Frequently Asked Questions
November 2009

General

A. The 2010 Rules and Regulations allow for a higher degree of flexibility in design, material and reinforcement choices.

If you are unsure whether something is permissible, assume that it is permissible ONLY if:

1. It does not compromise safety.
2. The rules and regulations do not specifically state that what you would like to do is not allowed.

B. A question to the CNCCC will not receive a response if the rules and regulations related to the question are specific in what is required and obvious in what is not said.

The following examples:

"The rules don't mention a thing about displays. Are there displays this year?
"I can't find anything restricting the use of end-caps. Are end-caps allowed?

Apply the general guideline (1 and 2 above) and you will have the answers to these questions and other like them.

Section 1 – General Rules and Eligibility Requirements

Section 1.2 – Registered Participants
1.2.1 – Eligibility Requirements

QUESTION 1: I have a returning paddler who will be officially finished with school in this winter quarter. I understand that students must be at the undergrad level to compete as a paddler, would he still qualify? Also, if there is a possibility our team qualifies for the national competition, will he be able to paddle? Thank you for your time.

RESPONSE 1: Section 1.2.1 " Eligibility Requirements" on page 2 covers this topic.

Section 2 – Canoe

Section 2.1 – Standardized Hull Design

QUESTION 1: According to section 2.1, "Teams shall not make any modifications to the hull design (i.e., increase/decrease in length, width, height and/or rocker; change in cross-section shape; etc.)." We understand and appreciate the idea of building the canoe to the specifications provided. We would like to know, however, if there is any room for deviation near the gunwales

(purely for atheistic purposes). Is it permissible to construct a canoe with deviations such as this since it does not really affect the overall hull design?

RESPONSE 1: The contours of the hull shape (which are the outside dimensions) are to be maintained up to and including the gunwale. Deviations are not to be made even for aesthetic purposes, which change the final dimensions.

QUESTION 2: During our review of the Rules and Regulations, we noted that the rocker for the 2009 canoe was 2.5 inches and the 2010 rocker is 3 inches. The Significant Changes document stated "One of the significant changes to the NCCC last year was the requirement for all teams to construct a canoe using a hull design that has been developed by the CNCCC. The CNCCC has decided to **reuse** the design for the 2010 competition." Is there a change in the hull design?

RESPONSE 2: The hull design used in 2009 is the same design being used for the 2010 competition. No changes have been made to either the AutoCAD drawings or the Excel Spreadsheet. Upon review of the coordinates in the stern stem section (see the Excel Spreadsheet), the CNCCC felt that the 3.0 inch rocker was more accurate of a description for that given section. We apologize for any confusion that this may have caused.

Section 3 – Concrete

Section 3.2 – Materials

3.2.1 – Hydraulic Cement

QUESTION 1: This section states, "A maximum of 50% (by mass) of the cementitious materials used in any concrete mixture can consist of hydraulic cement meeting the requirements of Section 3.2.1.1" Can you please clarify your definition of "cementitious materials"? There has been confusion on our team for a few years as to whether materials refer to binders (i.e. portland cement, fly ash, metakaolin) or the entire concrete mixture (i.e. binders, aggregate, etc.).

RESPONSE 1: Section 3.2.1, "Cementitious Materials" covers this relatively clearly (the binders you have listed above are covered in the subsections). If the question pertains to the 50% mass, the intent is that upwards to 50% of the total mass of the cementitious materials content can (not must) be hydraulic cement (for example, if you have 800 pcy of cm, the maximum amount of hydraulic cement meeting Section 3.2.1.1 is 400 pcy).

3.2.2 - Aggregate

QUESTION 2: I am just checking to make sure my understanding of Rule 3.3.2 is correct. So if you are using two mixes, each mix must be composed of at least 15% aggregate by weight and for each mix at least 50% of the total aggregate used per mix (25% of two types) must be recycled aggregate by weight? Or is the 50% by weight of recycled combined? I hope what I am trying to say is clear.

RESPONSE 2: Section 3.0, "General" states, "Concrete mixtures, regardless of their use in the canoe, are defined as unique and independent mixes and shall comply with all of the requirements of this section." If you have more than one mixture, each and every one of them must meet the specifications individually.

QUESTION 3: In Section 3 with regards to recycled aggregates, what is the definition of "different?" Does this refer to different sizes of the same brand, different brands, or different materials? For example would we be allowed to use Siscor glass spheres and K1 microspheres?

