Workshop: Validating Fume Hood Safety and Mitigating Risk

Sun May 11, 2:30 PM - 4:30 PM








Chip Albright "Founder"
www.fumehoodcertified.com

Since 1980


MAKING LABS SAFER
FHC
ONE FUME HOOD AT A TIME



•How many of you have ever been asked about fume hood performance during a project?

•Who here has actually *seen* a fume hood being tested?
(face velocity, containment, tracer gas testing, anything.)

Fume Hoods 101: What Architects Need to Know





When people hear "fume hood," they often think it’s just a box with an exhaust fan.

In reality, a fume hood is a carefully engineered **containment device** — designed to capture, contain, dilute and exhaust hazardous vapors, gases, and particulates **before** they can enter the room.

ECD- Exposure Control Device

Knowledge is Power



- Laboratories = High-risk environments
- Fume Hoods are standalone, they are the user interface to the mechanical system
- Fume hood failures = Serious accidents, lawsuits, reputational harm, substantial cost
- False sense of security: Face velocity ≠ containment
- Slower face velocities result in less dilution

Loss of containment is a performance failure

Many Things Look Like Fume Hoods but Are Not



Types of Hoods and Exhaust Devices

- Conventional (Constant Volume) Hoods
- Variable Air Volume (VAV) Hoods
- High-Performance Fume Hoods
- Specialty Hoods (Radioisotope, Perchloric Acid, Acid Digestion)
- Snorkels, Laminar Flow Hoods

Containment Matters Regardless of Face Velocity

Turbulence causes the hood to become unstable and results in loss of containment.



Containment is Dynamic

- Building HVAC influence
- User behavior influence
- Room disturbances (doors, vents, walkways)
- Equipment blocking airflow

Understanding ASHRAE 110

- Is not a Pass/Fail Standard
- Is not a measure of safety
- Snapshot in time testing
- Simulated conditions, not real-life conditions



ASHRAE110 is a testing protocol, not a safety standard



This standard defines a reproducible method of testing laboratory hoods. It does not define safe procedures. However, laboratory hoods are considered by many to be the primary safety devices in conducting laboratory operations.

There are many important factors in the safe operation of laboratory hoods that are not described in this standard.

Meaningful Excerpts

- ANSI/ASHRAE 110 may be used in the laboratory as an accepted test with specific values for the control levels (and the release rate if you depart from the standard). It also may be used for routine periodic testing, but it is somewhat expensive and other less rigorous tests may be adequate if conditions have not changed since commissioning tests.

- The test data should be available from the manufacturer for each specific model and type of hood so a potential buyer to assist with design specifications or compare one manufacturer's hood containment against another.

- Values for control level may not be suitable for establishing hood safety, as the tracer gas test methods may not adequately simulate actual material use, risk, or generation characteristics. In addition, the tracer gas test does not simulate a live operator, who may increase potential for escape due to operator size, movements near the hood opening, or improper hood use.

More on tracer gas

- Hood containment should be evaluated at different mannequin heights to represent workers of different height. AM 0.05 can be achieved with a properly designed laboratory fume hood. It should not be implied that this exposure level is safe. Safe exposure levels are application specific and should be evaluated by properly trained personnel (SEFA 1-2010, Recommended Practices for Laboratory Fume Hoods).

- The tracer gas, Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF6), typically used during ANSI/ASHRAE 110 fume hood performance tests has been identified as a very potent Green House Gas (GHG). Generation of SF6 is discouraged and banned in some locations requiring specification and use of alternative tracers. ASHRAE has undertaken an investigation to evaluate alternative tracers but have not approved a more environmentally friendly replacement of SF6. Where SF6 tests are discouraged or banned, alternative methods can be utilized where approved by the owner, responsible person and the design team.

More Considerations

- In summary, there are many factors to consider in evaluating the performance of a laboratory hood installation. This standard provides one tool in evaluating such safety

- The procedure is a performance test method and does not constitute a performance specification.

