BC BUILDING CODE INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE

A joint committee with members representing AIBC, EGBC, BOABC

File No: 18-0025 INTERPRETATION Page 1 of 1

Interpretation Date:	October 15, 2019
Building Code Edition:	BC Building Code 2018, Book II: Plumbing Systems (BCPC)
Subject:	Required Relief Valves for Indirect Service Water Heaters
Keywords:	Relief Valves, Indirect Service Water Heaters, Storage- Type Service Water Heaters
Building Code Reference(s):	2.6.1.7.(4).

Question:

What relief valves are required as safety devices for an indirect service water heater?

Interpretation:

An indirect service water heater derives its heat from a heating medium such as warm air, steam or hot water. It differs in this way from a storage-type service water heater which has the fuel (commonly either gas or electric), as an integral part of the appliance.

Sentence 2.6.1.7.(4) requires an indirect service water heater to be equipped with a pressure-relief valve and any storage tank that forms part of the system to be equipped with a temperature-relief valve. It is quite common to have the heat exchanger and storage tank combined and therefore both of the above safety devices would be required. This situation is similar to the storage-type service water heater other that there is no fuel supplied directly to the appliance.

Patrick Shek, P.Eng., CP, FEC, Committee Chair

The views expressed are the consensus of the joint committee with members representing AIBC, EGBC and BOABC, which form the BC Building Code Interpretation Committee. The Building and Safety Standards Branch, Province of BC and the City of Vancouver participate in the committee's proceedings with respect to interpretations of the BC Building Code. 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.