RESPONSE 3: The intent of requiring two “different” aggregates is to have teams look at the variety of materials that are out there that can be incorporated into concrete mixtures. Therefore teams should be looking at different types of materials. Different sizes of the same brand (such as the various grades of Poraver Siscorspheres™) only constitute one type of material. Different brands of the same material only constitute one type of material (for example, if one used shredded tires but one source is Firestone and the other is Michelin, it is still just shredded tires). This does not prevent you from using Siscor and K1 microspheres together, however, at least one other type of aggregate is going to be needed. Also, it is our understanding that Siscorspheres are considered to be made from post consumer glass (hence it meets the recycled definition). K1 microspheres might not meet the requirements of recycled material; if used, teams should ensure that they do if they intent on making that claim.

QUESTION 4: In regards to the recycled aggregate, what is the ruling if the aggregate is made (burned/cooked) by recycled oil? If it is allowed how would it tie into the 25% of the total weight?

RESPONSE 4: Section 3.2.2, “Aggregate” states that each mixture must contain a minimum of two (2) different recycled materials and that each recycled aggregate must make up at least 25% of the total amount of aggregate by weight. The recycled aggregates are the final processed material (crushed glass, crumb rubber, crushed concrete, etc.). Section 3.2.2 defines that recycling aggregate as processing used materials into new products in order to prevent the waste of potentially useful materials, reduce the consumption of fresh raw materials, reduce energy usage, reduce air and water pollution by reducing the need for "conventional" waste disposal, and lower greenhouse gas emissions as compared to virgin production. In the question above, if the aggregate itself a processed material that contains recycled oil, or is the aggregate a natural material that is processed using the oil (for example, an expanded shale that is bloated in a furnace that used the oil to generate the heat). If it were the former, than it would be considered a recycled aggregate. If it is the latter, then it is not a recycled aggregate but one that is processed/manufactured using sustainable practices.

QUESTION 5: We wanted to know if a 3M bubble glass product (.853mm) is legal product pertaining to the usage as a recycled aggregate.

RESPONSE 5: The link that was included with the question directly us to the 3M™ Glass Bubble product data sheet. According t the information provided by 3M, their K and S series glass bubbles are a chemically stable soda-lime-borosilicate glass. There are no claims of it being a recycled aggregate (whereas a similar product, Poraver, indicates that it is made from post consumer glass, hence a recycled material). Unless information is provided to the contrary, 3M glass bubbles do not meet the recycled aggregate criteria.

QUESTION 6: We wanted to know if pumice is legal product pertaining to the usage as a recycled aggregate.

RESPONSE 6: Pumice is a textural term for a volcanic rock commonly resulting from explosive eruptions (plinian and ignimbrite-forming) where gases from viscous magma nucleate bubbles cannot readily decouple from the viscous magma prior to cooling to glass (i.e. not having a

crystalline structure). The result is a solidified frothy lava composed of highly microvesicular glass pyroclastic with very thin, translucent bubble walls of extrusive igneous rock. (Source: Wikipedia)

In its natural form it cannot be construed in any way as a “recycled aggregate” it is igneous rock.

QUESTION 7: We are considering using crushed tiles as recycled aggregate. Would that work?

RESPONSE 7: While it might be obvious that the answer is “yes,” the technical response is “it depends.” This response below will be applicable to a variety of materials and the explanation that we provide should be fairly clear.

According to Section 3.2.2, Aggregate, “Recycling aggregate shall be defined as processing **used** materials into new products in order to prevent the waste of potentially useful materials, reduce the consumption of fresh raw materials, reduce energy usage, reduce air and water pollution by reducing the need for "conventional" waste disposal, and lower greenhouse gas emissions as compared to virgin production.” Basically, the aggregates that are being considered here are either by-products of a manufacturing particular process (for example, bottom ash and slags), which would enter the waste stream and would be disposed of elsewhere (i.e., a landfill) or post-consumer materials that are processed and reused (examples would be crushed glass, recycled concrete, crushed brick, etc.). The issue that we wish to cover is the post-consumer one. If one goes to their local home supply store and purchases a pallet of bricks or tiles, takes them to the laboratory and crushes them down to use as aggregate in the canoe, this would not be considered a recycled aggregate. If the same set of bricks and tiles were used in the construction of a building, then the building was demolished and the bricks and tiles were collected, taken to the laboratory and then crushed and used in the canoe, it would be considered a recycled aggregate.