- The desired hood performance should be defined through the cooperative efforts of the user, the chemical hygiene officer, the applications engineer, and other parties affected by the hood performance. It should be noted that the performance test method does not give a direct correlation between testing with a tracer gas and operator exposures.

- The performance test method does, however, give a relative and quantitative determination of the efficiency of the hood containment under a set of specific, although arbitrary, conditions. The same test can be used to evaluate hoods in manufacturer facilities under (presumably) ideal conditions or under some specified condition of room air supply or during the commissioning of a new or renovated laboratory before the user has occupied the laboratory

Test Protocol Details

- The full test procedure (visualization, face velocity, and tracer gas) is a quantitative measurement of a hood's containment ability and is useful for hood development and rigorous evaluation of hood performance.
- This standard does not constitute an engineering investigation of what the causes may be for poor performance or of ways to improve the performance.
- This standard defines a reproducible method of testing laboratory hoods. It does not define safe procedures. However, laboratory hoods are considered by many to be the primary safety devices in conducting laboratory operations

It is important to evaluate the performance of the laboratory hood under dynamic conditions. This performance test method may be modified to evaluate a dynamic challenge.

Specific operations, such as a pedestrian walking past the hood, laboratory doors opening, and specific actions at the hood, are only a few of the challenges that could be expected at the hood.

This test method addresses only the dynamic challenge of sash movement.

VAV hoods place a significant emphasis on the sash movement and the potential effect on hood performance. However, some constant-volume hoods may also experience a decrease in protection when the sash is moved.

Face Velocity ≠ Containment

- 80–100 fpm typical target
- Passing face velocity doesn't guarantee safe containment
- High-performance hoods operate at lower velocities (~60 fpm)

If a hood is losing containment, it is failing

Key Takeaway

- The fume hood isn't an appliance — it's part of a system.

- (Hood Design + Lab Design + Room airflow + User behavior = Containment success)



Figure 4 Diagram depicting ECD Systems and energy use corresponding to the range of airflow modulation.

2

When a Fume Hood Fails



For a fume hood to work properly, you have to look at all these factors

Fume Hood Design



Lab Design /User Work Practices

Laboratory Ventilation System

Why do hoods fail to perform Safely?



25% perform poorly due to design issues. Either hood design issues (10%) or lab design issues (15%).

50% perform poorly because of room conditions. Improper balance, VAV lag time, placement of supply air, etc.

25% perform poorly because of user work practices. We have to consider the user part of the laboratory ventilation system.

Unless we address hood performance in a holistic way and address all three of the above factors, we will not optimize fume hood performance and if hoods are not performing safely, not only are wasting money, but you increasing liability

Containment is Fragile



To move from theory into reality, I want to walk you through a real-world fume hood failure.

This isn’t just about mechanical systems — it’s about how small decisions, missed warnings, and lack of coordination can lead to devastating consequences.

At a large, well-known university, a brand-new science building opened with state-of-the-art labs. The fume hoods installed were high-efficiency, low-flow models, designed to save energy.

On paper, everything looked great — ASHRAE 110 reports looked good, face velocity was in spec, and the system met LEED standards.

Six months later, a graduate student was working with volatile organic solvents inside a hood.

Despite the hood showing “normal” airflow on the monitor, vapors escaped into the lab. An ignition source was nearby — a small explosion occurred.

The student suffered serious burns. Investigations showed:

•The fume hood **failed to contain vapors** due to turbulence at the sash opening.
•Supply air vents were located directly above the fume hood — causing **cross-drafts** that disrupted containment.
•The building management system had been **adjusted** post-occupancy to optimize energy savings, unintentionally reducing exhaust rates.
•The student was **unaware** of how sensitive hood performance could be to these factors.



Velocity does not indicate or predict containment

In fact, over 70% of hoods that perform poorly on a containment test have acceptable face velocities

Lower Explosion Limit

Small quantities of chemicals can pollute the air and create an explosive atmosphere, potentially in the vortex of a hood.







