

BC BUILDING CODE INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE

A joint committee with members representing
AIBC, APEGBC, BOABC, POABC

File No: 06- 0085

INTERPRETATION

Page 1 of 1

Interpretation Date:	Feb 15, 2011
Building Code Edition:	BC Building Code 2006
Subject:	Relief Valve Discharge Piping
Keywords:	Relief Valves
Building Code Reference(s):	7.6.1.7.(5) & (7) ; A-7.6.1.7.(5)

Question:

1. Is it permitted to connect the discharge piping from a water heater temperature and pressure relief valve with the discharge piping from another temperature and pressure or pressure only relief valve prior to draining to a floor drain?
2. If permitted, is it required to increase the size of the common piping at the connection of each additional temperature and pressure or pressure only relief valve discharge drain pipe?

Interpretation:

1. Yes

Article 7.6.1.7. does not address the connection of discharge piping from multiple temperature and pressure or pressure only relief valves to a common discharge piping system. However, that relief valve discharge piping must be in compliance with the requirements of Sentence 7.6.1.7.(5) & (7).

2. Yes

The common discharge piping must be increased in size to be at least equal to or greater than the sum of the cross-sectional areas and gallon per minute capacities of all connected relief valve discharge pipes. Appendix A-7.6.1.7.(5) indicates, where the discharge piping exceeds 2m developed length or has more than 2-90 degree elbows, the manufacturers instructions must be consulted to ensure the valve performance is not compromised.


R. J. Light, Committee Chair

The views expressed are the consensus of the joint committee with members representing AIBC, APEGBC, BOABC, and POABC, which form the BC Building Code Interpretation Committee. The purpose of the committee is to encourage uniform province wide interpretation of the BC Building Code. These views should not be considered as the official interpretation of legislated requirements based on the BC Building Code, as final responsibility for an interpretation rests with the local *Authority Having Jurisdiction*. The views of the joint committee should not be construed as legal advice.