



For Foam Plastic Insulation, Extrusion Matters Performance Equals Resisting Water XPS Performs Better Than EPS

Technical Bulletin

Polystyrene Insulation Types

There are two types of rigid polystyrene foam plastic insulation, extruded (XPS), and expanded (EPS).

- XPS is manufactured in a continuous extrusion process that produces a homogeneous closed cell cross section (Fig 1).
- EPS is manufactured by expanding spherical beads in a mold, using heat and pressure to fuse the beads together where they touch, leaving open spaces between the beads where they don't touch (Fig. 2).

Although both types are comprised of polystyrene, the two types of manufacturing processes produce finished products with very different performance properties. Of the two types, EPS absorbs more water in laboratory tests and in application resulting in reduced performance. This bulletin explains the important difference between XPS and EPS and demonstrates that extrusion matters.

AASHTO M230, ASTM D6817 and ASTM C578: Water Absorption Differences in XPS and EPS

These widely used industry standards define rigid polystyrene insulation. The standards are the basis of design for a variety of construction insulation applications for both building and geo-technical polystyrene foam or "geofoam".

Both XPS and EPS are manufactured to meet the physical property specifications in ASTM C578¹, ASTM D6817⁵ and AASHTO M230². For any type of construction it is important that the rigid insulation chosen for use possess properties that are suitable for the application. That is particularly critical when rigid insulation will be exposed to water as in protected membrane roofing, or below grade uses including foundations, frost protected shallow foundations, and geotechnical applications such as under pavement and lightweight fill replacement.

The most important difference between EPS and XPS is the amount of water absorbed by each. Although some EPS manufacturers attempt to disguise it, EPS absorbs more water than XPS. Absorbed water results

in lost insulation power (R-value). Lost R-value results in reduced performance. The industry standards separate EPS and XPS types so that important physical property differences like water absorption can be identified for specifications purposes. See Table 1.

Resisting Water Absorption is Critical for High Performance Insulation

Over the lifetime of a building or paved surface water gets into, and lingers in, the soil around the construction. Therefore, where the purpose of the insulation is to insulate, the most important characteristic of the insulation is its ability to retain R-value and continue to insulate even when exposed to water for long periods of time. Water is an excellent conductor of heat, so if insulation is water soaked, R-value is lost. If absorbed water freezes and thaws the insulation structure will breakdown over time and structural integrity can be compromised.

There are two keys to resisting water absorption:

- The plastic itself must be hydrophobic (repels water), not hydrophilic (attracts water), and,
- The cell structure must be continuous and closed.

What Closed Cell Means


Some specifications are written to require compliance with AASHTO M230 "except the extrusion process is not required...". Actually, the extrusion process is the most important difference between EPS and XPS and it results in one of the most important performance differences which is water absorption.

Both XPS and EPS are manufactured using polystyrene which is a hydrophobic polymer that repels water. The big difference that causes EPS to absorb more water than XPS is a result of the manufacturing process. The XPS continuous extrusion process produces a homogeneous "closed cell" matrix with each cell fully enclosed by polystyrene walls. The EPS bead molding process, although individual beads are closed cell, leaves open voids between beads where water enters.

Table 1

Water Absorption as Defined by Industry Standards (volume %)			
	XPS	EPS	Difference
ASTM C578	0.3	3.0 to 4.0	10 -13 X
AASHTO M230	0.3	3.0	10 X
ASTM D6817	Does not address water absorption or thermal performance		

Figure 1: Extruded Polystyrene Cell Structure






For Foam Plastic Insulation, Extrusion Matters Performance Equals Resisting Water XPS Performs Better Than EPS

Technical Bulletin

Figure 2: Expanded Polystyrene Cell Structure




Compare XPS (Fig. 1) to EPS (Fig. 2). Because of the homogeneous cross section of XPS, very little water is absorbed into the cell structure. "Closed cell" means very little R-value reducing water will be absorbed into the insulation board. The XPS extrusion process produces that closed cell structure. The EPS expansion process does not, therefore, EPS should be considered an open void structure.

Closed Cell versus Open Cell: The Impact on Water Absorption

Both ASTM C578 and AASHTO M230 require that polystyrene insulation be tested for water absorption in accordance with ASTM C272³. C272 requires the sample to be fully immersed in water for 24 hours, and weighed immediately upon removal from immersion to determine the amount of absorbed water. Figure 3 shows the dramatically higher EPS water absorption rate when tested in accordance with the industry mandated standard.

Figure 3: XPS and EPS Water Absorption Compared



Tested in accordance with ASTM C272

EPS Water Absorption via Capillary Action and Wicking

Although industry standards require that water absorption be measured after full immersion, what happens if EPS boards are not fully immersed? What

happens if only a partial area of EPS insulation is exposed to water? The answer is, EPS wicks water into its open void structure even when only a small surface area is exposed to water.