A different kind of containment

Fume hoods can also provide passive protection from physical threats.

The sash is a **“safety shield”** - a barrier between the user and the hazards

The sash protects users from hazards such as:

- Chemical splashes
- Sprays
- Runaway experiments
- Small fires
- Minor explosions

If you are hood user, the sash is your best friend!

Lessons Learned
From this failure, several critical lessons emerge:

1. Inadequate Testing
•Testing needs to go beyond initial ASHRAE 110.
•**Commissioning must validate containment** with full building airflow in operation.
•Changes to building systems should **trigger retesting**.

2. Poor User Training
•Lab users often assume “the hood will protect me” without understanding how airflow and sash use affect performance.
•**Training must emphasize that hoods are containment tools, not magic shields.**

3. Misaligned Expectations Between Design and Operations
•Architects, engineers, contractors, and owners often treat fume hoods as static equipment.
•But they must be seen as **dynamic systems** — affected by building pressure changes, occupancy, retrofits, and even furniture placement.

•**Question:**
- "Does your client have a plan for retesting hoods periodically or after system changes?"
- If not, your design might be setting up future risks without realizing it.

Question:

- Does your client have a plan for retesting hoods periodically or after system changes?

- If not, your design might be setting up future risks without you realizing it.



Failure to properly select, design, operate, use and maintain ECD systems may:

- Increase the potential for unacceptable impact on the **health of people**
- Increase the potential for **harm to the environment**
- Increase the potential for **premature degradation of the fume hood and equipment**
- Increase the potential for the **loss of productivity and operational efficiency**
- Increase the potential to have **lab work/results compromised** by contamination
- Increase **unnecessary energy consumption** and **operating costs**
- Increase the **risk of non-conformance with regulatory and industry standards**
- Increase the **risk of liability**



If there was an accident and it make it to a jury trial, which of these would you rather have?



Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
EETD – Applications Team

LBID - 2457

BERKELEY LAB

ASHRAE 110 Tracer Gas Containment Test

Prototype Berkeley hood;
"Final" Configuration

Sponsored by:
U.S. Dept. of Energy

Report Date: 22 October 2001

Test Date: 18 August 2000

Dale Sartor P.E., Principal Investigator

Geoffrey C. Bell P.E., Project Head

Team Members:

LBNL Staff	Students
Douglas Sullivan	Joe Walsh
Darryl Dickerhoff	Wayne Huang
Dennis DeBartolomeo	Kevin Fox

A formal, printed report

Safety Stickers

Chemical Fume Hood Evaluation

Date of Evaluation:_____

Evaluation by:_____

Measured Face Velocity:_____

Result:_____







FUME HOOD # _____

FACE VELOCITY: _____ **FPM**

DATE: _____ **CHECKED BY:** _____



Actual
Video
Evidence



3

The Architect’s Risk Profile

How Design Decisions Create Legal Exposure



As architects, you know you carry liability for life safety — but in laboratories, that risk profile grows exponentially.

Let’s be clear:

•If you specify the wrong type of fume hood for the application

•If your layout contributes to airflow disruptions

•If your documents don't clearly define testing, commissioning, or revalidation requirements

•Or if performance expectations aren’t documented properly

You can be named in lawsuits if there is a lab accident involving exposure, injury, fire, or death.

Common Legal Arguments Against Architects:

- "You designed an unsafe lab environment.“
- "You failed to specify proper safety validation.“
- "You did not ensure systems matched operational needs.“
- "You left risk unaddressed between design and operations."





You don't have to be *solely* responsible to be *held liable*. Joint and several liability applies — meaning you can be pulled into major legal settlements even if others (engineers, contractors, owner) also share blame.



This creates a **huge gap** between **what they think they are buying** and **what actually gets delivered**.

If you don't spell out the performance verification, acceptance testing, and maintenance expectations **in writing**, you are setting yourself up for claims later — especially after an accident.

