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What is the Census?

The Census is a collaborative research project that started in 2002.

Although the BRC Census is technically a survey and not a real census (where everyone in a population was sampled), we aspire to be a true census where everyone voluntarily participates. Until that day, we will continue to provide the most complete picture possible of the highly diverse population of Black Rock City.
Method

• Based on analysis of 11707 surveys filled out online after the event in 2014 (roughly 1 in 5.5 citizens!)
• This is roughly the same proportion of useful data as the 2012 and 2013 surveys
• This is the 3rd consecutive year in BRC history that these results were weighted to correct for non-response biases.
  – Implication: these results are the most reliable estimates available concerning the BRC population
• Project was approved by a research ethics committee (@ Denver University) and confidentiality of respondents is protected
Details about the weighting procedure

• As with 2012 & 2013, the 2014 BRC Census created an “unbiased” reference by randomly sampling cars at the gate during ingress, asking nine sociodemographic questions of each sampled burner who accepted.

• In addition, we surveyed entering Burner Express Riders to add their data to the weighting procedure.

• The weighting procedure corrects the biases in the after-event, online survey due to self-selection. (i.e., burners who decided to fill out the Census might be different from those who chose not to fill it out)

• In population surveys, the national census is used as a reference to weight (i.e., adjust) each survey.

• Thus, the results from 2014 Census were weighted according to this random sampling at Gate and Burner Express, improving the collective accuracy of the data.
This presentation covers the descriptive results for the most important questions.

The first section of results contrasts the weighted (i.e., corrected results) and the unweighted (i.e., original but biased) results to help understand the usefulness of the procedure.

The remaining sections present only the weighted results.

These results are the most reliable estimates that we have of the Black Rock City population.

The “real” population values could be slightly different from the presented values due to measurement error.

For more results, visit us on the playa (near Center Camp) and follow the Census Lab’s blog at

http://blackrockcitycensus.wordpress.com
Weighting the Census
Variables used to weight the 2014 Census

- Inherent self-selection bias in past surveys
- 2014 complemented census with a random sampling at the gate
- Random sample allowed us to weight the collected data
- Variables used to weight the 2014 Census:
  - Day of arrival versus number of participants arriving
  - Gender
  - Age
  - Virgin Burner or not
  - Foreigner or not
  - English Speaker as a first language or not
  - US Party Affiliation (if eligible to vote in the US)
  - Voting Behavior
Details about the weighting procedure

- As with 2012 & 2013, the 2014 BRC Census created an “unbiased” reference by randomly sampling cars at the gate during ingress, asking nine sociodemographic questions of each sampled burner who accepted.
- In addition, we surveyed entering Burner Express Riders to add their data to the weighting procedure.
- The weighting procedure corrects the biases in the after-event, online survey due to self-selection. (i.e., burners who decided to fill out the Census might be different from those who chose not to fill it out)
- In population surveys, the national census is used as a reference to weight (i.e., adjust) each survey.
- Thus, the results from 2014 Census were weighted according to this random sampling at Gate and Burner Express, improving the collective accuracy of the data.
In this section, we illustrate the weighted data based on the random sample and compare it against the unadjusted data of the convenience sample (online survey).

Annotations of “over-represented” or “under-represented” are highlighting areas that have statistically significant differences between the weighted random sample data and the unweighted convenience sample data.

Those answering “yes” were more likely to fill out the online survey (i.e., over-represented) than those answering “no” (i.e., under-represented in the online data).

The **PINK** bars represent the results adjusted based on the random sample.
The **GREY** bars represent the unadjusted convenience (online survey) sample.
Weighting Variables

Gender

Males slightly under-represented
Females slightly over-represented
Weighting Variables

Virgins slightly over-represented

Newbies (0-1 burns) over-represented

Number of Burns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Burns</th>
<th>Unweighted</th>
<th>Virgin (0-1 burns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_11or_more</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_8to10</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_5to7</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_3to4</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_2</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_1</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>virgin</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weighting Variables

Age

- _40_or_more: 33.9% weighted, 35.2% unweighted
- _30_39: 35.2% weighted, 34.9% unweighted
- _20_29: 29.6% weighted, 29.4% unweighted
- _0_19: 1.4% weighted, 0.5% unweighted

Oldest age group over-represented
Youngest age group under-represented
Weighting Variables

