

# **Assessment of Prone Positioning of Restrained, Seated Crew Members in a Post-landing Stable 2 Orion Configuration**

*Yael Barr<sup>1</sup>, Jennifer Fogarty<sup>2</sup>*

*<sup>1</sup>University of Texas Medical Branch Galveston and Wyle Integrated Science and Engineering Group*

*<sup>2</sup>NASA Johnson Space Center, Houston*

## THE NASA STI PROGRAM OFFICE . . . IN PROFILE

Since its founding, NASA has been dedicated to the advancement of aeronautics and space science. The NASA Scientific and Technical Information (STI) Program Office plays a key part in helping NASA maintain this important role.

The NASA STI Program Office is operated by Langley Research Center, the lead center for NASA's scientific and technical information. The NASA STI Program Office provides access to the NASA STI Database, the largest collection of aeronautical and space science STI in the world. The Program Office is also NASA's institutional mechanism for disseminating the results of its research and development activities. These results are published by NASA in the NASA STI Report Series, which includes the following report types:


- **TECHNICAL PUBLICATION.** Reports of completed research or a major significant phase of research that present the results of NASA programs and include extensive data or theoretical analysis. Includes compilations of significant scientific and technical data and information deemed to be of continuing reference value. NASA's counterpart of peer-reviewed formal professional papers but has less stringent limitations on manuscript length and extent of graphic presentations.
- **TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM.** Scientific and technical findings that are preliminary or of specialized interest, e.g., quick release reports, working papers, and bibliographies that contain minimal annotation. Does not contain extensive analysis.
- **CONTRACTOR REPORT.** Scientific and technical findings by NASA-sponsored contractors and grantees.

- **CONFERENCE PUBLICATION.** Collected papers from scientific and technical conferences, symposia, seminars, or other meetings sponsored or cosponsored by NASA.
- **SPECIAL PUBLICATION.** Scientific, technical, or historical information from NASA programs, projects, and mission, often concerned with subjects having substantial public interest.
- **TECHNICAL TRANSLATION** English-language translations of foreign scientific and technical material pertinent to NASA's mission.

Specialized services that complement the STI Program Office's diverse offerings include creating custom thesauri, building customized databases, organizing and publishing research results . . . even providing videos.

For more information about the NASA STI Program Office, see the following:

- Access the NASA STI Program Home Page at <http://www.sti.nasa.gov>
- E-mail your question via the Internet to [help@sti.nasa.gov](mailto:help@sti.nasa.gov)
- Fax your question to the NASA Access Help Desk at (301) 621-0134
- Telephone the NASA Access Help Desk at (301) 621-0390
- Write to:  
NASA Access Help Desk  
NASA Center for AeroSpace Information  
7115 Standard  
Hanover, MD 21076-1320



# **Assessment of Prone Positioning of Restrained, Seated Crew Members in a Post-landing Stable 2 Orion Configuration**

*Yael Barr<sup>1</sup>, Jennifer Fogarty<sup>2</sup>*

*<sup>1</sup>University of Texas Medical Branch Galveston and Wyle Integrated Science and Engineering Group*

*<sup>2</sup>NASA Johnson Space Center, Houston*

Available from:

NASA Center for AeroSpace Information  
7115 Standard Drive  
Hanover, MD 21076-1320  
301-621-0390

National Technical Information Service  
5285 Port Royal Road  
Springfield, VA 22161  
703-605-6000

This report is also available in electronic form at <http://ston.jsc.nasa.gov/collections/TRS/>

## CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	1
The Harness Hang Syndrome .....	2
Vascular compromise .....	4
Respiratory compromise.....	4
Other contributing factors.....	4
Time to Rescue and Possible Countermeasures.....	4
Treatment considerations.....	5
Effects of Long-duration Microgravity.....	5
Limitations .....	6
Conclusions.....	6
Concurrence .....	6
References.....	7

## FIGURES

1	Approximate position of Orion seat in stable 2.....	1
2	Orion seat configuration in a nominal position .....	1
3	OSHA-approved full body harness with D-ring attachment point in the mid-back, as studied by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) (reproduced from Turner et al, 2008).....	2
4	Soyuz seat – note the higher degree of flexion in the hips and knees compared with the Orion seat in figures 1 and 2 .....	5