Owner Expectations vs. Delivered Performance

Owners often assume:

•That the fume hood "works" if it's installed.
•That code compliance means performance safety.
•That architects and engineers have verified operational safety, not just design compliance.
But here's the reality:
•Building codes focus on *minimum life safety*, not chemical containment performance.
•Owners are often **never taught** how fragile fume hood containment is.
•Most owners do not request or budget for full ASHRAE 110 containment testing or periodic retesting.

Your Design Decisions = Legal Exposure

- Wrong hood specified
- Layout impacts fume hood performance
- Missing commissioning/testing requirements
- Duty of care: jointly liable even if others share blame

Common Legal Arguments Against Architects

- Unsafe lab design alleged
- Performance not validated
- Operational needs not met
- Risks unaddressed in design documents

Owner Expectations vs. Delivered Performance

Owners assume:

- Installed = Safe
- Code compliant = Operationally safe
- Reality:
- Building code ≠ containment
- Gaps in performance expectations

Best Practice: Clear Specification Language

Include In Your Specification:

- Dynamic containment testing
- Fully operational HVAC during testing
- Commissioning documentation
- Periodic revalidation
- Training requirements
- Record Keeping

Quick Discussion

- What are architects specifying?
  - ?

- What should they be specifying?
  - Dynamic containment
  - Commissioning standards
  - Coordination
  - Record Keeping
  - User education

Let’s do a quick exercise!



I’m handing out a sample fume hood specification, take 2 minutes to skim through it.

Your task: Identify what’s missing

- ✅ Containment performance specified?
- ✅ Testing method defined beyond face velocity?
- ✅ Room airflow disturbance control addressed?
- ✅ Revalidation requirements stated?
- ✅ User training mentioned?
- ✅ Clear acceptance criteria provided?

Mini-Exercise: Spot the Risks

- Skim the sample spec
- Identify what's missing:
- Containment performance?
- Testing method?
- Revalidation?
- User training?
- Acceptance criteria?

Group Discussion

- What gaps did you find?

- Would this spec protect the architect after an accident?

Key Takeaway

- Every word you write — or omit — either manages risk or creates it.
- Push toward validated, documented, defensible systems.

Architects must move beyond simply providing systems that "comply" and push toward systems that are **validated, documented, and defensible**.

4

Validating Performance in the Real World

- How to know a fume hood is really safe — not just compliant.



Earlier we discussed that installed equipment doesn't automatically guarantee safety.
Now we shift to **how performance is validated** — how you can know if a fume hood is truly containing hazards in the real world, not just on paper.
We'll look at standard industry testing methods, show you some real-world containment behavior, and engage you in making some judgment calls yourself.

Introduction: Why Validate?

- Installed ≠ Safe

- Real-world conditions and behavior matters more than design specs.

Testing Overview: ASHRAE 110

While ASHRAE 110 is a well-established testing protocol, it does little to ensure safety. Coupled with Z9.5 “Laboratory Ventilation” There are some result recommendations.

While 110 is a useful tool, it is only one of the tools in performance evaluation.

It is very common when 110 is mentioned in a specification it is refenced incorrectly since there is no pass/fail criteria.

In general, 110 is highlighting turbulence.

ASHRAE 110 is *very useful* — but it's **a controlled test under ideal conditions**. It is a static snapshoot under prescribed conditions.

In the real world, room disturbances, poor maintenance, or bad user practices can cause even a well-tested hood to fail.

Key Point

- ASHRAE 110 is essential, but not enough to guarantee real-world containment.

- And to be useful it has to be properly specified



How many people work at an empty hood in an unoccupied building? Not very realistic.

Laser Airflow Visualizer

- Real-time visualization of airflow behavior
- Colored beams highlight turbulence and containment breaches
- Great for diagnosis, training, and repair validation
- The dynamic challenges are everyday real-world conditions
- Results are highly visible, more dramatic than numbers on paper
- Results are documented with video for future reference

Lab Manager

SAFETY EXCELLENCE

AWARDS

CHIP ALBRIGHT

FUME HOOD CERTIFIED

At Fume Hood Certified.

