



Building Code Commission

ANNUAL REPORT 2020 - 2021

**Building Code
Commission**

16th Floor, 777 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M5G 2E5
Telephone: 416 585-6645
<https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontarios-building-code>

**Commission
du code du bâtiment**

777, rue Bay, 16 étage
Toronto, ON M5G 2E5
Téléphone: 416 585-6645
<https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontarios-building-code>



June 9, 2021

The Honourable Steve Clark
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
777 Bay Street, 17th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 2J3

Dear Minister Clark:

**Re: Building Code Commission
Annual Report –2020-2021 Fiscal Year**

It is my pleasure, as Chair of the Building Code Commission, to present to you the Building Code Commission's Annual Report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2021.

The enclosed Annual Report highlights the Building Code Commission's accomplishments and challenges over the 2020-2021 fiscal year. Overall, the Building Code Commission had a productive year, having received 23 new applications, one court referral application and conducted 31 remote hearings.

I would like to thank my fellow Commission members whose knowledge and dedication have earned the Building Code Commission an excellent reputation as a valuable service provider in the building and construction industry. On behalf of all members of the Commission, I would also like to express our thanks to the staff of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing for their exemplary expert support to the Building Code Commission. Without their excellent secretariat, administrative, technical and legal assistance, the Building Code Commission simply could not function.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Stephen Wong".

Stephen Wong, Chair
Building Code Commission

encl.

Building Code Commission

2020 - 2021 ANNUAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Building Code Commission.....	4
A. MANDATE	4
Commitment to Service and Guiding Principles.....	4
B. ABOUT THE BUILDING CODE COMMISSION.....	5
Building Code Commission Process and Procedures.....	5
Hearing Procedures.....	5
Commission Members and Ministry Staff	6
2020-2021 Caseload	6
C. ANALYSIS OF BUILDING CODE COMMISSION PERFORMANCE.....	7
Performance Measures and Targets	7
Measured Performance Results	8
Operational Performance.....	10
D. FINANCIAL REPORT	11
Budget	11
Revenues	11
Remuneration of Commission Members.....	12
Appendix 1 – Performance Measures Table	13
Appendix 2 – Building Code Commission Appointees List	16

Building Code Commission 2020-2021 ANNUAL REPORT

A. MANDATE

The Building Code Commission (the “Commission”) is an adjudicative agency whose legislative authority is set out in sections 23 and 24 of the *Building Code Act, 1992* (the “Act”).

The Commission has a mandate to resolve disputes between proponents of construction projects and local enforcement officials. The Act sets out three types of disputes that can be heard by the Commission:

- those relating to the sufficiency of compliance with the technical requirements of the Building Code;
- those related to compliance with the prescribed time frames for permit processing; and
- those related to compliance with the prescribed time frames for site inspections.

Commitment to Service and Guiding Principles

The inaugural meeting of the Commission was held on February 9th, 1976, shortly after the first Building Code Act came into effect in 1974. Since then the Commission has endeavoured to provide a timely, cost effective and non-adversarial process for resolving Building Code disputes through a streamlined and accessible appeals system. In doing so, the Commission has earned a reputation within the construction industry of being an effective, useful and high-quality adjudicative body.

The Commission has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing in respect of the administration of the Commission. The Memorandum of Understanding sets out the relationship between the Chair of the Commission, the Minister and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (the “Ministry”) with respect to the Building Code Commission and the service it provides. The purpose of the Memorandum of Understanding is to establish the responsibilities of these parties and to ensure that accountability is a fundamental principle that is observed in the management, administration and operations of the Commission.

As an agency of government, the Commission conducts itself according to the management principles of the Government of Ontario. The Commission’s proceedings are governed by the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*, the *Building Code Act, 1992*, the *Adjudicative Tribunals Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act, 2009*, the Building Code Commission’s Guidelines, Policies and Procedures Handbook, Management Board of Cabinet Directives and the *Public Service of Ontario Act, 2006*. The principles and governance elements required of the Commission by these statutes and documents include ethical behavior, accountability, excellence in management, wise use of public funds, and high-quality service to the public by contributing to the health, safety, accessibility and energy efficiency of buildings in Ontario, and by playing a positive role within Ontario’s building design and construction sector.

B. ABOUT THE BUILDING CODE COMMISSION

Building Code Commission Process and Procedures

The process leading to a Commission hearing begins with the receipt of an application for a hearing.