## ACRONYMS

ARDS	Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome
CEV	Crew Exploration Vehicle
CMUS	Crew Module Up-righting System
CO <sub>2</sub>	carbon dioxide
ECLSS	Environmental Control and Life Support System
GN&C	guidance, navigation, and control
HHS	Harness Hang Syndrome
NIOSH	National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration



## Introduction

During the June 2009 Orion landing and recovery subsystem design review, it was noted that the human system and various vehicle systems (eg, the Environmental Control and Life Support System (ECLSS) and Guidance, Navigation, and Control (GN&C) System) are negatively affected by Orion assuming a stable 2 (upside down; figure 1) configuration post landing. The stable 2 configuration is predicted to occur about 50% of the time based on Apollo landing data and modeling of the current capsule. The configuration will be countered by an active up-righting system (Crew Module Up-righting System [CMUS]). Post-landing balloons will deploy and inflate, causing the vehicle to assume or maintain the stable 1 (up-right; figure 2) configuration. During the design review, it was proposed that the up-righting system could be capable of righting the vehicle within 60 sec. However, this time limit posed a series of constraints on the design that made it less robust than desired. The landing and recovery subsystem team requested an analysis of Orion vehicle systems as well as of the human system with regard to the effect of stable 2 to determine whether an up-righting response time greater than 60 sec could be tolerated.



**Figure 1.** Approximate position of Orion seat in stable 2.



**Figure 2.** Orion seat configuration in a nominal position.

The following report focuses on assessing the human system in the posture assumed when Orion is in the stable 2 configuration. Stable 2 will place suited, seated, and restrained crew members in a prone (ie, face-down), head-up position for a period of time dependent on the functionality of the up-righting systems, ability of crew members to release themselves from the seat and restraints, and/or time to arrival of rescue forces. Given that the Orion seat and restraint system design is not complete and therefore, unavailable for evaluation, Space Medicine personnel assessed how long a healthy but deconditioned crew member could stay in this prone, restrained position and the physiological consequences of this posture by researching terrestrial analogs and considered the known physiological alterations and deconditioning experienced by long-duration space flight crew members.

## Literature Review

Following review of the medical literature, several terrestrial analog populations were identified that may serve as a surrogate from which data could be extrapolated and recommendations made. The most applicable and analogous of these is the population that uses a full-body fall protection harness with a D-ring attachment point in the mid-back. Such harnesses are used both for safety in specific work environments and in certain recreational activities, encompassing workers at heights or at depths (industrial climbing, well construction), mountaineers, rock climbers, cavers, and parachutists, to mention a few (Lee 2007). All of these harness users are typically young to middle-aged adults who are relatively healthy and fit, mirroring members of the NASA Astronaut Corps.

Another possible analog population that has fewer similarities to the astronaut cadre is that of patients who are placed in a prone posture for surgery (spine, kidney, neurosurgery), recovery from surgery (closure of macular holes in the eye), or prone ventilation strategies in critically ill patients with sepsis or Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS). This population group is less applicable to the astronauts in a stable 2 configuration because these patients, aside from being far from healthy, are placed in a flat horizontal and occasionally slightly head-down posture, which is not physiologically equivalent to the position assumed to occur with the stable 2 seat position.

Therefore, literature examining harnessed populations was reviewed for applicable data relating to the physiological challenges of the prone harnessed position.

