BC BUILDING CODE INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE AIBC, APEGBC, BOABC, POABC

File No: 98-0142	INTERPRETATION	Page 1 of 1
Interpretation Date:	November 22, 2005	
Building Code Edition:	BC Building Code 1998	
Subject:	soil gas control	
Keywords:	soil gas	
Building Code Reference(s):	9.13.1.3., 9.13.8.1., 9.13.8.2	

Question:

Article 9.13.1.3. 'Required Soil Gas Control' indicates that all wall, roof and floor assemblies in contact with the ground must be constructed to resist the leakage of soil gas from the ground into the building. Do these requirements apply in all areas of Canada, regardless of whether soil gases (for example, radon) exist or not?

Interpretation:

No.

Sentence 9.13.1.3.(1) refers to exception Sentence 9.13.1.3.(2). Clause 9.13.1.3.(2)(b) indicates that where it can be demonstrated that soil gas does not constitute a hazard, construction to resist leakage of soil gas into the building is not required.

However it should be noted that the Appendix A-9.13.1.3. discussion indicates that evaluation for high levels of soil gas infiltration, such as for radon, is very difficult prior to construction; and a soil gas problem may only become apparent once the building is completed and occupied.

Measures to exclude soil gas are difficult to retrofit once a building is constructed, but if installed initially, are typically low in cost, and desirable for other benefits or Building Code requirements related to environment separation.

See also previous interpretation 98-0013 on this subject.

R. J. Light, Committee Chair

The views expressed are the consensus of the joint committee of 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.