US vs Foreign was not a bias in the survey

English as a Primary Language

English speakers were slightly over-represented

US Residents

- US Resident
  - unweighted: 84.8%
  - weighted: 84.9%
- Foreign Resident
  - unweighted: 15.2%
  - weighted: 15.1%

weight, 84%
unweighted, 86%
Weighting Variables

**Eligible to Vote**
- unweighted: 19.8% not_eligib, 6.4% didnt_vote, 73.7% voted
- weighted: 18.5% not_eligib, 9.1% didnt_vote, 72.4% voted

**US Party Affiliation**
- unweighted: 19.8% Not_eligible, 4.8% Republican, 3.2% Libertarian, 2.8% Green, 2.4% Am_Indep_Party, 2.2% Other, 1.1% None
- weighted: 18.5% Not_eligible, 37.1% Democratic, 34.6% Republican, 4.7% Libertarian, 3.2% Green, 2.4% Am_Indep_Party, 1.3% Other, 1.5% None

Those eligible but didn’t vote, Independents or have no party affiliation were under-represented.

Libertarians, Democrats, Green & those not eligible were over-represented.
### Sociodemographic Characteristics

**Age Group**

- **70_or_more**: 0.9%
- **60-69**: 5.3%
- **50-59**: 10.5%
- **40-49**: 17.2%
- **35-39**: 14.5%
- **30-34**: 20.7%
- **25-29**: 22.6%
- **20-24**: 7.0%
- **0-19**: 1.4%

**Income**

- **300k_or_more**: 2.7%
- **150k_299999US**: 7.6%
- **100k_149999US**: 13.1%
- **75000_99999US**: 12.2%
- **50000_74999US**: 13.7%
- **35000_49999US**: 11.8%
- **25000_34999US**: 9.7%
- **15000_24999US**: 9.6%
- **7500_14999US**: 7.5%
- **Less_than_7500US**: 5.3%
- **None**: 3.5%

*Median Age: 34*
*Median Personal Income: $54k-$55k*
Sociodemographic Characteristics

Gender

- Male: 58%
- Female: 41%
- Fluid: 1%

Non-white Participants

- Asian: 5.7%
- Native: 2.1%
- Black: 1.3%
- Hispanic: 6.3%
- Ethnoother: 4.9%

Includes respondents who may have checked more than one answer.
**Sociodemographic Characteristics**

**Education (Highest Degree Earned)**

- **Grad_Degree**: 27.0%
- **Bac_Degree**: 42.6%
- **Assoc_Degree**: 5.6%
- **Some_College**: 18.5%
- **High_School**: 4.5%
- **Only_Other**: 1.4%
- **None**: 0.4%

**Other Degrees**

- beauty_certif: 1.1%
- healing_certif: 3.4%
- techvocational_certif: 9.3%
Sociodemographic Characteristics (USA)

Population from US

- 83.5% from the US

Country Other than US

- Canada: 4.8%
- Europe: 4.4%
- UK/Ireland: 2.5%
- Australia/NZ: 1.8%
- Latin America: 0.7%
- Africa: 0.6%
- Asia: 0.4%

State (Country) of Residence

- California: 43.7%
- USA_other: 34.4%
- Other: 11.7%
- Nevada: 5.4%
- Canada: 4.8%
Sociodemographic Characteristics

Primary Language other than English

- French: 2.8%
- Spanish: 2.6%
- Russian: 2.0%
- German: 1.7%
- Portuguese: 1.7%
- Dutch: 0.7%
- Italian: 0.6%
- Polish: 0.6%
- Swedish: 0.4%
- Norwegian: 0.3%
- Tagalog: 0.2%
- Hindi: 0.2%
- Arabic: 0.2%
- Romanian: 0.2%
- Urdu: 0.0%
- Punjabi: 0.0%
- Other: 0.9%
- English: 84%
- Hebrew: 0.9%
- Japanese: 0.3%
- Korean: 0.3%
- Malay: 0.2%
- Mandarin: 0.2%
- Russian: 0.2%
- Spanish: 0.2%
- Finnish: 0.1%
- French: 0.1%

Sociodemographic Characteristics

Primary Language other than English

- French: 2.8%
- Spanish: 2.6%
- Russian: 2.0%
- German: 1.7%
- Portuguese: 1.7%
- Dutch: 0.7%
- Italian: 0.6%
- Polish: 0.6%
- Swedish: 0.4%
- Norwegian: 0.3%
- Tagalog: 0.2%
- Hindi: 0.2%
- Arabic: 0.2%
- Romanian: 0.2%
- Urdu: 0.0%
- Punjabi: 0.0%
- Other: 0.9%
- English: 84%
- Hebrew: 0.9%
- Japanese: 0.3%
- Korean: 0.3%
- Malay: 0.2%
- Mandarin: 0.2%
- Russian: 0.2%
- Spanish: 0.2%
- Finnish: 0.1%
- French: 0.1%
Sociodemographic Characteristics

