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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNL</td>
<td>Crocker Nuclear Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Displacement Damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSFC</td>
<td>Goddard Space Flight Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUPTI</td>
<td>Hampton University Proton Therapy Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Integrated Circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAR</td>
<td>International Traffic in Arms Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCF</td>
<td>Indiana University Cyclotron Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANSCE</td>
<td>Los Alamos Neutron Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBNL</td>
<td>Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratories (LBNL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLUMC</td>
<td>Loma Linda University Medical Center (LLUMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGH</td>
<td>Mass General Francis H. Burr Proton Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPP</td>
<td>NASA Electronic Parts and Packaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSRL</td>
<td>NASA Space Radiation Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProNova</td>
<td>ProNova Solutions, Proton Therapy Treatment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM</td>
<td>Rough Order of Magnitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRIPPS</td>
<td>SCRIPPS Proton Therapy Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEs</td>
<td>Single Event Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEs</td>
<td>Solar Particle Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TID</td>
<td>Total Ionizing Dose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIUMF</td>
<td>Tri-University Meson Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCD</td>
<td>University of California at Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFHPTI</td>
<td>University of Florida Health Proton Therapy Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outline

• Background: why we perform proton testing
  – Environment
  – Effects on Electronics
  – Testing on the Ground
• The “Study”
  – Proton Facility Status
    • Plan
    • Status
    • Highlights
  – Other Facilities
• The Future
  – Near Term
  – Future Considerations
• Summary

Sunset from SCRIPPS Proton Therapy Center
9730 Summers Ridge Rd, San Diego, CA 92121
Background
Protons in Space

- Protons of various energies exist in space.
  - Primarily in trapped belts due to magnetic fields, and from,
  - Solar Particle Events (SPEs).
- The image below shows the proton energy spectra for representative large SPE.

http://journalofcosmology.com/images/StraumeFigure3a.jpg
• Single Event Effects (SEEs)
  – Two mechanisms for depositing energy that depend on the device sensitivity:
    • Indirect ionization: the energy deposited by nuclear recoils with device materials, and,
    • Direct ionization: the energy deposited by the proton as it passes through the device.
  – Two types of effects observed:
    • Soft errors: upsets, interrupts, etc…
    • Hard errors (possible destructive): latchup, rupture, etc…

• Total Ionizing Dose (TID)
  – Cumulative long term ionizing damage due to protons.
  – May cause threshold shifts, increased device leakage (& power consumption), timing changes, decreased functionality, etc.

• Displacement Damage (DD)
  – Cumulative long term non-ionizing damage due to protons.
  – May have similar failure modes to TID.
Proton Energies for Test
- nominal break points

![Graph showing proton fluence versus proton energy in MeV with low, medium, and high energy ranges indicated.]
Proton Energy Regimes

• For SEE testing (indirect ionization)
  – Most common rate prediction method utilizes the Bendel 2-parameter fit to the test data.
  – This method uses data points usually in both the high and medium energy regimes (curve fitting).
    • High energy provides the “worst case” device sensitivity (go/no-go).

• For SEE testing (direct ionization)
  – Testing is performed in the low energy regime.

• TID or DD
  – May use both medium and high energy protons.
    • Medium energy is the “go-to” energy regime for testing optics/sensors/etc…
  – Low energy may not have sufficient penetration for a packaged device, but is used for DD such as with solar arrays.
The Study
Options for Proton Facilities in North America

• While the team has mostly been focused on high energy cyclotrons to replace the now-defunct Indiana University Cyclotron Facility (IUCF), both the low and medium regimes also need to be considered.

• The following charts present the status as we’ve explored with focus on the high energy proton regime.
Background: Proton Beam Delivery for Cancer Therapy

- There are two types of facilities being used for proton cancer therapy:
  - Cyclotrons, and,
  - Synchrotrons.

- In addition, there are three types of beam delivery methods used.
  - Scatter,
  - Wobble/uniform scan, and,
  - Pencil beam scan.

- IUCF was a cyclotron and utilized a scatter beam delivery system.
  - Other options require thought and consideration for possible use.
Basic Study Requirements for High Energy Proton Facility

- **Energy range:**
  - 125 MeV to > 200 MeV

- **Proton flux rates:**
  - 1e7 p/cm²/sec to 1e9 p/cm²/sec

- **Test fluences:**
  - 1e9 p/cm² to 1e11 p/cm²

- **Irradiation area:**
  - Small (IC ~ 1cm) to Large > 15cm x 15cm

- **Beam uniformity:**
  - >80%

- **Beam structure:**
  - Cyclotron *preferred* (random particle delivery over time)
  - Fixed spot or scatter (random particle delivery over area)
Proton Therapy Site Access – Team Plan

✔ Contact facilities (focus on cyclotrons)
✔ Site visit to determine interest
  – Technical
  – Access
  – Business case

