magnitude based on coal thickness. The interaction of contributing factors (e.g., the geology of the roof and floor and the previous subsidence at the site) is not well understood and is too complex to include in this study. However, these factors should be considered to evaluate the subsidence potential at a specific site.

Conclusions

This study found that an estimated 333,000 housing units and approximately 201,000 acres of urban and developed lands are in close proximity to underground mines and may be exposed to subsidence. The total land area in Illinois overlying or immediately adjacent to underground mines is 1,676,000 acres. Planners, developers, local government officials, and landowners should be made aware of the general locations of these areas.

The tables in this report can be used to determine the amount of land within a county that lies in close proximity to underground mines. Maps are included that illustrate the general intersection of urban area land cover classifications with zones of proximity above and adjacent to the boundary of underground mines. These maps are not suitable for site-specific studies. Original individual mine maps must be used to delineate the position of mine boundaries accurately with respect to urban features.

County maps (1:100,000 scale) and quadrangle maps (1:24,000 scale) showing the general location of mined areas are available on the ISGS Web site

(http://www.isgs.illinois.edu/maps-data-pub/maps.shtml). These areas continue to be studied to ensure the detailed quadrangle mined area maps depict the best-known position of mine boundaries with respect to individual properties, as located on a USGS topographic map base. Information on the availability of these mined-area maps and/or scanned source map images for many individual mines can be obtained from the ISGS.

Factors that contribute to subsidence potential (e.g., thickness of the coal, geology of the roof and floor, and previous subsidence at the site) should be considered when evaluating the subsidence potential of specific sites. As more is learned about these contributing factors, the assessment of exposure to potential mine subsidence can continue to be refined.

Acknowledgments

This publication is a revision of *The Proximity of Underground Mines to Residential and Other Built-up Areas in Illinois*, which was released in 1991 as ISGS Environmental Geology 138.

This project was sponsored by the Illinois Mine Subsidence Insurance Fund (IMSIF). The material in this report is solely the work of the authors and does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the IMSIF.

The ISGS staff members who contributed to the project were Robert Bauer, who provided valuable insight and guidance in the development of our depth-based methodology for assessing underground coal mines; Donald Luman, who provided the 1999-2000 Land Cover of Illinois data as well as advice and guidance on the use of this data; Zakaria Lasemi, who provided the data for mines that produce industrial metals and minerals; and Cheri Chenoweth, Jennifer Obrad, and Alan Myers, who maintain and update the coal mine GIS and tabular databases, mined area maps, and reports. We appreciate the helpful review comments provided by David Morse, Cheri Chenoweth, and Robert Bauer from the ISGS and Agnieszka Drobniak from the Indiana Geological Survey.

References

- Bauer, R.A., 2006, Mine subsidence in Illinois: Facts for homeowners: Illinois State Geological Survey, Circular 569, 20 p.
- Bauer, R.A., 2008, Planned coal mine subsidence in Illinois: A public information booklet: Illinois State Geological Survey, Circular 573, 19 p.
- Bauer, R.A., and S.R. Hunt, 1982, Profile, strain, and time characteristics of subsidence from coal mining in Illinois, *in* S.S. Peng, ed., Proceedings of the Workshop on Surface Subsidence Due to Underground Mining, March 1982, Morgantown, WV, p. 207–218.
- Illinois Department of Natural
 Resources, Illinois Natural History
 Survey, Illinois State Geological
 Survey, Illinois Department of Agriculture, United States Department
 of Agriculture, National Agricultural
 Statistics Service 1:100 000 Scale
 Land Cover of Illinois 1999–2000
 [raster digital data], Version 2.0, September 2003.

- New South Wales Coal Association, 1989, Mine subsidence: A community information booklet: New South Wales Coal Association, Department of Minerals and Energy, and the Mine Subsidence Board of Australia, 32 p.
- Peng, S.S., and H.S. Chiang, 1984, Longwall mining: New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 708 p.
- Price, C.V., N. Nakagaki, K.J. Hitt, and R.C. Clawges, 2006, Enhanced historical land-use and land-cover data sets of the United States Geological Survey, Digital Data Series 240 [vector digital data]: Reston, Virginia, United States Geological Survey (imagery and classification dates from 1970s and 1980s).
- Touseull, J., and C. Rich, Jr., 1980, Documentation and analysis of a massive rock failure at the Bautsch Mine, Galena, Illinois: United States Bureau of Mines, Report of Investigations 8453, 49 p.
- Treworgy, C.G., and C.A. Hindman, 1991, The proximity of underground