The same goes with recycled concrete aggregate (RCA). If it were created from concretes used in building, highways, QC test cylinders, and yes, old concrete canoes, then it would meet the definition of a recycled material. Now, if you solely created a very lightweight concrete will no other intended purpose then to just crush it down and use it as aggregate in another concrete mixture, then you do not have a recycled material. So, if the tiles you plan on crushing have been used elsewhere and are then being reused as aggregate then it is considered recycled.

QUESTION 8: This section states, "The aggregate(s) selected shall contain a minimum of two (2) different recycled materials in accordance with Section 3.3.2. Each recycled aggregate must constitute at least 25% of the total amount of aggregate by weight. Recycling aggregate shall be defined as processing used materials into new products in order to prevent the waste of potentially useful materials, reduce the consumption of fresh raw materials, reduce energy usage, reduce air and water pollution by reducing the need for "conventional" waste disposal, and lower greenhouse gas emissions as compared to virgin production."

If we were to crush last year’s concrete canoe and use it as an aggregate, would it be acceptable to do this?

RESPONSE 8: Yes.

QUESTION 9: May we use blast furnace slag (a co-product of the iron production process) that is expanded or pelletized, as a recycled aggregate? I know that ground granulated blast furnace slag is used as a supplementary cementitious material but the slag I would like to incorporate into our concrete mix comes in sizes ranging from 1/2" to sand grades of aggregate.

RESPONSE 9: In a previous response dated 09.28.09 regarding recycled aggregates from the same base material, we indicated that the combustion of coal results in the generation of a variety of by-products into the waste stream including bottom ash (which are granular pieces of material), cenospheres which are a processed material and fly ash (usually Class C or Class F depending on the type of coal used) which is a pozzolan. The same would go for slag in that the equivalent of bottom ash would be a recycled aggregate as it is being taken from the waste stream (i.e., not going to a landfill).

QUESTION 10: If we take aesthetic rocks used in a previous canoe display and crush them into aggregates, would this constitute as recycled aggregate?

RESPONSE 10: This would not meet the definition of a recycled aggregate.

QUESTION 11: I have a few aggregate choices that may meet the requirements for recycled aggregates. They are bottom ash and fine silica sands. I would prefer to use the bottom ash since it has a lower Specific Gravity than the sand. Does this meet the requirement for recycled aggregate? The sand is extremely fine; finer than golf course sand trap sand. The sand would be screened to assure nothing incorporated would pass the #200 sieve. This sand is a waste product and has no particular use. I would prefer to use the bottom ash. Does that meet the requirements of "recycled aggregate"?

RESPONSE 11: The CNCCC sent out a response on 9.28.09 discussing recycled aggregates and the base materials that they come from. Bottom ash which is a granular material resulting from coal combustion meets the definition for recycled aggregate. So you have one of the two required aggregates for the concrete mixtures. Fine silica sand on the other hand is a natural occurring material (how would one consider it a waste product?). This does not mean that it cannot be used in the concrete, however, to consider it as a recycled aggregate would be incorrect.

QUESTION 12: In Section 3.2.2 Aggregate, it states that the "aggregate(s) selected shall contain a minimum of two (2) different recycled materials". If two aggregates are made from the same base material but processed into different types of aggregate, are they considered different recycled aggregates? For example, glass Sicospheres and crushed glass are both made from glass, but they have been processed in different ways, resulting in two very different aggregate materials.

RESPONSE 12: There is an understanding that various base materials may result in the production of several products that can be considered as recycled aggregate. We cite several examples below:

Post-consumer glass – can be simply crushed into what is commonly referred to as “crushed glass” or “glass cullet.” Then there are proprietary processes that result in products such as Siscorsphere ™ aggregate.
Coal – during the combustion of coal a variety of products are generated such as bottom ash (which are granular pieces of material) as well as cenospheres, which are a processed material. Fly ash, which is a pozzolan and not an aggregate, is also a by-product of coal combustion.

Wood – technically paper, cardboard, wood chips, saw dust, etc. would fall under this category. Given that the properties of the materials (specific gravity, particle size, strength, absorption, etc.) would be different, even if they were coming from the same base material, the CNCCC will consider them as different recycled materials. Therefore microsphere aggregate (such as Siscorsphere) and crushed

glass would be considered as two different materials. Teams are cautioned to ensure that the products that they intend to use are meeting the recycled description.