Section 24 of the Act provides that the Commission may determine disputes between a chief building official, inspector or registered code agency and an applicant for a permit, a holder of a permit, or a person to whom an order is given. Parties to an application to the Commission are typically builders, developers, architects, engineers, and building owners as applicants, and municipal chief building officials, plan reviewers, building inspectors, and registered code agencies as respondents.

The applicant submits a completed Application for Hearing form together with supporting documents and the application fee. At the same time, the applicant is required to also provide a copy of the application form and the supporting documentation directly to the respondent. Once an application is received, the Commission requests confirmation of the dispute from the respondent by sending a Confirmation of Dispute form for the respondent to complete and return. The respondent is required to provide a copy of the completed Confirmation of Dispute and supporting documentation directly to the applicant. The Confirmation of Dispute is similar to the application form. Its purpose is twofold: 1) to verify that there is a dispute involving the technical requirements of the Building Code, and 2) to allow the respondent to explain their position on the issue.

For disputes related to sufficiency of compliance with the technical requirements of the Building Code, once the Confirmation of Dispute is received, the Commission under the authority in subsection 24(6) of the Act, requests a technical report from the Building and Development Branch of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. This report, known as the Technical Background Information memo, analyzes the matters raised by the parties with regard to the provisions of the Building Code identified by the parties as being relevant to the disputed matter. The Technical Background Information memo examines the technical considerations, and proposed amendments (if any) regarding the pertinent Building Code provision(s).

For disputes related to the prescribed time frames, a Technical Background Information memo is not requested, as no technical matters are involved in the dispute.

Hearing Procedures

Once all of the required information is received and has been provided to all parties to the hearing, a hearing is scheduled.

Commission hearings, while generally informal, are conducted in accordance with procedural rules established under the *Building Code Act* and the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*.

The Commission Chair, Vice-Chair, or Chair-Designate for the day conducts the hearing. Hearings begin with introductions of the parties and preliminary matters, such as identification of exhibits. Parties can represent themselves, but applicants often choose a designated agent such as a contractor, architect, engineer, lawyer, or specialized consultant.

Once a hearing has concluded, the members of the panel deliberate on the evidence and render their ruling. This decision is then communicated to the parties to the hearing and the full written decision is subsequently issued to the parties and posted online to a legal reporting website, CanLII, which can be found at <https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onbcc/>.

Commission Members and Ministry Staff

As of March 31, 2021, the Commission had 18 part-time members, which include the Chair and two Vice-Chairs. All Commission members are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council through an Order in Council. Current Management Board of Cabinet Directives permit individuals appointed to the Commission to serve a combined term of appointment of up to ten years. Commission members preside over hearings and render decisions on disputes. The Chair and Vice-Chairs also make administrative decisions regarding operations and relations with the Ministry.

The Commission believes it is appropriate to try and stagger the terms of appointment for Commission members as part of its succession plan strategy. This staggering of terms of appointment allows for newly appointed members to be mentored by experienced members and ensures that large numbers of members do not have terms that expire all at the same time.

To ensure adequate membership, the Commission Chair and Ministry staff work with the Public Appointments Secretariat to advertise positions for new members with relevant expertise in the construction sector.

In addition to ensuring an adequate number of members, the Commission also works at maintaining the knowledge base of its membership. It is important for the Commission to continue to solicit new members with expertise that reflects the full spectrum of relevant technical disciplines represented in the Building Code.

The following divisions of the Ministry support the Commission in fulfilling the requirements of the Agencies and Appointments Directive:

- The Municipal Services Division's Building and Development Branch;
- The Business Management Division's Corporate Services Branch, and Controllership and Financial Planning Branch;
- Legal Services Branch; and
- Community Services Information and Information Technology Cluster.

The Commission receives all of its staffing and financial resources from the Building and Development Branch of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Although the Commission has no staff of its own, the Policy/Program Analyst-Building Code Commission is the Ministry staff person assigned to support the Commission. The Policy/Program Analyst is responsible for the overall administration of the Commission. This involves managing the appointments process, issues management, business planning, performance measurement, monitoring of expenditures, managing the application and hearing process, communicating and publishing rulings, and ensuring compliance with agency sector requirements and Management Board of Cabinet directives.

2020-2021 Caseload

The Commission can hold up to 6 hearings in a month; however, the number of applications received determines the number of hearings the Commission needs to schedule. For the current reporting cycle, the Commission received 23 new applications, one court referral and held 31 hearings.

