



Summary Record of Decision

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

DEC 26-H110

In the Matter of

Bruce Power Inc.

**Application to Amend the Licensing Basis for Lutetium-177
Production at Bruce A and B Nuclear Generating Stations**

Summary Record of Decision Date: August 10, 2026

DEC 26-H110

Applicant: Bruce Power Inc.

Applicant Address: 177 Tie Road
Tiverton ON
N0G 2T0

Subject: Application to Amend the Licensing Basis for
Lutetium-177 Production at Bruce A and B Nuclear
Generating Stations

Application Received: [November 28, 2025](#)

Hearing Notice [*Notice of Hearing in Writing and Participant Funding
published on April 8, 2026*](#)

Participant Funding [*Decision on Participant Funding*](#)

Requests for Confidentiality [*Decision on Bruce Power's Request to Protect
Confidential Information*](#)
[*Decision on Bruce Power's Second Request to Protect
Confidential Information*](#)

Commission Member: Jerry Hopwood

Commission Registrar: Jude Samson

Recording Officer: Henry Forester

Licensing Basis: Amended

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Overview	1
2	Issues	2
3	Decision	3
	Appendix A - Hearing Submissions and Participants	5

1 OVERVIEW

1. On [November 28, 2025](#), Bruce Power Inc. (Bruce Power) applied to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission¹ (CNSC) to amend the licensing basis² to authorize additional steps in lutetium-177 (Lu-177) production at [Bruce A and B nuclear generating stations](#) (Bruce A and B).
2. Bruce A and B are in the Municipality of Kincardine, on the eastern shore of Lake Huron, on the Traditional and Treaty Territory of the Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON), and the traditional harvesting territories of the Métis Nation of Ontario Region 7 and the Historic Saugeen Métis peoples.
3. The SON, comprised of the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation and the Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation, hold Aboriginal and/or treaty rights within the area encompassing the Bruce A and B sites. The Métis Nation of Ontario (Region 7), the Historic Saugeen Métis, and the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation have also expressed an interest in the Bruce A and B site.³
4. In [2021](#), the Commission amended Bruce Power's power reactor operating licence, PROL 18.01/2028, authorizing the production of Lu-177 in Bruce B unit 7. The amendment authorized Bruce Power to produce Lu-177, and possess, transfer, package, manage and store nuclear substances that are required for, associated with, or arise from Lu-177 production in Bruce B unit 7 only.⁴
5. Under the current licensing basis, Bruce Power is authorized to irradiate Lu-177 targets (aluminum encased quartz ampoules), discharge the irradiated targets into type B transport packages, and prepare the transport packages for shipment. Bruce Power is proposing the following changes to the Lu-177 process to improve logistics and reduce doses to workers and the public:
 - transfer the irradiated Lu-177 targets from the reactor building to the Central Maintenance Facility (CMF)

¹ The *Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission* is referred to as the "CNSC" when referring to the organization and its staff in general, and as the "Commission" when referring to the tribunal component.

² The licensing basis is the set of regulatory requirements, licence conditions, and supporting licensing documents that define the safety and control measures governing a licensed activity and establish the basis for CNSC compliance oversight.

³ CMD 26-H110, section 4.1.

⁴ Record of Decision, DEC 21-H100, *Application to Amend Power Reactor Operating Licence PROL 18.01/2028 for the Production of Lutetium-177 at Bruce Nuclear Generating Stations A and B*, CNSC, September 22, 2021.

- remove the outer target carrier capsule from the inner Lu-177 quartz ampoule in a newly installed hot cell in the CMF
 - repackage the irradiated Lu-177 ampoules for offsite transport in the CMF
6. The President established Commission member Mr. Jerry Hopwood to consider the application.⁵ The Commission, in conducting a public hearing based on written materials, considered written submissions from Bruce Power ([Appendix A](#)) and CNSC staff ([CMD 26-H110](#)). The Commission also considered written submissions from 13 intervenors,⁶ as set out in [Appendix A](#).
 7. This *Summary Record of Decision* reflects the Commission's decision with respect to the application to amend the licensing basis to authorize additional steps in Lu-177 production at Bruce A and B. The detailed reasons for the Commission's decision will be provided in a detailed Record of Decision, to be published at a later date.