- mines to residential and other builtup areas in Illinois: Illinois State Geological Survey, Environmental Geology 138, 18 p.
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2000a, Census 2000 tables: Illinois [tabular data]: Washington, D.C., U.S. Census Bureau. http://census.gov.
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2000b, TIGER/ Line Shapefiles, Census 2000 blocks: Illinois Counties [vector digital data], Washington, D.C., U.S. Census Bureau. http://census.gov.
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2008a, American FactFinder glossary. http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/epss/ glossary_a.html, accessed April, 2008
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2008b, Illinois QuickFacts, http://quickfacts. census.gov/qfd/states/17000.html, accessed April, 2008.
- U.S. Geological Survey, 1986, Land use and land cover digital data from 1:250,000- and 1:100,000-scale maps: User guide 4: Reston, Virginia, U.S. Geological Survey, 25 p.

Appendix 1: Detailed GIS Calculation Methodology

GIS Buffer Distance Calculations

Statewide vector data for underground coal and non-coal mines were sourced from yearly updated mined-out area GIS layers maintained by the ISGS. Statewide polygon layers for coal depths were sourced from previous mapping studies. Depth values were in increments of 100 feet (e.g. 50 feet, 150 feet, 250 feet). All vector data in this study were projected to a common working coordinate system (Lambert Conformal Conic, NAD27) with feet as the unit of measure.

Coal mine point and polygon layers were selected by coal seam and intersected with their respective coal seam depth layer. If a mine fell outside of a depth polygon, and thus did not intersect any mapped depth values, the mine was manually given an estimated depth value or a null value. Mines in minor coal seams for which the ISGS does not have depth layers were given a null depth value. Non-coal mines were also given a null depth value because the depth-dependent Zone

1 assignment was performed only on coal mines.

Three short integer fields were added to the mine GIS layers:

- ANGLE_DRAW = 30 OR NULL (for null depths)
- Z1_BUFFER = Depth × 0.577 (where tan(30°) = 0.577) OR = 500 (for null depth values)
- Z2_BUFFER = Z1_BUFFER + 1,000 (for coal mines) OR = Z1_BUFFER + Table 5 Width Value (for noncoal mines)


Creation of Final GIS Layer

Analysis tools from ESRI's ArcToolbox were used to create the final GIS layers. Using the buffer tool, a layer was created for each buffer zone (i.e., one layer for Zone 1 and another layer for Zone 2) using the three integer fields as the variable buffer distances. A union was then conducted that spatially combined these layers into a single layer that allowed for the differentiation of Zone 1 polygons from Zone 2 polygons. Finally, a union of the buffer zones, census data, and land cover data layers was conducted, which resulted in the final GIS data layer.


Tabulations and Final Data Results


Three Python programming language scripts were developed to calculate and tabulate data per county and to export the data in database file (.dbf) format for use in Tables 6, 7, and 8 (results for Zone 1, Zone 2, and Zones 1 and 2 combined, respectively). The scripts first calculated acres for each polygon by dividing the square footage by 43,560, and the housing fraction data attribute was calculated by multiplying acres by the density of housing units per acre (which was initially calculated in the census data before it was joined with other data layers). This process ultimately yields the number of housing units per polygon. Each script then sums and outputs the total acres and total housing units based on several expressions that select each land use classification as well as total land area (all land use classes except water) for each county. The data were then compiled in a Microsoft Access database to calculate percentages and exported to Excel for final formatting.

Appendix 2: County Map Series Showing Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining



Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Alexander County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **149,940**Total housing units: **4,570**

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **6,576**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **62**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **4.4**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1.4**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Bond County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 239,895
Total housing units: 6,662


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **5,275**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **795**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **2.2**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **11.9**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Brown County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: 192,925
Total housing units: 2,450


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1,540**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **9**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.8**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.4**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Bureau County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: **549,253**Total housing units: **15,313**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **16,372**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **3,695**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **3.0**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **24.1**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Carroll County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 282,404 Total housing units: 7,817


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: 734 Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 10


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 0.3 Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 0.1





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Cass County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: 237,578
Total housing units: 5,771


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **947**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **15**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.4**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.3**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Champaign County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 630,404 Total housing units: 74,972


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: 324 Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 522


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 0.1 Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 0.7





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Christian County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: 449,003
Total housing units: 14,919


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **74,419**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **10,526**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **16.6**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **70.6**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Clinton County, Illinois







County Statistics


Total acres: 298,026 Total housing units: 13,720


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: 30,174 Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 5,125

Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 10.1 Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 37.4



Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Coles County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 320,808
Total housing units: 22,692

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **260**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **374**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.1**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1.6**




This map accompanies ISGS Circular 575. Refer to the publication for more detailed information.