The Commission received the following numbers of applications over the previous five years:

Fiscal* Year	Type of Application				Total Applications	Court Referrals	Total Hearings
	Building	On-site Sewage System	Permit Processing Prescribed Time Frame	Site Inspection Prescribed Time Frame			
2016- 2017	30	4	1	0	35	0	40**
2017- 2018	26***	4	3	0	33	0	31**
2018- 2019	17	5	2	0	24	0	29**
2019- 2020	37***	7	0	0	44	1	35**
2020- 2021	17***	6	0	0	23	1	31**

Notes:

* The Commission's fiscal year runs from April 1 – March 31.

**Differences in application vs. hearing totals may be attributed in part to matters being resolved between the parties before a hearing is held as well as having some hearings involving files from previous fiscal years.

***In the fiscal year of 2015-2016 two applications were referred to the Commission by the Superior Court of Justice, which resulted in ten additional hearing days. In 2016-2017, the same two applications resulted in seven additional hearing days. In 2017-2018, one court referral resulted in four additional hearing days. In 2019-2020, in addition to the 24 applications received from April 1, one more application was referred to the Commission by Superior Court of Justice resulting in one additional hearing day. In addition to the 23 applications received in 2020-2021, one more application was referred to the Commission by Superior Court of Justice with the hearing to yet be scheduled.

It should be noted that the complexity of applications continues to increase. With the increase in the complexity of the applications and the number of applications that contain multiple disputes, the Commission notes that the length of time it takes to fully hear the matter has also increased. In addition, the Commission has also seen an increase in the number of applications requiring it to examine and determine its jurisdiction and mandate, because of disputes that may extend beyond the technical requirements of the Building Code.

C. ANALYSIS OF BUILDING CODE COMMISSION PERFORMANCE

Performance Measures and Targets

The Commission has adopted the recommendations for performance measurement established by the Agency Reform (Guzzo) Commission. These are: fairness, accessibility, timeliness, quality and consistency, transparency, expertise, optimum cost, and courtesy. While not all of the goals were rated as “high” by the Commission, there are processes in place to ensure that all goals are integrated into the Commission's operations and are, therefore, adequately addressed. The chart below indicates how the Commission ranked the goals.

Goals	Ranking
Fairness	High
Accessibility*	Low
Timeliness	High
Quality and Consistency	Medium
Transparency	High
Expertise	High
Optimum Cost	Low
Courtesy	High

** It should be noted that the term "Accessibility" for the purposes of the performance measurement recommendations of the Agency Reform Commission was related to providing seamless and simple access to dispute resolution so that the public can receive quality and timely services regardless of their familiarity with the system.*

Measured Performance Results

Several steps have been taken to enhance the Commission's performance and accountability over the years, including continued monitoring of Commission-specific performance measures (Guzzo Report recommendations) and continued surveying of its clients to provide feedback on the Commission's performance. Overall, the Commission has surpassed its targets for high rated goals. Performance measures based on these goals are found in Appendix 1.

Fairness

- The stated target of not more than 10% of hearings resulting in judicial review was again met in the 2020-2021 fiscal year. The Commission did not receive any judicial reviews. Survey results for the 2020- 2021 fiscal year indicate that 89% of clients that responded to the survey agreed that they were treated fairly.

Timeliness

- Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, on March 30, 2020, the Commission resolved to make modifications to its process in order to continue to offer its services, including accepting electronic applications, holding remote hearings, and offering flexible timelines to parties and Ministry staff to allow for the adaptation to remote working and adjustment to new protocols and procedures during the pandemic. The Commission notes that holding a hearing within a certain number of working days is based on the responses received from the parties and Ministry within a specific time frame. Therefore, the Commission temporarily suspended its practice of offering a hearing within 40 working days from receipt of a complete application and offering a date for a hearing within 20 working days from receipt of the respondent's confirmation of dispute, as responses from participants were expected to be delayed under the pandemic working conditions. The Commission notes that during this past

fiscal year, timing from application to hearing and timing from receipt of the respondent's confirmation of dispute to hearing was, on average, twice the target timelines. The Commission will continue to evaluate its current processes as it looks for opportunities to improve timing to hearings and monitor for any impacts in the next fiscal year as the COVID-19 pandemic continues.