Eligible to Vote

- Yes: 81%
- Voted 0 times: 9.2%
- Voted 1 time: 9.2%
- Voted 2 times: 11.3%
- Voted 3 times: 9.3%
- Voted 4 times: 42.4%

Voting Probability

- Over 52% of Eligible Burner Voters have voted in each of the past 4 elections.
- 77% of Burners who are eligible to vote have voted in at least 2 of the last 4 elections.
Sociodemographic Characteristics

**Party Affiliation if Eligible**

- Democratic: 42.7%
- Republican: 5.9%
- Libertarian: 3.5%
- Green: 2.6%
- Am_Indep_Party: 1.7%
- Other: 1.7%
- None: 41.8%

**Reason Independent**

- Vote_for_candidate: 75%
- Do_not_participate: 16%
- Other: 9%

**If unaffiliated, how did you vote?**

- Democratic: 75.5%
- Republican: 7.4%
- Libertarian: 5.6%
- Green: 3.2%
- Am_Indep_Party: 0.2%
- Other: 1.9%
- Never_voted: 0.2%
- Don_t_remember: 5.9%

---

**Party Affiliation**

Large Burner bias toward Democratic Party

Even those claiming no affiliation overwhelmingly voted Democratic
Sociodemographic Characteristics

Left vs Right Self Assessment

Left-Right by Topic

Left-vs-Right
Burners tend to classify themselves as Left-of-Center
More strongly Leftist sentiment around Environmental and Social issues
Sociodemographic Characteristics

Number of Burns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Burns</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>virgin</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_1</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_2</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_3to4</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_5to7</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_8to10</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_11or_more</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virgin?

- Yes: 35%

Improvements in Weighting Procedure Impacted this Measure Significantly

Virgins -6% from preliminary results
Burning Man
Related Variables
Burning Man Related Variables

Arrivals and Departures

How did you enter BRC?

Gate 96.0%
BxB 4.0%
Other_shuttle 0.8%
Airport 0.8%
Other 0.4%

Number of children in your vehicle

1 0.9%
2_or_more 0.2%
Burning Man Related Variables

Number in Vehicle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you flew, what airport?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airport</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRC</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFO</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAX</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72.6% didn’t fly to get to BRC

Type of Vehicle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUV</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck_wt_trailer</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickup</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No vehicle</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SemiTruck_wt_trailer</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Average # Miles Driven / Burner is ~272miles with a reported 19.7 MPG
Roughly 6.3 Million Miles
Consuming around 320,000 gallons of gas to get to BRC
Burning Man Related Variables

Number of Family Members With You

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Family Members</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 or More</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you brought children under 18 to BRC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No but would bring children if I had the opportunity</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No I would never bring any children</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes and would bring them again</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes but would not bring them again</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do you feel about children under 18 in BRC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okay to bring children of all ages</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents must assess each child</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not okay to bring teenagers (13-17)</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not okay to bring children between 5-12</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not okay to bring infants and children under 5</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think that children are safe in BRC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. There are dangers, but they can be avoided.</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I feel that there are psychological dangers</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, there are physical dangers</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I feel that children are safe</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact on Nevada

Nevada Spending

- $0-$250: 37.4%
- $250-$500: 23.8%
- $500-$1000: 22.7%
- $1000-$2500: 13.0%
- $2500-$5000: 2.3%
- $5000 or more: 0.8%

Average stated spending in Nevada is ~$639/Burner

Where Burner's spent their Nevada $'s

- Fuel: $147.29
- Food: $156.55
- Lodging: $121.70
- Survival supplies: $89.02
- Fun: $124.77

Visit a Park in Nevada?

- Yes: 25%
- Not sure: 2%
- No: 73%
Burning Man Related Variables

Where did you purchase your ticket?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No_ticket</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third_party_reseller</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somone_I_know</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What did you pay for your ticket?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More_than_facevalue</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facevalue</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less_than_facevalue</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your personal cost of attending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0_250USD</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250_500USD</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500_1000USD</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000_2500USD</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500_5000USD</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More_than_5000USD</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Life at Burning Man
Camping

Number in your Camp

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Camp</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 9</th>
<th>10 to 19</th>
<th>20 to 29</th>
<th>30 to 49</th>
<th>50 to 99</th>
<th>100 to 199</th>
<th>200 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of People</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>20 to 29</td>
<td>30 to 49</td>
<td>50 to 99</td>
<td>100 to 199</td>
<td>200 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assigned by Placement

- Yes: 31.4%
- No: 64.0%
- IDK: 4.6%

What determined camp location?