10

Miles



Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Crawford County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: **279,299**Total housing units: **8,730**

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1,352**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **15**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.5**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.2**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Cumberland County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 218,015 Total housing units: 4,813


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: 303 Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 24


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 0.1 Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 0.5





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Douglas County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: **263,664**Total housing units: **7,980**

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **13,077**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **94**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **5.0**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1.2**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining DuPage County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 210,039 Total housing units: 332,548 Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: 658


Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 1,415


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 0.3 Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 0.4





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Edgar County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: **394,121**Total housing units: **8,566**

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **4,657**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **32**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1.2**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.4**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Edwards County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **140,227**Total housing units: **3,185**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **489**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.3**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.0**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Franklin County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: 257,451
Total housing units: 17,962


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **120,979**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **13,818**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **47.0**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **76.9**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Fulton County, Illinois







County Statistics


Total acres: **537,975**Total housing units: **16,069**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **81,205**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **6,477**

Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **15.1**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **40.3**



Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Gallatin County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: 203,182
Total housing units: 3,029


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **32,755**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **566**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **16.1**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **18.7**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Greene County, Illinois







County Statistics


Total acres: **342,376**Total housing units: **6,319**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **5,762**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **177**

Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1.7**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **2.8**



Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Grundy County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 264,624
Total housing units: 14,918

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **24,193**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **8,106**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 9.1


Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 54.3





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Hamilton County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **274,450**Total housing units: **3,966**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **8,808**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **63**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **3.2**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1.6**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Hancock County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: **502,644**Total housing units: **8,866**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1,389**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **4**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.3**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.0**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Hardin County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 112,206 Total housing units: 2,461


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: 22,982 Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 740


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 20.5 Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 30.1





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Henderson County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: 238,195
Total housing units: 3,972


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **571**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **3**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.2**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.1**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Henry County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **520,274**Total housing units: **21,185**

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **17,189**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1,935**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **3.3**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **9.1**




This map accompanies ISGS Circular 575. Refer to the publication for more detailed information.

10 ⊐ Miles

Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Jackson County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 366,617
Total housing units: 26,347


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **28,568**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **5,175**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 7.8

Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 19.6



Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Jasper County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: **311,719**Total housing units: **4,276**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1,071**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **18**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.3**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.4**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Jefferson County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **357,374**Total housing units: **16,887**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **36,214**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **2,074**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **10.1**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **12.3**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Jersey County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 233,603
Total housing units: 8,854


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1,211**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **50**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.5**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.6**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Jo Daviess County, Illinois







County Statistics


Total acres: 381,609
Total housing units: 11,896

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **27,154**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1,267**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 7.1


Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 10.7





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Johnson County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 216,462
Total housing units: 4,841


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **2,323**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **42**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1.1**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.9**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Kane County, Illinois







County Statistics


Total acres: 329,258
Total housing units: 138,142
Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: 363
Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 62


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.1**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.0**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Kankakee County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 428,713
Total housing units: 40,247


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1,035**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **141**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.2**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.3**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Knox County, Illinois








County Statistics


Total acres: **450,211**Total housing units: **23,451**

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **21,468**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **404**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **4.8**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1.7**








Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Lawrence County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: 233,256
Total housing units: 6,914


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1,379**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **5**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.6**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.1**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Livingston County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: 660,845
Total housing units: 15,231


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **5,742**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1,736**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.9**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **11.4**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Logan County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **390,944**Total housing units: **11,858**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **18,451**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **4,225**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **4.7**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **35.6**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Macon County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 366,760
Total housing units: 50,041

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **3,775**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **6,620**

Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 1.0

Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 13.2





This map accompanies ISGS Circular 575. Refer to the publication for more detailed information.