- In its 2020-2023 Business Plan, the Commission revised one of its performance measure commitments related to communication of decisions. The Commission revised its performance target to communicate all decisions for technical disputes, to parties within 15 business days from completion of hearing for 75% of all hearings. The Commission met its target by communicating decisions to parties within 15 working days of completion of a hearing for 100% of all hearings.
- The Commission's target of preparing and finalizing full written decisions within six months of completion of hearing for 75% of all hearings was not met during this fiscal cycle. Written decisions for 50% of disputes were completed within the six-month target timeline.
 - o As mentioned in the 2021-2024 Business Plan, the Commission introduced a pilot project in the fall of 2020 to meet its performance target of providing timely written decisions. The pilot project was launched in December 2020. The Commission will continue to monitor, and report results in the next fiscal cycle.
- The Commission also notes that its ability to achieve timelines was impacted by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and associated measures. The Commission will continue to monitor performance measures and will endeavor to adapt quickly to continue its delivery of services.

Quality and Consistency

- The Commission has set a target that 85% of parties will feel that the process had a high degree of quality and consistency. Survey results indicate that 89% of clients that responded to the survey agreed that the processes and procedures had a high degree of quality and consistency.

Transparency

- The Commission has set a target that 85% of parties will feel that the process and procedures were clear and understandable. Survey results indicate that 89% of clients that responded to the survey agreed that the processes and procedures were clear and understandable.

Expertise

- The Commission has set a target that 85% of parties will be satisfied that Commission members demonstrated an appropriate level of expertise regarding the technical matters under consideration. Survey results indicate that 88% of clients that responded to the survey agreed that members demonstrated an appropriate level of expertise regarding the technical matters under consideration.

Courtesy

- The Commission has set a target that 85% of parties will feel that they are treated with courtesy throughout the application process and the hearing. Survey results indicate that 100% of clients that responded to the survey agreed that they were treated with courtesy by Ministry staff throughout the application process, and 100% felt that they were treated with courtesy by Commission members.

The “Goals” ranked high and medium were surveyed by the Commission, and the results can be found in Appendix 1.

Operational Performance

The Commission believes that in order to provide quality service, to the public and the building design and construction sector, the Commission as an agency must operate as effectively and efficiently as possible. This means more than having performance measurements in place to strive for service excellence on a day-to-day basis. It also means pursuing excellence from an operational and administrative standpoint over the long term. To achieve this, the Commission also assesses itself on its operational performance. As with the above performance measures, operational excellence ensures accountability.

The following are some of its operational achievements in 2020-2021:

- The Commission adapted quickly in response to the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure the continuance of its service delivery. On March 30th, 2020, the Commission determined it would accept electronic applications for hearings and proceeded with scheduling hearings via telephone and video conferencing, while modifying procedures and timelines where appropriate in keeping with the government's priority on digitizing services where possible and continuing to ensure the continuance of service delivery in all situations.
- During the COVID-19 pandemic, the Commission continued to maintain its compliance with the Management Board of Cabinet's Agencies and Appointments Directive:
 - o The three-year Business Plan for 2021-2024 was prepared, finalized and submitted within the specified time frame.
 - o The Annual Report for 2019-2020 was completed, approved by the Commission and submitted within the specified time frame.
 - o Both the Commission's Business Plan and Annual Report were publicly posted as required by the Agencies and Appointments Directive.
- The Commission continued to maintain compliance with the Adjudicative Tribunals Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act, 2009.
- In December 2020, the Commission held a General Meeting with the full Commission members by video conference in order to complete the review and approval of its accountability requirements (i.e. the 2021-24 Business Plan), assess risks, and consider proposed operational improvements such as launching its pilot project to improve the timeliness for issuance of written decisions.
 - o Consistent with the government's priority of risk management, the Commission continues to monitor risks, including identifying and assessing the risks and proposing mitigation strategies which are reported in the business plan each year.
- In the fall of 2020, the Commission posted a job advertisement for new members, as part of its succession plan for staggering appointments and maintaining the technical expertise of its membership.
- The Commission continued its practice of surveying clients and received an overall satisfaction rating of 90% from clients that responded to the survey.

- The Commission continues to be committed to providing services in accordance with the Accessibility Standards for Customer Service and the Integrated Accessibility Standards regulation made under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

D. FINANCIAL REPORT

Budget

The Commission has no financial budget of its own, separate from that of the Ministry. All of the Commission's costs, including Commission members per diem remuneration, Ministry staff and administrative support, and operational costs, are borne by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

The chart below provides details on the costs associated with the Commission:

	2021-2022 Estimates	2020-2021 Estimates	2020-2021 Actuals	2019-2020 Actuals
Expenses:				
Members' per diems	\$58,000	\$54,000	\$38,006	\$52,918
Members' travel and hearing/meeting expenses**	\$13,100	\$12,700	\$0	\$11,355
Other administration	\$8,800	\$8,500	\$6,988	\$12,160
Total Expenses	\$79,900***	\$75,200***	\$44,994*	\$76,433*

* The operating expenses cover costs associated with Commission hearings; per diems for Commission members; and reimbursement for out-of-pocket travel expenses related to hearings/meetings, including hotel accommodations, meal allowances (to the maximum allowed through the Travel, Meal and Hospitality Expenses Directive), parking and public transit. Due to COVID-19 work from home policies, fewer applications, and fewer meetings held by the Commission, operating expenses fell in the 2020-21 fiscal year.