QUESTION 13: We would like to ask for clarification on several things regarding section 3.2.2. The rules say, "The aggregate(s) selected shall contain a minimum of two (2) different recycled materials in accordance with Section 3.3.2. " (1) whether two different recycled materials means two different recycled aggregates or two different recycled materials within the mix; (2) whether this requires (2) different recycled all mixes used in the canoe. Scenarios such as the following confuse us: for canoe X we are using 2 mixes (1 and 2). If recycled aggregates A and B are used in Mix 1, do aggregates A and B still count as 2 different recycled materials if used in Mix 2; or must we have different recycled aggregates C and D in Mix 2? The rules also say, "Recycling aggregate shall be defined as processing used materials into new products in order to prevent the waste of potentially useful materials, reduce the consumption of fresh raw materials, reduce energy usage, reduce air and water pollution by reducing the need for "conventional" waste disposal, and lower greenhouse gas emissions as compared to virgin production." If used concrete containing lightweight sand was recycled and aggregates were separated and we were to use this lightweight sand, would it count as a recycled aggregate?

RESPONSE 13: We have defined the recycled aggregate material issue in several previous responses. Teams may use different recycled aggregates made from the same base material (for example, crushed glass and Siscorspheres, both of which are made from post consumer glass). Obviously, two different types of materials (say, crushed glass and rubber tire chips) would suffice this requirement as well. Previous responses also discuss using various grades of the same product and different producers of same materials (i.e., brand names). Each and every concrete mixture used in the canoe, regardless of its use, shall meet the requirements as outlined in the rules and regulations. Therefore, each mixture used must have two recycled aggregates (minimum) in it. Teams can use the same two recycled aggregates in the mixes that they develop. So in the scenario that you outlined above, aggregates A and B can be used in Mixes, 1, 2, 3…n. In regards to recycling lightweight sand from a hardened concrete, we assume that the end result of the pulverization of the concrete will be recycled concrete aggregate (RCA) which definitely meets the requirements. The hydrated cement paste will stick to the sand and you will end up with chunks of concrete with the sand embedded within.

QUESTION 14: Section 3.2.2 states that each recycled aggregate must constitute at least 25% of the total amount of aggregate by weight. First, does this mean that every recycled aggregate used must constitute at least 25% of the total? E.g. if 3 recycled aggregates are used in a mix (and those 3 are the only aggregates used), must all 3 constitute at least 25% of the total. Or would 10% of one and 45% each of the remaining two fulfill the requirement? Second, if a team were to choose to use an extremely lightweight aggregate, will the 25% by weight requirement still apply, or will they be able to use 25% by volume to meet the requirement?

RESPONSE 14: The 25% for the recycled aggregate amount is in reference to the two (2) required recycled aggregates (also note that Section 3.3.2, Aggregate Proportioning, states that the amount of recycled aggregate must comprise a minimum of 50% of the total amount of aggregate by weight.). Teams can have more than two recycled aggregates, but only two need to meet the 25% requirement. Therefore in the scenario provided above, Aggregates A, B, and C (assume all recycled) can be proportioned 10%, 45%, and 45%, respectively, as B and C exceed the 25% requirement. In response to the second item regarding the use of extremely lightweight aggregate, the rules and regulations pertaining to aggregate content are based on weight percentages (in relation to the total aggregate content no volumetric values provided as it relates to aggregates. The 25% requirement would apply if the team were using only two recycled

aggregates. If the extremely lightweight aggregate is not a recycled material or if the team has two other recycled aggregates (like in the paragraph above), then the 25% requirement is not applicable.

QUESTION 15: For aggregates that don't already have documentation proving they are inert (like recycled concrete canoes), does ASTM C311- "Standard Test Methods for Sampling and Testing Fly Ash or Natural Pozzolans for Use in Portland-Cement Concrete" - with a test result of nearly 0% strength activity index suffice to prove aggregate do not react with the binding matrix?

RESPONSE 15: The evidence in the literature strongly suggests that the negative effects of recycled concrete aggregate (RCA) in the mix (increased absorption, reduced strength, lower stiffness) more than offset possible positive effects (activation of pozzolanic reaction by the alkali and calcium hydroxide in the residual paste or possibly additional hydration of unhydrated portion of cement particles). Running the pozzolanic activity index test will constitute an effort disproportional to the benefit. The CNCCC will consider RCA as inherently inert.

QUESTION 16: We have been researching ceramic microspheres made from fly ash production. They are recycled, however must we prove that they are inert and that they will not react? The website states they are inert however must further proof be provided by our team?