## The Harness Hang Syndrome

A rapidly incapacitating and potentially fatal medical syndrome has been described in occupational medicine and wilderness medicine literature as occurring in harnessed individuals who have sustained a fall and have remained motionless in their harness for a period of minutes to hours (Orzech 1987, Roggla 1996, Seddon 2002, Lee 2007, Roggla 2008, Turner 2008, Werntz 2008). This syndrome has received several names, including Harness Hang Syndrome (HHS), Suspension Trauma, and Harness-induced Pathology (Seddon 2002, Lee 2007, Werntz 2008, Turner 2008). This syndrome is caused by the body's physiological response to a motionless posture that is either vertical or semi-prone, depending on where the harness attaches to the pulley/rope (Seddon 2002, Lee 2007), with the main underlying mechanism for its occurrence being orthostatic hypotension. The standard Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)-approved fall-protection harness has the point of suspension in the mid-back (Turner 2008), yielding a body position similar to that of a restrained crew member in a Crew Exploration Vehicle (CEV) seat in a stable 2 landing configuration (figure 1). While most of the literature reviewed did not specify the angle at which subjects or victims were suspended, standards for full-body harnesses with a mid-back D-ring list angles of 30 to 50 deg from vertical (Seddon 2002). Figure 3 shows a full body restraint system with a 41-deg angle from vertical (reproduced from Lee 2007).



**Figure 3.** OSHA-approved full body harness with D-ring attachment point in the mid-back, as studied by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) (reproduced from Turner et al, 2008).

HHS is described as developing within 5 to 30 min in a suspended person who is either immobilized or unconscious, with the key factor being lack of sufficient leg movement to generate a pump action for return of venous blood that has pooled in the legs to the heart (Seddon 2002, Turner 2008). In experimental subjects, onset of symptoms is rapid (3.5 to 10 min), with one of the earliest signs being cognitive impairment that makes the suspended person less likely to assist with his/her own rescue (Werntz 2008). Symptoms start with general malaise, progressing to intense sweating, nausea, dizziness, hot flashes, brain function impairment that quickly worsens, respiratory difficulties, tachycardia, and progressively worsening arrhythmias, followed by a sudden increase in blood pressure and loss of consciousness (Lee 2007, Werntz 2008). Death is speculated to occur a few minutes after loss of consciousness if subjects are not quickly released from their harness (Werntz 2008). Case reports of HHS survivors also describe acute renal failure, coagulopathies, prolonged circulatory dysfunction, and long-term cognitive impairment; however, these may have been due to other coexisting injuries in those reported cases (Roggla 1996, Werntz 2008).

Studies done on harnessed individuals in a controlled simulated environment also report a rapid onset of symptoms, ranging from 3.5 to 10 min, with very few subjects (described as being particularly fit) able to tolerate the harness for 30 min without developing incapacitating symptoms (Werntz 2008). Loss of consciousness occurs after a range of 7 to 30 min (Lee 2007).

In another study, Roggla et al evaluated the cardiorespiratory response to suspension in a chest harness and noted that after 3 min of suspension, mean forced vital capacity decreased by 34%, mean forced expiratory volume decreased by 30%, mean end-tidal carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) increased by 12% (with no change in arterial oxygen saturation), mean heart rate decreased by 12%, mean systolic blood pressure decreased by 28%, mean diastolic pressure decreased by 13%, and mean cardiac output decreased by 36% (Roggla 1996). The authors speculated that the underlying mechanism for the observed hemodynamic and respiratory impairment was not only gravity-associated venous pooling, but that the rise in intra-thoracic pressure from chest strap pressure was also the main mechanism, with activation of intracardiac reflexes (eg, the Bezold-Jarisch reflex) as an explanation for the decrease in heart rate (Roggla 1996).

Orzech et al conducted a study on three fall protection harnesses at the Harry G. Armstrong Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, including a full-body harness, to evaluate for physiological effects and subjective responses to prolonged, motionless suspension (Orzech 1987). Subjects tolerated the full-body harness suspension for a mean of 14.38 min (range 5.08 to 30.12 min) with symptoms of lightheadedness and nausea being the most common causes for test termination (Orzech 1987).