**Due to COVID-19 and work from home policies, no member expenses were incurred from April 1, 2020 to March 31, 2021. Public posting of expenses incurred during the January 1, 2021 to March 31, 2021 period are required by July 1, 2021, in accordance with the Agencies and Appointments Directive.

***The number of hearings is determined by the application rate. Member per diem remuneration rates are established by the Management Board of Cabinet Agencies and Appointments Directive applying to part-time Order in Council appointed members. The expenditure estimates are based on typical application rates (using historical data and projecting forward), member per diem remuneration rates and other operating expenses noted above.

Revenues

Revenues received from the application fee are recorded as part of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing non-tax revenues.

The current application fee, effective January 1, 2021 for the Commission is \$194.00.

The chart below provides details of the revenues associated with applications to the Commission:

	2021-2022 Estimates	2020-2021 Estimates	2020-2021 Actuals	2019-2020 Actuals
Revenues				
Application Fees	\$6,790	\$6,720	\$3,648	\$8,711
Total Revenues	\$6,790	\$6,720	\$3,648	\$8,711

Remuneration of Commission Members

As part-time appointees, Commission members receive remuneration in the form of a per diem at rates established by Management Board of Cabinet. Effective January 1, 2018, this per diem ranged from \$472 for members to \$583 for the Vice-Chair and \$744 for the Chair. Commission members are also reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses associated with attending Commission hearings, in accordance with the Management Board of Cabinet's Travel, Meal and Hospitality Expenses Directive.

Costs associated with Commission activities, including operating costs and member per diems, form part of the overall budget for the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. The number of applications to the Commission and/or the complexity of issues raised in the applications directly impact the budget requirement in support of Commission activities.

Appendix 1 – Performance Measures Table

Building Code Commission: Performance Measures				
Outcomes	Measures	Targets	2020-2021 Status	2021-2022 Commitments
Fairness (processes and procedures that are fair and are seen to be fair)	Parties* are satisfied that the process was implemented fairly and without bias	Not more than 10% of hearings should result in judicial review on an annual basis	Target met and exceeded. No judicial review during the fiscal year.	Target of not more than 10%
Timeliness (Timely resolution of disputes related to technical Code requirements)	a) Number of working days from application to offer hearing date	a) Offer a date for hearing within 40 business days from receipt of complete application for 85% of all hearings	a) Target not met. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic the Commission resolved not to offer hearing dates within 40 business days from receipt of application in order to provide parties and Ministry staff flexibility during the pandemic.	a) Target of 85%
	b) Number of working days from receipt of respondent's confirmation of dispute to offer hearing date	b) Offer a date for hearing within 20 business days from receipt of respondent's confirmation of dispute for 85% of all hearings	b) Target not met. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic the Commission resolved not to offer hearing dates within 20 business days from receipt of the respondent's confirmation of dispute in order to provide parties and Ministry staff flexibility during the pandemic.	b) Target of 85%
	c) Timely communication of decision	c) Communicate decisions to parties within 15 business days of completion of hearing for 75% of all hearings	c) Target met and exceeded at 100%.	c) Target of 75%
	d) Timely preparation and finalization of full written decision	d) Prepare and finalize full written decision within six months of completion of hearing for 75% of all hearings	d) Target not met at 50%.	d) Target of 75%