RESPONSE 16: Technical data sheets which state that the product is inert will suffice. Teams do not need to prove that they are inert.

3.4.1 – Mixture Proportions Table

QUESTION 17: On page C-1, General Comments, under the section on water.
The first bullet says to include the amount of water needed to account for aggregate absorption, hydration and workability. The second bullet is for the amount of water added for aggregate absorption. At the end of the section it is stated that the total of all 3 categories is the "Total Water" for the mixture. Wouldn't this total water be including the aggregate absorption water 2 times?
Bullet 2 = 20 lbs for absorption
Bullet 3 = 5 lbs for admixtures
The total would be 260 + 20 + 5 = 285. When the real total should only be 265 since aggregate absorption is counted 2 times.

RESPONSE 17: Appendix C states…. The amount of water needed for the mixture is broken down into three (3) categories:

- "Batched Water" is the total amount of water needed to hydrate the cementitious materials and for workability. As noted on Table 3.1, include the amount of water needed to account for aggregate absorption.
- "Total Water Added for Aggregate Absorption" is the amount of water needed to reach the saturated, surface dry (SSD) condition from the oven-dry condition, for all of the aggregates
- "Total Water from All Admixtures" is the amount of water from the admixtures.

Combined, these three (3) categories of water will give you the "Total Water" for the mixture.
We can understand the confusion that the word "Combined" gives. In this case, you are not summing up the three categories as you correctly point out that the water for absorption would be included twice. The Total Water is the sum of the Batched Water and the Total Water from All

Admixtures. The Total Water Added for Aggregate Absorption is part of the Batched Water and is provided more for information purposes. So in the example you provided above, your Batched Water is 260 lbs (of which 20 lbs is for the aggregate), Admixture Water is 5 lbs, therefore your total water is 265 lbs.

QUESTION 18: According to the footnote for Specific Gravity in Table 3.1, "For aggregates, provide ASTM C 127 oven-dry bulk specific gravity." However, this ASTM standard is specified for Coarse Aggregate. Since our aggregate cannot be classified as coarse aggregate, it seems that we should actually use ASTM C 128, which is specified for Fine Aggregate. Is this a mistake in Table 3.1?

RESPONSE 18: Use the ASTM standards that you see fit. It appears that C 127 would be more appropriate for the fine aggregate used in the canoes. One question for teams to ponder – even though the particle size of the aggregates used in the concretes for canoes meet the definition of "fine" by ASTM, is the methodology applicable to the type of materials used? Just something to think about

QUESTION 19: Is it a legal procedure to condition dry aggregates such that at the time of batching they have some moisture content up to SSD?

RESPONSE 19: It is actually the preferred procedure to condition aggregates to the saturated surface dry (SSD) condition prior to batching the aggregate into the concrete mixture. This would allow the water that is added for cement (cm) hydration to be used for hydration and not to be absorbed by dry aggregate. Now the real question is, why would you think it would be?

Section 4 – Reinforcement

QUESTION 1: I have a question regarding whether carbon-fiber reinforcement is permitted in the concrete canoe competition. The particular carbon-fiber provider I am looking into describes the fiber's constituent materials as follows "Continuous 50k carbon tows w/heat set over-wrap in fill and warp direction, impregnated with epoxy resin." While, in the NCCC rules for concrete canoe, Section 3.0,"Bondo®, epoxy or similar materials are not permitted at any time during the casting of the canoe (i.e., placement of concrete, reinforcement and flotation) but may be used in the construction of the canoe mold." We will not be using epoxy resin in our admixtures or cementitious materials, but is this carbon-fiber permitted as a reinforcement? My understanding of the material is that epoxy only holds the carbon fibers together to form a mesh, and should have no effect on the cementitious materials or admixtures. May we use this carbon-fiber reinforcement?

RESPONSE 1: According to the CNCCC Intent of Section 4 – Reinforcement, "the reinforcing materials do not have post-manufacturer applied coatings that enhance the properties of the reinforcement." Based on the product data provided, the carbon fiber has a manufacturer applied epoxy and this is allowed. Basically, the product as received by the school from the manufacturer or supplier can be used as is. The "Bondo®, epoxy or similar materials" cited in Section 3 is to deal primarily with materials other than concrete that may be used to fill in divots or bugholes or repair pre-competition cracks, etc. however, they are just as applicable to placement of reinforcement (i.e., teams cannot apply epoxy to mesh and then place it in the canoe). You may use the carbon fiber reinforcement.