In a study conducted by the NIOSH by Turner et al (Turner 2008) subjects suspended in a full-body harness with a back attach point (as shown in figure 3) were found to have a 1.9 cm increase in midhigh circumference, a 1.5 L/min decrease in minute ventilation, a change in heart rate of 21.6 bpm, and a decrease in the mean arterial pressure of -2.6 mmHg. Ninety-five percent of subjects tolerated the suspension for 11 min. Eighty percent of tests were terminated for a medically based tolerance limit, defined as either a decrease in systolic blood pressure of more than 20 mmHg, a decrease in diastolic blood pressure of more than 10 mmHg, an increase in heart rate of more than 28 bpm, a decrease in heart rate of more than 10 bpm, a pulse pressure decrease to less than 18 mmHg, or other signs and symptoms including shortness of breath, nausea, and dizziness (Turner 2008). Body weight was found to be a statistically significant determinant for length of tolerance time. No difference between genders was observed (Turner 2008).

The speculated physiological mechanisms underlying the HHS mainly include vascular and respiratory compromise; these are briefly outlined below.

### ***Vascular compromise***

The major physiological driver of the adverse effects seen with HHS in a full-body harness are thought to be related to gravity-associated pooling of venous blood in the lower extremities leading to a 20% decrease of the effective circulating blood volume and relative functional hypovolemia (Seddon 2002, Lee 2007, Werntz 2008), which results in orthostatic hypotension (increased heart rate and decreased blood pressure). Immobility of the legs lessens the return of blood to the heart, reducing preload and cardiac output, resulting in decreased perfusion of vital internal organs including the brain, leading to hypoxic injury (Seddon 2002, Lee 2007, Werntz 2008). Unlike cases of orthostatic hypotension, in which loss of consciousness leads to a fall and thus a horizontal position allowing for redistribution of blood volume, a harnessed individual cannot assume a horizontal position and, therefore, is unable to restore adequate perfusion (Seddon 2002, Lee 2007).

In addition, the thigh or groin straps that are part of a full-body harness are thought to compress the femoral veins and further decrease venous and lymphatic return from the legs (Seddon 2002, Lee 2007, Werntz 2008).

### ***Respiratory compromise***

Compression on the abdomen and thorax by the harness results in increased intra-thoracic and intra-abdominal pressures that will restrict the chest and diaphragmatic movement, causing a decrease in ventilatory capacity as evidenced by the decrease in pulmonary function tests described above (Rogglia 1996, Werntz 2008).

### ***Other contributing factors***

Traumatic injuries, blood loss, dehydration, and other reasons for loss of consciousness that result in immobility of the lower extremities are all possible contributing factors to the phenomena seen with the HHS (Seddon 2002, Lee 2007).

## **Time to Rescue and Possible Countermeasures**

The literature notes that “a person who is motionless and suspended in a harness is a medical emergency, with only minutes to rescue the person to avoid HHS” and that all workplaces using harnesses should have a “concrete and rapidly employable rescue plan because “waiting for off-site rescuers such as the fire department or rescue squad will result in too slow a rescue and is therefore an inadequate plan” (Werntz 2008). NIOSH recommends that “to ensure that no more than 5% of workers would experience symptoms rescue would have to occur in 11 minutes” (Turner 2008). The recommendation for cavers using a harness is to initiate a rescue plan within 3 min for a harnessed hanging caver who is either immobile or unable to resolve an equipment problem. Deconditioned crew members who are relatively dehydrated and more susceptible to orthostatic hypotension may become symptomatic sooner than is outlined for terrestrial populations. Since rescue ships may not be available for a few hours after CEV landing, it is vital that an up-righting system be employed within minutes.

An OSHA Safety and Health information Bulletin titled “Suspension Trauma/Orthostatic Intolerance” recommends that if rescue of harnessed hanging workers cannot be performed promptly, the workers should be trained to maintain frequent leg movements to use the leg muscles as a pump to reduce the risk of venous pooling. This may be difficult for a deconditioned crew member who has become unaccustomed to the terrestrial force of

gravity, whose feet are restrained to the seat using toeholds or ankle straps, and who is suffering from vestibular challenges in an awkward post-landing posture and motion sickness from capsule movements on the water.

Another possible countermeasure is to shorten the vertical distance that blood needs to travel from the legs to the heart to overcome the orthostasis, for example by assuming a seated position with the legs flexed (Lee 2007). This is a similar posture to that of crew members seated in a Soyuz seat (Figure 4).