Building Code Commission: Performance Measures				
Outcomes	Measures	Targets	2020-2021 Status	2021-2022 Commitments
	e) Timely posting of final written decisions online within ten business days of completion of the French translation	e) Post 85% of final written decisions online within ten business days of completion of the French translation	e) Target met.	e) Target of 85%
Timeliness (Timely resolution of disputes related to prescribed time frames)	a) Timely acknowledgement of application and notification of hearing date	a) Acknowledge receipt of complete application submission and provide date for hearing within two business days	a) No applications received in this fiscal year.	a) Target of two days
	b) Timely scheduling of hearing date	b) Hear disputes regarding the issuance of municipal building permits and inspection service levels within five business days of receiving the completed application	b) No applications received in this fiscal year.	b) Target of five days
	c) Timely communication of decision	c) Communicate decisions within 15 business days of receiving the completed application	c) No applications received in this fiscal year.	c) Target of 15 days
	d) Timely preparation and finalization of full written decision	d) Prepare and finalize full written decisions within six months of completion of hearing for 75% of all hearings	d) No applications received in this fiscal year.	d) Target of 75%
	e) Timely posting of final written decisions online within ten business days of completion of the French translation	e) Post 85% of final written decisions online within ten business days of completion of the French translation	e) No applications received in this fiscal year.	e) Target of 85%

Building Code Commission: Performance Measures				
Outcomes	Measures	Targets	2020-2021 Status	2021-2022 Commitments
Quality and Consistency (process and procedures that have integrity and uniformity)	Parties are satisfied that the Commission process was conducted with a high degree of quality and consistency	85% of parties feel that the process had a high degree of quality and consistency	Target met and exceeded at 89%.	Target of 85%
Transparency (clear and understandable process and procedures)	Parties are satisfied that the Commission's process and procedures were clearly understood	85% of parties feel that the process and procedures were clear and understandable	Target met and exceeded 89%.	Target of 85%
Expertise (Thoughtful and sound Building Code Commission decisions made due to technical competence of members)	a) Parties are satisfied that the Commission members demonstrated an appropriate level of knowledge and technical competency	a) 85% of parties feel that the members were experts in the subject matter of the hearing	a) Target met and exceeded at 88%	a) Target of 85%
	b) Timely notice to the Ministry regarding upcoming Building Code Commission member terms of appointment expiration	b) Provide four months' notice to the Ministry in advance of members' appointments expiring	b) Target met.	b) Target of four months
Courtesy (polite and courteous treatment of all parties)	Parties are satisfied that they were treated with courtesy throughout the application process and at a hearing	85% of parties surveyed feel that they were treated with courtesy throughout the application process and the hearing	Target met and exceeded at 100%	Target of 85%

** In this Table, "parties" are those recognized by the Building Code Act, 1992, namely applicants to the Commission (i.e. applicants for building permits, holders of building permits or persons to whom an order has been issued) and respondents (i.e. municipal chief building officials and their designates).*

Appendix 2 – Building Code Commission Appointees List

Note: The following Table shows the Commission's Appointments as of March 31, 2021.
New appointments and re-appointments that occur after the end of the reporting period are not shown.
See Public Appointments Secretariat website for current Appointees List.

Commission Members	Original Appointment Date	Expiry Date of Current Appointment	Location	Total Annual Remuneration 2020-2021
Stephen Wong, Chair	December 31, 2018	December 30, 2021	Toronto	\$7,812
Alison Orr, Vice Chair	October 17, 2018	October 25, 2021	Hamilton	\$1,895
Matthew Graham, Vice Chair	April 11, 2019	April 10, 2021	Ottawa	\$2,769
Judy Beauchamp	September 13, 2017	September 12, 2021	Kitchener	\$4,720
Christina Kalt	November 2, 2016	April 28, 2021	Toronto	\$1,888
Lisa Miller-Way	November 2, 2016	April 28, 2021	Toronto	\$ 1,534
Leszek Muniak	November 2, 2016	April 28, 2021	Toronto	\$1,770
Andrew Steen	November 2, 2016	April 28, 2021	Toronto	\$ 2,048
Carolyn Bilson	November 30, 2016	May 29, 2021	Fergus	\$2,006
Rick Mori	November 30, 2016	May 29, 2021	Markham	\$1,888
Alexandra Chow	February 2, 2017	July 30, 2021	Toronto	\$944
Katherine Rentsch	August 31, 2017	August 30, 2021	Hillsburgh	\$1,888
Elektra Vrachas	February 14, 2019	February 13, 2024	Toronto	\$944
David Annable	February 14, 2019	February 13, 2024	Brockville	\$1,062
Michael Egberts	February 14, 2019	February 13, 2024	Toronto	\$1,416
George Christoff	February 14, 2019	February 13, 2021	Cornwall	\$708
Michael Gooch	February 14, 2020	February 13, 2022	Bracebridge	\$1,888
Fred Barkhouse	March 5, 2020	March 4, 2022	Kanata	\$826
Total Annual Remuneration for Commission				\$38,006