☑ Beta tests at interested sites to determine usability
  ✔ Underway

☑ Work logistics of access
  ✔ Underway

☑ Determine guidelines for usage of these sites
  ✔ Underway

☑ Recommendations for modifications and longer term access.
  ✔ Initial planning

Assumption: Therapy sites will have available 300-500 hours/year each (weekends).
Multiple facilities required to replace IUCF in the near term.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Access/ Annual Hours</th>
<th>Expected Avail.</th>
<th>Shakeout Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Medicine Chicago Proton Center</td>
<td>Warrenville, IL</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cyclotron</td>
<td>2 hrs – weeknights 8-16 hrs Saturdays</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripps Proton Therapy Center</td>
<td>La Jolla, CA</td>
<td>&lt;$1000/hr</td>
<td>Cyclotron</td>
<td>Up to 500 hrs</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Proton Center</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cyclotron</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>On hold until CY16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton University Proton Therapy Institute (HUPTI)</td>
<td>Hampton, VA</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cyclotron</td>
<td>TBD weekends (up to 30 hrs?)</td>
<td>Awaiting update</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKC ProCure Proton Therapy Center</td>
<td>OKC, OK</td>
<td>$1000 + one-time setup fee</td>
<td>Cyclotron</td>
<td>Weekdays 6 hrs + possible shared time Saturdays 5-8 hrs</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td>Change of management – no current interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida Health Proton Therapy Institute (UFHPTI)</td>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cyclotron</td>
<td>Weekend days (possibly shared with quality assurance)</td>
<td>CY16 Spring CY16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision Center for Proton Therapy</td>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cyclotron</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Proton Treatment Center</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cyclotron</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>On “pause”</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland Proton Treatment Center</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Cyclotron</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>CY16 Summer CY16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-University Meson Facility (TRIUMF)</td>
<td>Vancouver, CAN</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>Cyclotron</td>
<td>4x/year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slater Proton Treatment and Research Center at Loma Linda University Medical Center (LLUMC)</td>
<td>Loma Linda, CA</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Synchrotron</td>
<td>~1000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass General Francis H. Burr Proton Therapy (MGH)</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>Cyclotron</td>
<td>~800 hours 12hr weekend days, 3 of 4 weekends – 6 month+ lead time</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Space Radiation Lab (NSRL)</td>
<td>Brookhaven, NY</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
<td>Synchrotron</td>
<td>~1000 hours</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University Cyclotron Facility</td>
<td>Bloomington, IN</td>
<td>$820</td>
<td>Cyclotron</td>
<td>2000 hours</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proton Access - Status

• Team considers MGH and TRIUMF acceptable higher energy facilities (even before our visits).
  – Note that 200 MeV is not the norm at TRIUMF. Higher than 200 MeV is an acceptable alternative for most testing.
• Team has vetted SCRIPPS and Chicago as viable for all test modes (scattered, continuous beam).
• Team has tested at HUPTI with good results however, beam was pulsed so high speed dynamic tests were not validated.
  – In essence, they pulsed the beam so that it was always being modulated by the same thickness on the modulation wheel (1/16th duty cycle).
  – HUPTI now understands this request and we’re awaiting further interaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip</th>
<th>Average CS/bit in cm²</th>
<th>Percentage of MBU Events to All Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago #1</td>
<td>2.77 E-15</td>
<td>10.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripps</td>
<td>2.88 E-15</td>
<td>12.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>3.10 E-15</td>
<td>13.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago #2</td>
<td>2.74 E-15</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample 1 Mbit SRAM data showing good cross-correlation

General Things We’ve Discovered

• The medical physicists are REALLY bright, but
  – They speak a different language.
    • We talk flux, fluence, and dose in Silicon.
    • They talk beam current, monitor units/counts, and dose in water/tissue.

• Cable run length between the user area and beam line varies wildly.
  – 65-125’ depending on the facilities.
  – Some may have limited cable runs already in place.

• The technical is the easy part.
  – Government contracting is a lot different than medical insurance for “paying the bill”.
    • Things like “indemnification clauses” and federal procurement regulations are new to them and they’re not really set up for this.

• The playing field is very fluid.
  – Which facilities are and how they’re interested in working with our community changes nearly continuously.
Specific Things We’ve Discovered

- **MGH:**
  - Fully booked through end Aug 2016 (as of 12-13-15)!
  - Ethan’s an amazing one man show.

- **TRIUMF:**
  - 2 beam lines are available (<125 MeV, >350 MeV).
    - High energy line is available ~ 3-4 months a year.
    - TRIUMF is now “ITAR compliant”.

- **SCRIPPS and Northwestern:**
  - Multiple users have now tested here.

- **HUPTI:**
  - Usable for many tests as is, but we’re still closing the loop.

- **OKC and Seattle Proton Center:**
  - Have gone back and forth as to interest.
Pretty Pictures from Testing (1)

Beta testing at Northwestern Medicine Chicago Proton Center.
Big blue block is the beam stop.
Not all facilities thought one was necessary.