**Figure 4.** Soyuz seat – note the higher degree of flexion in the hips and knees compared with the Orion seat in figures 1 and 2.

### ***Treatment considerations***

There is no consensus on how to approach a harnessed suspended patient after rescue. Some authors advocate keeping a patient who has been suspended motionless for greater than 30 min in a seated position for 30 min after rescue and not placing him/her supine. Placing a suspension victim supine is thought by some authors to cause “rescue death,” which is speculated to occur due to hypoxic blood from the legs being reintroduced into the systemic circulation, causing ischemic heart failure. Right ventricular overload, reperfusion injury to organs that were hypoxic during the suspension, or release of toxins from the hypoxic blood that has stagnated in the legs are also speculated to play a role in “rescue death” (Seddon 2002, Lee 2007, Werntz 2008). This may be a consideration in rescue scenarios involving the vehicle and crew after being in stable 2 for an extended period of time.

### **Effects of Long-duration Microgravity**

Astronauts who have completed long-duration missions return to Earth in a deconditioned state. This deconditioned state is punctuated by decreased orthostatic tolerance, muscle strength, aerobic capacity, and bone density, as well as alterations in the neurovestibular system, which is easily provoked by head motion post flight, resulting in disorientation, nausea, and vomiting. Long duration crewmembers have also reported that their somatosensory capability is initially impaired. This means that their ability to use their muscles is affected and their motions are not fluid or well choreographed. So, an individual may want his or her arms and legs to execute certain maneuvers but the body is incapable of it due to the lack of familiarity with gravity and their own weight. This effect is reversed rapidly after the exposure to gravity, within minutes to hours, but it causes a crewmember’s physical activity to be initially precariously uncoordinated. This is eluded to by Skylab astronauts in the Skylab Medial Operations Project report (Lindgren 2009; p.47) and reported by a long duration ISS crewmember (personal communication). Taken together, deconditioning can manifest in several different ways leaving the

crewmembers vulnerable to injury and without physiological reserve. Any nominally planned post landing activities should be sensitive to these vulnerabilities and not unduly stress the crew.

## Limitations

As the exact seat, suit, and restraint system is unavailable to assess, a literature review was conducted to find a suitable analog. Some limitations of that literature review are as follows: crew members will not be positioned as upright as subjects in the studies; crew members will have the opportunity to push against the footboard to cause muscular contraction and encourage blood flow; the suit may provide some protection from the pressure points caused by the restraint system, which could cause blood flow restriction; and crew member body weight may be distributed more uniformly across the restraint system, also preventing pressure points.

## Conclusions

No exactly comparable population exists that would allow precise and definitive answers to the questions posed by the Landing and Recovery Subsystem designers with regard to the physiological effects of being restrained in an Orion seat while in a stable 2 configuration. There are enough similarities between crew member posture in the Orion stable 2 configuration and the harness studies reviewed, however, to make an informed recommendation for system requirements. The drivers for conservatism in this analysis are as follows: crew members are significantly more physiologically vulnerable after a long-duration mission to the effects of the posture caused by stable 2, which may negate any benefits of the Orion seat and restraint system; the cabin and in-suit environment may contribute to physiological compromise via thermal stress; and the sea state will exacerbate neuro-vestibular disturbance. Without performing an exact analysis of the suit/ seat/ restraint system to be used by Orion, a conservative analysis of the available literature must be used.

Based on the review of several terrestrial studies and the documented deconditioning of long-duration crew members, Space Medicine has identified that symptom onset will occur in as little as 3.5 min. Crew members will need to know whether the up-righting system is active or failed within this timeframe to determine the best course of action to take before cognitive deficits begin. The vehicle should be capable of up-righting itself within 7 min. If the system has failed, crew members will have to remove themselves from restraints to prevent worsening of symptoms and potential incapacitation. Crew members may be injured if they must release themselves from the restraints, and the risk of injury is significantly increased when the vehicle is up-righted while the crew is not restrained. Finally, if the crew is exposed to the stable 2 posture for an extended duration (15 min or more), the rescue will have to be treated as a medical emergency.