Key Takeaway

- If you wouldn’t trust standing in front of that hood, don’t approve it for others.

5

Design Strategies That Make Hoods More Robust

What can we do?

- Architectural decisions that improve fume hood performance.

Introduction

- Containment success begins with design.

- Small choices → Big impact on safety.

Do’s and Don’ts: Hood Placement

- Place on low-traffic walls
- Leave 12–18" side clearance between hoods
- Avoid air disturbance zones
- Don't place across from doors or heavy traffic.

Do’s and Don’ts: Sash Positioning

- Use vertical sashes, when possible, avoid combo sashes
- Include sash stops
- Automate sash closing if feasible
- Don't assume users will lower sashes manually.

Do’s and Don’ts: Exhaust Routing

- Short, direct exhaust ducts no 90 degree turns
- Be aware of duct velocity and duct noise
- Dedicated exhausts for incompatibles
- Coordinate with MEP early
- Don't overcomplicate duct runs.

Do’s and Don’ts: Avoiding Cross-Drafts

- Diffusers pointing away from hoods, no high velocity diffusers
- Maintain slight negative pressure in room
- Coordinate room airflow balance
- No supply vents near hood face.

Air is a fluid and follows the laws of fluid dynamics, while water flows downhill, air flows from high pressure to low pressure areas





Turbulence is the number one cause of loss of containment



Turbulence









Fume Hood “A”

Half/Design Opening

59	104	88	114	60
52	92	74	102	56

Average Face Velocity: 80

Fume Hood “B”

Half/Design Opening

80	82	84	82	82
79	81	76	79	78

Average Face Velocity: 80

Hood “A”, the airflow is very turbulent and would likely fail containment testing.

Whereas “B”, is much more laminar and will have more robust containment.

Why a hood with adequate face velocity could still have unsafe loss of containment.

It isn't about face velocity, there are many reasons that a hood could have an acceptable velocity but still not be performing safely.



Fume Hood Face Velocity Tests



What design actions have you taken to improve fume hood performance?

Reinforcing Good Practices

Examples:

- Hood orientation
- Auto sash closers
- Airflow zoning
- HVAC integration early in design

Key Takeaway

- Good lab design = Proactive containment engineering.

- Design choices make hoods perform better and protect everyone.

6

Recap & Open Floor Q&A

Key Takeaway 1



- Design for performance, not just code compliance.
- Real-world containment > Minimum standards.

Key Takeaway 2

- Insist on real validation, not just a sticker
- Tracer gas
- Smoke visualization
- Dynamic commissioning



Key Takeaway 3

- Partner with testing professionals early.

- Early input = Fewer surprises, safer labs, lower liability.

Handout Details

- 10 Questions Every Architect Should Ask About Fume Hood Safety



Final Closing Thought

- Every lab you help design is a chance to save lives, protect discoveries, and advance science safely.

- Thank you for designing smarter, safer spaces.



We converted the book…

No, not into a movie, which would be cool,

but into a **free** online course

Check it out, we want everyone who is a fume hood stakeholder to have access to this information.

fumehoodonlinecourse.com



Thank you for your time and attention!

Any Questions?

Slides, videos, and other references can be downloaded at

www.fumehoodcertified.com/ldc2025

Making Labs Safer One Fume Hood at a Time

Chip Albright
Founder and President
Fume Hood Certified, LLC

chip@fumehoodcertified.com





Fume Hood Certified, LLC
PO Box 71477
Phoenix, AZ 85050 USA
+1 (623) 562 - 0907

www.fumehoodcertified.com

www.tricolorlasertesting.com

www.fumehoodtesterscatalog.com

www.fumehoodperformance.com

ASHRAE

LEED AP

Creative Solutions

SEFA MEMBER