## **CUSHION PACKAGING CHART**

Learn more from the packaging experts at ValleyBox.com or call 866.449.2882



PRODUCTS		PERCEIVED ADVANTAGES		POTENTIAL DISADVANTAGES	
	Polyethylene (PE)	Multiple-impact protection     Lightweight     Flexible     Higher load-bearing capacity than PU	Unaffected by chemicals     Resilient     Easily fabricated     Available with     antistatic and fire- retardant additives	<ul> <li>Requires fabrication</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Requires storage space</li> <li>Less "thickness- efficient" than PU</li> </ul>
	Expandable Polystyrene (EPS)	<ul><li>Rigid</li><li>Lightweight</li><li>Good esthetics</li><li>Relatively inexpensive</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Manufacturing can be automated</li> <li>Available with anti-static and fire- retardant additives</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Design development</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Lacks multiple-impact protection</li> <li>Requires storage space</li> </ul>
	Resilient Moldable Beads (RMBs)	Same as EPS     Provides multiple-impact protection		Equipment cost     Raw material cost     Compressive creep	<ul> <li>Requires storage space</li> </ul>
	Polyurethane (PU)	Lightweight     Flexible     Resilient     Provides multiple-impact protection	Relatively inexpensive     Available with antistatic and fire-retardant additives	capacity	<ul> <li>Requires storage space</li> <li>Requires fabrication</li> </ul>
	Polyurethane Foam-in-Place	Cost-effective     Minimal storage space required     Low density	<ul> <li>No need for sophisticated custom design</li> <li>Ability to package onsite as needed</li> <li>Can be automated</li> </ul>	Lacks multiple-impact protection     Cushion thickness must often be increased     Large volumes required     Capital investment	Equipment maintenance     Messy     Labor intensive     Handling/storage/     disposal of on-site     chemicals
	Expandable Polystyrene (EPS Loose-Fill)	Inexpensive     Doesn't use floor space	<ul><li>Lightweight</li><li>Easy to use</li><li>Reduces labor costs</li><li>Reduces shipping costs</li></ul>	Settles     Messy	<ul> <li>Not designed for heavy objects</li> </ul>
	Foam Wraps: Polypropylene (PP) Polyethylene (PE) Polyurethane (PU)	Good drapability Lightweight Flexible Lightweight Flexible Soft Relatively inexpensive (less than PP or PE)	<ul> <li>Soft • Thin gauge</li> <li>Heat sealable</li> <li>Uniform cell size</li> <li>Heat sealable</li> <li>Lightweight</li> <li>Flexible • Soft</li> </ul>	Nonuniform in appearance     Relatively expensive     Easily compressed	<ul> <li>Relatively expensive</li> <li>Doesn't provide a moisture barrier</li> </ul>
	Cellulose wadding	Better cushioning and aesthetics than plain paper Absorbent (bottled chemical applications)  Better cushioning and aesthetics than plain paper  chemical applications)		Same as shredded or wadded paper	Absorbency can cause moisture retention and weaken packaging
	Shredded/wadded paper	Cheap     Plentiful     Disposable		Inconsistent protection     Crushes     Susceptible to moisture	<ul> <li>Labor-intensive application</li> <li>Adds to shipping costs</li> <li>Poor esthetics</li> </ul>
	Excelsion	Few, if any, when compared with other packaging materials     Adds to premium look of wine and gourmet foods packaging		Labor intensive     Messy     More expensive than paper	<ul> <li>Heavier than paper</li> <li>Susceptible to infestation</li> </ul>