Section 5 – Final Product

QUESTION 1: Section 5.6 states that the sealer may be silane- or siloxane-based penetrating sealer with a minimum solids contend of 20 percent and a VOC of less than or equal to 350 g/L. The VOC is different than last year's but was not included in the significant changes. Will you please confirm that the VOC has to be less than or equal to 350 g/L.

RESPONSE 1: The VOC limit has been reduced to 350 g/L (max). Please note that the Rules and Regulations are the official documents for the NCCC. The Significant Changes are a supplement document and provide highlights, but not all of the changes in the Rules are listed in it.

QUESTION 2: In Section 5.7.1, Material Technical Data Sheets, it states that "Material Technical Data Sheets (MTDS) for each material used in the construction of the canoe shall be presented." Does this include materials used in the fabrication of the mold, but which are not present in the finished canoe?

RESPONSE 2: MTDS are not required for the products used in the mold.

Section 6 – Design Paper

QUESTION 1: Under Paragraph 2 of Section 6.2.1, it clearly states that a section heading shall be considered part of the body text and shall adhere to the margin requirements, however, later in the last paragraph of that section it says that section headings ("items") may be incorporated into the header and footer and located outside of the body text limits. What is the intent or is this language contradictory?

RESPONSE 1: Section headings are to be included within the body text of the report in order to distinguish the sections from one another and shall follow the format for font, size, etc. as described in the rules and regulations. Generally, teams will place a variety of items in the header and/or footer of the various pages – page numbers, logos, quotes, school names, etc. including the section heading again. The pagination of the report is required, and the rest of the items are left to the school to decide what they wish to incorporate.

Section 7 – Engineer's Notebook

QUESTION 1: This is a follow up question to the 9.28.09 CNCCC response to using crushed concrete (i.e. an old concrete canoe) for recycled aggregate. In the response it was stated that it would be permissible to crush an old canoe for recycled aggregate. Section 7.1.2 d. states: "Present MTDS for each of the materials used in the construction of the canoe, including but not limited to binders (other than cement), aggregate (other than natural or manufactured sands), chemical admixtures, paints, stains and sealers." If we were to crush an old canoe and use it as recycled aggregate, what documentation would be required for the engineer's notebook since there would not be and MTDS? In other words, what proof (if any) is necessary to show that we are in compliance with the rules?

RESPONSE 1: In this case, the school is the "manufacturer" of the aggregate (even if it requests an outside source to actually crush it). The technical data sheets could include the mix design sheets from the concrete canoe report (that provides the composition and unit weight of the material). Pertinent data that would be needed includes specific gravity and absorption (and these tests are ASTM standards that can be done by the schools). Data sheets prepared by the schools would suffice

and it is highly recommended that a design professional and/or professor review them. In essence, you are making your own MTDS.

Section 9 – Final Product (Canoe and Cutaway Section)

QUESTION 1: Section 9.3 states that "A full-scale cutaway section representative of both the raw and finished canoe shall be judged as part of the Final Product and shall be presented alongside the canoe." Does the cutaway section have to represent the shape of the hull? If so, does it matter what section of the hull it represents (i.e. bow, middle, stern?)

RESPONSE 1: A full-scale cutaway section of the canoe inherently will represent the shape of the hull. The CNCCC does not specify what portion of the hull it represents. The goal is to show how the canoe is constructed (including the mold) and how the concrete is finished. Usually, the end sections are used because flotation tanks are used and teams show how those are encased.

Section 10 – Product Display

QUESTION 1: Section 10.0 States that each team shall provide a Product Display with the following configuration: a. Conference Table – standard table, with maximum dimensions of 30” (W) x 96” (L) x 29” (H). Last year we created our own table that was oval shaped and fit within the dimensions. Is this an acceptable table or not?

RESPONSE 1: The Product Display is a TABLE TOP display. The Rule and Regulations (for the past several years) have stipulated that a standard conference table be used. However, we have seen various displays with tables that were built, even a dresser drawer (based on the concept of reusing it), etc. Therefore, to be absolutely clear on what is required and specified, we placed a picture of a standard rectangular folding conference table with maximum dimensions in the Rules. The table your team used last year is not acceptable this year.

Questions regarding rule interpretations should be directed via e-mail to **cnccc@ermail.asce.org**.

Official responses will come from **CNCCC@asce.org**. This e-mail account will be BLOCKED from receiving e-mail and is only intended to be used to send out responses and other announcements.