Beam comes out here

Brass collimator supplied by SCRIPPS

Beta testing at SCRIPPS Proton Center.

Robotic patient sled supplied by SCRIPPS

Clamp (NASA equipment)

Device Under Test

Table jack (NASA equipment)
Beta testing at HUPTI.

Gantry was rotated for vertical beam line.
The floor was the beam stop.

Typical cable run under chamber doors.
Non-Cyclotron Options

- Synchrotron (pulsed beam – timing challenge)
  - Loma Linda University Medical Center (LLUMC) – in use by multiple organizations for testing.
  - NASA Space Radiation Laboratory (NSRL) - >>200 MeV available, but at a cost.
  - There are numerous other cancer treatment synchrotrons in North America (St. Louis, Rutgers, Roberts Proton, etc…).
    - These are outside the scope of what we were looking for, but they ARE usable for many test types (see next chart).

- Possible new development
  - LANSCE (up to 800 MeV max)
    - Micro-pulsed beam that would need some development for usage down to the 200 MeV regime and to develop appropriate test flux rates.
    - They have a white paper on this topic.
# Beam Delivery Recommendations for Proton Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Test</th>
<th>Cyclotron</th>
<th>Synchrotron</th>
<th>Fixed or Scatter</th>
<th>Wobble/Uniform Scan</th>
<th>Pencil Beam Scan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Static test (Biased, non-clocked)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructive event test</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic test (device with low proton sensitivity or slow operation) - example, commercial flash memory</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic test (high proton sensitivity or fast operation) - example, Intel 14nm processor*2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System test (board/box level) - example, commercial motherboard</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 - Assuming energy, flux, fluence, uniformity, etc... are met.

*2 - Timing dependent tests (dynamic operations) especially on very proton sensitive devices require careful thought for using other than an IUCF-like beam (a cyclotron with a scatter mode). Further work is needed to evaluate useful nature of scan beam delivery for these kinds of tests.
Medium Energy Proton Cyclotrons

- Commonly used medium energy proton facilities:
  - University of California at Davis (UCD) Crocker Nuclear Laboratory (CNL) – (63 MeV)*,
  - Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratories (LBNL)* – (50 MeV), and,
  - Texas A&M University (TAMU) – 50 MeV.
- LBNL’s future is uncertain for continued access.
  - Trade space between government sustaining funds and return on science and aerospace needs.
- CNL has been struggling with reduced user loads.
  - Facility has been a staple for testing of optics/sensors/etc…
  - They’ve raised their rates, but are struggling with obtaining sufficient customers.

* also in use for low energy proton testing
The Future
Plans for FY16

• **Beta Tests:**
  – Spring: UFHPITI
  – Summer: Baltimore
  – Other?

• **Guidance**
  – Proton facility guideline in the “new era”
  – Possible training for newbies as an adjunct to SEE-MAPLD

• **Technical**
  – Beam dosimetry
    • Determine if a common-core dosimetry system is required for electronics testing versus those used for medical purposes
    • Possible new development for a standard system

• **Logistics**
  – Evaluate logistics challenges (business models)
  – Evaluate assured access options
Protons – Future Considerations

• Scenario 1: Insurance and medical needs stays the same
  – Status quo: we should have enough proton beam time options via existing sites plus ones being built new ones being built (20+ total).
  – Mostly weekends

• Scenario 2: insurance and medical industry will not have the need for the number of facilities being built
  – We get more access
  – Some sites may close
  – *Possibility of buying a site or turning it into a dedicated test facility*

• Notes
  • ProCure (parent of Seattle, OKC, New Jersey) currently in “financial challenge”
  • APT (SCRIPPS, Baltimore, and others) and ProNova looking to expand

• Scenario 3: insurance and medical industry have increased needs for cancer therapy sites
  – We get limited access
  – More sites may be built
  – *We’re hosed for using these sites*

• Scenario 4: government determines that assured access to a proton site is needed
  – Upgrade existing facilities (DOE? Crocker? Other?) or build a new site using more modern cyclotron options.
Protons Assured Access – Possible Options

• Government lab - LANSCE (DOE) upgrade
  – Pulsed beam with max energy of 800 MeV
    • Steve Wender developing white paper
    • White paper is on reducing flux to SEE test levels and obtaining 200 MeV regime

• Build a new (government/industry) facility – up to $100M
  ROM pending land/zoning/capability
  – May include some heavy ion capability

• Upgrade Crocker – they have experience
  – ROM is anywhere from $15-50M – have asked for better estimate

• Private company builds research facility
  – Former founder of Mevion (cyclotron manufacturer) has expressed interest in a privately funded facility

• Side note: discussion held with Zevacor
  – 70 MeV cyclotron near Indianapolis - possible access for both protons and neutrons
Summary

• An overview of North American Proton Facility status for electronics testing has been shared.
• We note that this is a fluid area where the facilities and players change on a regular basis.
  – The future may be bright or dark.