10

Miles

Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Macoupin County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **544,883**Total housing units: **20,936**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **100,398**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **12,580**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **18.4**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **60.1**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Madison County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **456,220**Total housing units: **108,383**

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: 58,522

Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 33,608


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 12.8
Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 31.0





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Marion County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: **361,345**Total housing units: **17,960**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **12,609**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **5,598**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **3.5**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **31.2**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Marshall County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 245,501 Total housing units: 5,901

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: 8,765 Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 1,417


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 3.6


Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 24.0





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining McDonough County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: 372,492
Total housing units: 13,274


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **11,042**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **801**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **3.0**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **6.0**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining McLean County, Illinois







County Statistics


Total acres: **749,343**Total housing units: **59,737**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **2,048**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1,868**

Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.3**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **3.1**



Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Menard County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 198,687
Total housing units: 5,245

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **10,205**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1,523**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 5.1


Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 29.0





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Mercer County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **354,600**Total housing units: **7,021**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **16,938**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **767**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **4.8**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **10.9**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Monroe County, Illinois








County Statistics


Total acres: **245,519**Total housing units: **10,672**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **2,444**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **85**

Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1.0**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.8**



Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Montgomery County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **444,616**Total housing units: **12,496**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **59,918**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **6,197**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 13.5
Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 49.6





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Morgan County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: **359,076**Total housing units: **15,241**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1,603**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **70**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.4**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.5**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Moultrie County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: 212,348
Total housing units: 5,723


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1,245**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **530**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.6**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **9.3**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Peoria County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 388,810
Total housing units: 77,808


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **45,817**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **8,980**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 11.8

Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 11.5



Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Perry County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 273,632
Total housing units: 9,330

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **53,586**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **6,230**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 19.6
Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 66.8




This map accompanies ISGS Circular 575. Refer to the publication for more detailed information.


10

Miles



Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Pope County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 232,948
Total housing units: 2,325

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **16,689**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **580**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **7.2**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **24.9**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Putnam County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **101,613**Total housing units: **2,875**

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **3,866**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **734**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 3.8


Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 25.5





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Randolph County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: **362,741**Total housing units: **13,231**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **46,168**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **3,133**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **12.7**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **23.7**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Saline County, Illinois








County Statistics


Total acres: 238,916
Total housing units: 12,238

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **104,437**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **9,862**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **43.7**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **80.6**








Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Schuyler County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 275,896
Total housing units: 3,284

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **8,949**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **99**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **3.2**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **3.0**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Scott County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **158,145**Total housing units: **2,446**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1,328**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **67**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **0.8**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **2.7**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Shelby County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 477,511 Total housing units: 9,920

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: 12,204 Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 1,215


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 2.6

Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 12.3



Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining St. Clair County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 417,429
Total housing units: 104,057


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **86,157**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **52,534**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **20.6**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **50.5**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Stark County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 182,274
Total housing units: 2,722


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **2,519**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **22**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1.4**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.8**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Tazewell County, Illinois







County Statistics


Total acres: **409,599**Total housing units: **52,725**

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **8,296**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **7,540**

Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 2.0


Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 14.3





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Union County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **259,580**Total housing units: **7,797**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **4,184**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **79**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1.6**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1.0**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Vermilion County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **564,866**Total housing units: **35,994**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **54,519**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **8,273**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **9.7**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **23.0**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Wabash County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: **140,971**Total housing units: **5,696**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: 19,472
Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 291


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 13.8
Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 5.1





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Warren County, Illinois








County Statistics

Total acres: **343,193**Total housing units: **7,647**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **3,366**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **25**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1.0**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **0.3**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Washington County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **355,496**Total housing units: **6,357**

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **16,697**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **1,025**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 4.7


Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 16.1





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining White County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **309,844**Total housing units: **7,310**


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **20,125**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **314**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **6.5**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **4.3**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Will County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 525,854 Total housing units: 174,291


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: 6,506 Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 2,373


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: 1.2 Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: 1.4





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Williamson County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: 262,106
Total housing units: 27,193


Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **99,330**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **13,132**


Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **37.9**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **48.3**





Areas in Close Proximity to Underground Mining Woodford County, Illinois







County Statistics

Total acres: **334,017**Total housing units: **13,383**

Total acres in Zones 1 and 2: **3,650**Total housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **906**

Percent acres in Zones 1 and 2: **1.1**Percent housing units in Zones 1 and 2: **6.8**

