

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 this 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 Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) May 1983			2. REPORT TYPE Conference Proceedings			3. DATES COVERED (From - To)		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Development and Evaluation of a Device for the Prevention of Army Flail Injuries						5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
						5b. GRANT NUMBER		
						5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) Michael P. Connors Lawrence J. Specker Thomas J. Jennings						5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
						5e. TASK NUMBER		
						5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory Aerospace Medical Division, Air Force Systems Command Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433						8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) US Air Force Research Laboratory 2800 Q Street, Bldg 824 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH 45433-7947						10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
						11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.								
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES ASMA Proceedings, May 1983, pp. 178-179								
14. ABSTRACT								
15. SUBJECT TERMS								
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:				17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON John R. Buhrman		
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) 937-255-3121					
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified		UU	2			

DEVELOPEMENT AND EVALUATION OF A DEVICE FOR THE PREVENTION OF ARM FLAIL INJURIES

Michael P. Connors, Lawrence J. Specker, and Thomas J. Jennings

Air Force Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory
Aerospace Medical Division, Air Force Systems Command
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

INTRODUCTION. Past attempts to provide arm flail protection for USAF emergency ejection seats have not been successful. The devices that have been designed have ranged from mechanically deployed web nets to paddles which retain the arms during the ejection sequence. Although each system has had advantages, factors such as mechanical complexity, lack of crew acceptance, weight, space limitations, and dependence on directional stability of the ejection seat have precluded their acceptance or operational effectiveness.

To overcome these factors, the authors designed and tested an active limb restraint system that can be used in current and future escape systems. This system, referred to as the Nonrestrictive Arm Restraint (NAR) is a sleeve-mounted strap configuration, as shown in Figure 1. It is attached to the seat by straps which are routed through snubbers to a shear pin on the aircraft floor. Seat motion up the ejection rails activates the system, simultaneously pulling the elbows of the crewmember to his torso and his wrists to the ejection controls. The crewmember is restrained in this position until released at seat/man separation.

A Laboratory test program was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the design. The tests included emergency ground egress, seat/man separation, windblast, and upper limb capture and haulback.

METHODS. An F-4 egress trainer was used to evaluate emergency egress. During these tests a crewmember performed normal pre-flight hookup, with the additional task of routing retraction straps through rings on the arm restraint and into lock-pin boxes on the ejection seat. This action was performed to engage the NAR. Emergency egress was then executed without deviating from established emergency egress procedures.

Seat/man separation during escape was also simulated using the F-4 egress trainer. All restraint systems, including the NAR, were cinched tightly to simulate the crewmember's positioning in the airstream. An observer activated the emergency release handle to simulate the operation of the automatic recovery sequence thruster that releases the crewmember's restraint system during seat/man separation. The subject was then hoisted from the seat to simulate separation.

The windblast tests were conducted at the Dayton T. Brown Windblast Facility using a 95th percentile dummy seated in an ACES II ejection seat. Controlled release of stored, compressed

AFRL BIODYNAMIC DATA BANK




FIGURE 1.

air simulated the windblast environment. It was planned to test the NAR at airspeeds of 309 +10 m/s (600 +20 KEAS) for a minimum of 0.3 seconds. Seven seat attitudes were to be used. Arm restraint loads were measured at the seat connections and windblast velocities were recorded.

Arm capture and haulback tests were accomplished using the AFAMRL Body Positioning and Restraint Device (BPRD) with volunteer subjects and anthropomorphic dummies. The BPRD is a hydraulically actuated retraction system used to evaluate restraint and positioning systems. Retraction force was applied to the NAR by cables routed through a series of pulleys to the hydraulic actuators of the BPRD. Retraction strap velocities were increased by raising the hydraulic pressure. Load cells mounted in line with the cable measured the retraction strap forces. High speed and video cameras recorded each test for photometric evaluation. Retraction velocities were gradually increased to levels approaching expected operational strap retraction velocities which have been estimated to be 9.3 m/s as shown in Figure 2.

Twenty-one volunteer subjects, twenty male and one female, participated in the haulback test program. Their arm lengths measured from the wrist (stylium) to the shoulder (acromion) varied from 0.54 m to 0.68 m with a mean of 0.61 m.