2 ISSUES

8. Bruce Power's application does not call for a licensing decision under section 24 of the NSCA, as a change to the licensing basis does not necessarily amend the terms of a licence and would not in this case. What is requested would not change the licensed activities authorized in the current licence. Nevertheless, the Commission must determine:
 - is Bruce Power qualified to carry on the activity that the licence, including the proposed changes to the licensing basis, would authorize?⁷
 - will, in carrying on that activity in the changed manner contemplated, Bruce Power make adequate provision for the protection of the environment, the health and safety of persons and the maintenance of national security and measures required to implement international obligations to which Canada has agreed?⁸

⁵ [Nuclear Safety and Control Act](#), S.C. 1997, c. 9, section 22.

⁶ Pursuant to rule 19 of the [Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission Rules of Procedure](#), individuals or organizations with relevant expertise, a direct interest in this matter, or information that may be useful to the Commission in its decision-making were invited to submit written comments on Bruce Power's application.

⁷ NSCA, SC 1997, c 9, s 24(4)(a).

⁸ NSCA, SC 1997, c 9, s 24(4)(b).

9. The Commission’s consideration of Bruce Power’s application also focused on the following key issues within the Commission’s mandate:

- In considering Bruce Power’s application, do any requirements of the [*Impact Assessment Act*⁹](#) (IAA) apply to the proposed licensing basis amendment such that an impact assessment is triggered?
- Is the duty to consult and, where appropriate, accommodate potential or established Aboriginal¹⁰ or treaty rights triggered?
- Has the duty to consult and, where appropriate, accommodate been discharged and the honour of the Crown upheld?
- If the above is established, does the Commission amend the licensing basis?

3 DECISION

10. Based on its consideration of all the materials received, the Commission amends the licensing basis for PROL 18.04/2028 for Lu-177 production at Bruce A and B. The Commission directs CNSC staff to update the licence conditions handbook for Bruce A and B as described in CMD 26-H110, Appendix C.6.
11. The Commission finds that the proposed licensing basis amendment does not require an impact assessment under the IAA.
12. The Commission also concludes that the proposed licensing basis amendment does not trigger the duty to consult with respect to the Indigenous Nations and communities listed in paragraph 3, above. Granting the amendment will not result in new adverse impacts to potential or established Aboriginal or treaty rights.¹¹
13. In addition, the Commission’s responsibility to uphold the honour of the Crown has been met. The Commission finds that the actions taken and measures proposed satisfy its constitutional duties with respect to the Indigenous Nations and communities above.
14. The Commission is satisfied that Bruce Power is qualified to carry on the licensed activities that the amended licensing basis will authorize and, in carrying on those activities, will make adequate provision for the protection of the environment, the

⁹ S.C. 2019, c. 28, s. 1.

¹⁰ “Aboriginal” is the term used in this document when referring to the Crown’s duty to consult as that is the term used in s. 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*. In all other cases, “Indigenous” is the preferred terminology and used accordingly.

¹¹ *Rio Tinto Alcan v. Carrier Sekani Tribal Council*, [2010 SCC 43](#), at paras 45 and 49; *Fond du Lac Denesuline First Nation v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2012 FCA 73.

health and safety of persons, and the maintenance of national security and measures required to implement international obligations to which Canada has agreed.



August 10, 2026

Mr. Jerry Hopwood
Commission Member
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

Date

APPENDIX A - HEARING SUBMISSIONS AND PARTICIPANTS

This appendix provides a list of submissions and individuals or organizations that participated in the hearing in writing.

Table 1: Submissions by Bruce Power

Bruce Power Submissions
Application
Supplemental Document 1
Hot Cell Security Measures
Waste Strategy Outline for Target Carriers
Central Maintenance Facility: Evidence for the Record for Commission Approval
Supplementary Information Ref1

Table 2: Submissions by CNSC staff

CNSC Staff Submissions
CMD 26-H110

Table 3: Intervenorors who provided written submissions

Intervenor	
Organization of Canadian Nuclear Industries	CMD 26-H110.2
Brightshores Health System	CMD 26-H110.3
Rebecca Wong (University Health Network)	CMD 26-H110.4
ITM Isotope Technologies Munich SE	CMD 26-H110.5
Georgian College	CMD 26-H110.6

Intervenor	
Canadian Nuclear Isotope Council	CMD 26-H110.7
London Health Sciences Centre	CMD 26-H110.8
Cameco Corporation	CMD 26-H110.9
Lawson Research Institute	CMD 26-H110.10
BWXT Canada	CMD 26-H110.11
Nuclear Innovation Institute	CMD 26-H110.12
Kinectrics	CMD 26-H110.13
Gamzook'aamin aakoziwin Oversight Committee	CMD 26-H110.14