## Concurrence

Signature on File \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 09/28/09 \_\_\_\_\_

James D. Polk, D.O.

Chief Space Medicine Division

Signature on File \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 10/05/09 \_\_\_\_\_

Terrance Taddeo, M.D.

Chief Medical Operations Branch

## References

- 1) Lee C, Porter KM. Suspension trauma. *Emerg Med J.* Apr 2007;24(4):237–238.
- 2) Werntz CL 3<sup>rd</sup>. Workers at height are required to use fall prevention systems. What are the health risks from being suspended in a harness? *J Occup Environ Med.* Jul 2008;50(7):858–859.
- 3) Roggla G, Moser B, Roggla M. Re: Suspension trauma. *Emerg Med J.* Jan 2008;25(1):59.
- 4) Turner NL, Wassell JT, Whisler R, et al. Suspension tolerance in a full-body safety harness, and a prototype harness accessory. *J Occup Environ Hyg.* Apr 2008;5(4):227–231.
- 5) Roggla M, Brunner M, Michalek A, et al. Cardiorespiratory response to free suspension simulating the situation between fall and rescue in a rock climbing accident. *Wilderness Environ Med.* May 1996;7(2):109–114.
- 6) Orzech MA, Goodwin MD, Brinkley JW, et al. Test Program to Evaluate Human Response to Prolonged Motionless Suspension in Three Types of Fall Protection Harnesses. Ohio, USA: Harry G Armstrong Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory, September 1987, AAMRL-TR-87-055, AD-A262 508. Available at: <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA262508>. Accessed on 03/03/2010.
- 7) Seddon P. Harness suspension: review and evaluation of existing information. Contract Research Report 451/2002 prepared for the British Health and Safety Executive. Available at: [www.hse.gov.uk](http://www.hse.gov.uk). Accessed on 03/03/2010.
- 8) OSHA. *Safety and Health Information Bulletin: Suspension Trauma/Orthostatic Intolerance*. SHIB 03-24-2004. Available at: <http://www.osha.gov/dts/shib/shib032404.html>. Accessed on 03/03/2010.
- 9) Lindgren K, Mathes, K, Scheuring, R, et al. *The Skylab Medical Operations Project: Recommendations to Improve Crew Health and Performance for Future Exploration Missions*; Aug 2009. NASA/TM-2009-214790.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)	2. REPORT DATE March 2010	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED TP-2010-216119		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Assessment of Prone Positioning of Restrained, Seated Crew Members in a Post-landing Stable 2 Orion Configuration			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Yael Barr*, Jennifer Fogarty**				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center Houston, Texas 77058			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBERS S-1064	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546-0001			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER TP-2010-216119	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES *University of Texas Medical Branch Galveston and Wyle Integrated Science and Engineering Group; **NASA Johnson Space Center, Houston				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT  Unclassified/Unlimited Available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information (CASI) 7115 Standard Hanover, MD 21076-1320 Category: 54			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)  During the June 2009 Orion landing and recovery subsystem design review, it was noted that the human system and various vehicle systems (eg, the Environmental Control and Life Support System and Guidance, Navigation, and Control System) are negatively affected by Orion assuming a stable 2 (upside down) configuration post landing. The stable 2 configuration, which is predicted to occur about 50% of the time, will be countered by an active up-righting system. Post-landing balloons will deploy and inflate, causing the vehicle to assume or maintain the stable 1 (up-right) configuration. During the design review, it was proposed that the up-righting system could be capable of righting the vehicle within 60 sec. However, this time limit posed a series of constraints on the design that made it less robust than desired. This report focuses on assessing the human system in the posture assumed when Orion is in the stable 2 configuration. Stable 2 will place suited, seated, and restrained crew members in a prone, head-up position for a period of time dependent on the functionality of the up-righting systems, ability of crew members to release themselves from the seat and restraints, and/or time to arrival of rescue forces.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS  environmental control; spacecraft guidance; spacecraft configurations; posture, human body; crew procedures (inflight); seats; reentry effects; seat belts			15. NUMBER OF PAGES  18	16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT  Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE  Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT  Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT  Unlimited	



---