Five different initial arm positions were evaluated. These were the "D-Ring" position, where the

ASMA Proceedings, 1983
pp. 178-179

20060926065

subject placed both hands on the ejection control; the "Front" position, with both arms placed directly in front of the subject; the "Side" position, with the arms held horizontal to the subject's sides; and the "Above" position with the arms positioned above the subject's head; and the "Across" position, with one arm extended across the chest. The position of the subject's hands after retraction were at the D-Ring initiation control. Each subject wore thick work gloves and ensolite padding on the thighs and forearms for protection.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION. The emergency egress and seat/man separation tests demonstrated minimal ingress tasks, positive release during seat/man separation, and unimpeded egress from the aircraft. These tests also demonstrated unrestricted crewmember mobility and the ease of integrating the NAR with an existing ejection seat.

Eight windblast tests were performed. All tests except test 8 were accomplished with an ejection rail angle of 17°. The yaw angle was 0° except in test 6 where a 45° yaw angle was used. Failure of the NAR sleeves due to inadequate seam strength was the primary defect demonstrated by these tests. Both sleeves failed in tests 1, 3, and 4 at windstream velocities ranging from 345 to 371 m/s (670 to 720 knots). No failures were observed in test 2 at 311 m/s (605 knots), but the duration of the windblast exposure did not meet the minimum time requirement. The NAR successfully withstood windstream velocities of 346 m/s (672 knots) and 349 m/s (677 knots) in tests 5 and 7 respectively. The straps of the inertia reel failed during test 6 at 349 m/s (677 knots). During test 8, where the seat was pitched 18° forward, the stitches on the upper part of the right sleeve failed when exposed to a windblast velocity of 344 m/s (668 knots). The maximum strap force measured was 4072 N (911 lbs) which occurred during test 8.

The arm capture and haulback test results indicated that the retraction of the arms in a 1 g field could be safely performed in 55 milliseconds with retraction strap lengths of 0.6 m. The maximum retraction strap force measured was 894 N recorded in a "Front" position test at a retraction strap velocity of 7.8 m/s. Selected parameters from retraction tests at the most severe test conditions are presented in Table 1. Eleven

retractions were performed at these conditions and 61 retractions were accomplished in total.

One experimental condition purposely did not reproduce an operational retraction. In the laboratory tests, the NAR was fastened to the retracting cable with the piston fully retracted and adjusted for comfort. This assured that no significant afterload would be placed on the subject by the hydraulics after retraction. This would not be true during actual ejection. The terminal ring of the fully deployed NAR would be a the snubber preventing afterloads produced by excessive retraction. It is anticipated that the forces would continue to increase in the retracting straps during the ejection sequence, but this increase would be due to aerodynamic and inertial loading and not from the NAR deployment.

The protective padding proved unnecessary. All subjects reported the experimental retractions as a pleasant break from their "normal" impact stress panel exposures.




FIGURE 2.

Laboratory tests have demonstrated the strengths of the NAR design and its potential for reducing windblast injuries to the upper limbs. It is currently a candidate in a program to provide a limb restraint system for the ACES II ejection seat.

REFERENCES

1. Cummings, R. J., Adams, W. J., Aircrew Windblast Protection Concepts, Development and Evaluation, AFAMRL-TR-80-123, March 1982.
2. Specker, L. J., Jennings, T. J., Connors, M.P., Simple Nonrestrictive Arm Restraint System, U. S. Patent Application, October 1982.

TABLE 1. SELECTED RETRACTION TEST PARAMETERS*

INITIAL POSITION	STRAP VELOCITY (m/s)		PEAK FORCES (N)		RETRACTION STRAP LENGTH (m)	
	RIGHT	LEFT	RIGHT	LEFT	RIGHT	LEFT
D-Ring	7.5 (-)	11.0 (-)	431 (-)	516 (-)	0.58 (-)	0.62 (-)
Front	9.5 (0.9)	9.4 (1.0)	583 (62)	627 (13)	0.58 (0.03)	0.59 (0.04)
Across	9.9 (0.5)	10.2 (0.03)	641 (41)	658 (44)	0.56 (0.06)	0.61 (0.02)
Above	9.4 (-)	9.4 (-)	649 (-)	649 (-)	0.56 (-)	0.60 (-)
Side	9.4 (0.4)	9.4 (0)	694 (28)	707 (9)	0.63 (0.01)	0.64 (0.03)

*TABULATED VALUES ARE EXPERIMENTAL MEANS WITH THE STANDARD DEVIATION IN PARENTHESIS (DATA WERE COLLECTED AT 700 PSI WITH 2 PISTONS, 4 PULLEYS/PISTON)