- Access to work/volunteer group: 11.6%
- I don't know: 9.6%
- Access to all-night parties: 3.6%
- Quiet: 14.1%
- Different than last year: 5.3%
- Same as last year: 26.8%
- Nice neighbors: 16.4%
- Space available: 27.2%
- Friends' choice: 40.3%
- Favorable Playa surface conditions: 8.5%
- Nearby attractions: 16.3%
Burning Man Specific Variables

Power Source

- Batteries: 58%
- Camp Generator: 44%
- Solar: 34%
- Vehicle Generator: 19%
- No Power: 8%
- BRC Grid: 6%
- Another Camp’s Generator: 3%
- Wind: 1%

You have a bike?

- Exclusive Use: 88%
- Borrowed from friend: 4%
- No: 3%
- Other: 2%
- No, but wish: 2%
- Community Bike: 2%

RV

- Yes: 28.6%
- Not sure: 0.7%
- RV: 2%
Burning Man Related Variables - Information

**How do you get your information?**

- **BMIR**
  - Never listened: 10.0%
  - Didn't know: 1.2%
  - On loadspeakers near Center Camp: 15.9%
  - On an FM radio in BRC: 73.9%
  - On my mobile device to/from BRC: 25.6%
  - Online: 18.0%

- **Jack Rabbit Speaks**
- **Word of Mouth**
- **BM Social Media Pages**
- **Other Social Media**
- **BM Website**
- **Discussion lists**
- **Eplaya**
- **Regional Newsletter**
- **Regional Website**
- **BMIR**
Burning Man Related Variables

What information do you value most?

- Info on BM affiliated non-profits: 8.4%
- Stories about Burners around the world: 28.5%
- Photos/Videos about BRC: 43.5%
- BRC preparations: 43.5%
- Volunteer opportunities: 22.6%
- Regional events: 25.6%
- Events around the world: 12.7%
- SF events: 17.5%
- BRC events: 58.0%

Ever attended a BM Regional event?

- Yes attended: 37%
- Yes volunteered: 15%
- No but email list: 16%
- No: 32%
Burning Man Specific Variables – WWW

Did you use the WWW Guide?

- Did not use it: 9.7%
- My group published an event in it: 15.3%
- As a souvenir: 64.1%
- At BRC: 68.8%
- Pre-event: 26.2%

How Useful was the WWW Guide?

- Somewhat: 36.0%
- Very: 29.9%
- Extremely: 23.0%
- Not_really: 10.1%
- No_access_to_it: 0.9%

What, Where, When continues to be popular for people as a souvenir almost as much as an On-Playa Guide.
Identity & Self
In regard to sexual attraction, reported heteronormativity persists within the Burning Man population. This ideology is reflective of distributions in the default world with men reporting less fluidity in sexual attraction than females.
71.8% of Burners do not identify with an organized religion. Burners that do identify with an organized religion are most likely to report being Catholic and least likely to report being Muslim.
Report of Judgment and Unfair Treatment

42.1% of Burners report being worried about judgment or unfair treatment based on their participation in Burning Man.
Main Reasons to Go to Burning Man
Contributions and Acknowledgements
Contributions and acknowledgements

**Project coordination:**
Megan Heller (Countess), David Nelson-Gal (Scribble), Dominic Beaulieu-Prévost (Hunter) and Kateri McRae (Variance) are the principal investigators who led the 2014 Census project.

**Sampling & data analysis:**
Dominic Beaulieu-Prévost (Hunter)

**Report coordination, graphics, layout & design:**
David Nelson-Gal(Scribble) & Andrew Pedersen

**The 2014 Census Lab:**
The project also involved numerous other volunteers whose contributions were essential in many ways: research collaborators, volunteer coordinators, statisticians, camp builders, gate samplers, keypunchers, census lab hosts, graphic designers, and many more. These contributors will globally be referred to as “the Census Lab”. We would also like to thank the Burning Man organization for the resources that they provided both on playa and off playa and for believing in the project.

Special thanks to Entropy for rescuing our volunteers at Gate on stormy Monday.
A final thanks to all the BRC citizens who contributed to the 2014 Census. The Census project could not exist without you.
Still Curious?

For more information about the 2014 Census project or the people involved in the project, please write to census@burningman.org.

For more information about this report, please write to Dominic Beaulieu-Prévost at beaulieu-prevost.dominic@uqam.ca.

You can also access the Census blog at http://blackrockcitycensus.wordpress.com.
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