To demonstrate, columns of colored water were sealed over a small surface area of three different densities of EPS (See Fig. 4a). With only a small surface area of EPS exposed to the water column, the colored water traveled by capillary action through voids in the EPS then wicked throughout the entire sample (See Fig. 4b). Using the same method, FOAMULAR[®] XPS showed no water movement into or through its closed cell structure neither by capillary action nor wicking. This demonstration shows the important water absorption differences that result from the EPS bead expansion process compared to the XPS extrusion process.

Figure 4a: EPS Water Absorption via Wicking



Figure 4b: EPS Water Absorption via Wicking



The Effect of Water Absorption on R-Value

It has been demonstrated that EPS absorbs significantly more water than XPS. Although the individual beads of EPS are closed cell, the voids between the beads absorb significant amounts of water, which reduces the already




For Foam Plastic Insulation, Extrusion Matters Performance Equals Resisting Water XPS Performs Better Than EPS

Technical Bulletin

lower in-service R-value of EPS compared to XPS. How much R-value does EPS lose after it absorbs water?

To measure R-value after water absorption samples of EPS were half-submerged in a tray of water for three weeks. (See EPS representative samples in Fig. 5. Tested samples were the standard size for thermal testing, 12 x 12.)

Figure 5: EPS Water Absorption and R-Value Samples



EPS Sample ID: Sample 70 is ASTM C578 Type II, density 1.64 pcf; 71 was identified as Type IX by its manufacturer; but measured 1.62 pcf which is a high density version of Type II; 72 is Type XIV, 2.55 pcf; 73 is Type XV, 2.71 pcf

The samples were periodically removed from the water tray and weighed to determine the amount of water absorbed, and to measure the R-value of the wet EPS sample. For each EPS sample the results show significant water absorption during the first week, continuing water absorption in subsequent weeks, and a corresponding loss of R-value due to the intrusion of highly conductive water into the open voids of the EPS. In three of the four EPS samples note that over the extended test time the amount of water absorbed exceeded the maximum allowed by industry standards. This demonstrates that long term exposure to water and the resulting absorption is a concern regardless of manufacturer claims to the contrary. (See Figures 6a through 6d)

Figure 6: EPS Water Absorption and R-Value Loss

Fig. 6a: EPS Type II, ASTM C578 (Sample 70)




Fig. 6b: EPS Type IX, ASTM C578 (Sample 71)




Fig. 6c: EPS Type XIV, ASTM C578 (Sample 72)




Fig. 6d: EPS Type XV, ASTM C578 (Sample 73)





Fig. 6e: FOAMULAR® 250 XPS, Type IV, ASTM C578





For Foam Plastic Insulation, Extrusion Matters Performance Equals Resisting Water XPS Performs Better Than EPS

Technical Bulletin

Using the same test procedure FOAMULAR® 250 XPS shows minimal water absorption and minimal loss of R-value. (Fig. 6e)

EPS has a Lower R-Value than XPS

As demonstrated, when EPS absorbs water it loses R-value. It must also be noted that dry EPS begins with a lower R-value than XPS. When wetted, the R-value of EPS is even lower making the differences even greater. Dry EPS R-value ranges from 3.1 to 4.3 R per inch depending on density. EPS R-value per inch varies with density because the higher the density, the smaller the open void air spaces between beads, which results in a slightly higher R-value. XPS is a uniform R 5 per inch regardless of density because the XPS cell structure is closed resulting in a uniform and reliable R-value.


Confusing R-Value Claims Comparing XPS and EPS

EPS manufacturers sometimes make R-value claims based on measurements made a lower mean temperature. They do so in part to make a more favorable comparison to XPS.

Nearly all materials have a lower conductivity rate at a lower mean temperature. This is true for XPS and EPS. However, it is not true for water. More about that later.

R-value for rigid insulation board is typically measured in accordance with ASTM C518⁴. The test places a foam board sample horizontally between two parallel plates, one "hot", one "cold", and at consistent but different temperatures. (See Fig. 7)

Figure 7: R-Value Measurement, ASTM C518



R-value is measured through the center section of the sample

"R-value" is reported based on the mean temperature of the two plates. Generally, the lower the mean temperature, the higher the R-value due to slower heat transfer occurring as the mean temperature gets colder.

Better R at Lower Mean Temperature? Not Always.

The phenomenon of "lower mean temperature, higher R-value" generally holds true for all insulation products unless water is absorbed into the sample. Water is one of a few materials for which thermal resistance gets worse rather than better when it gets colder. When the insulation boards are dry, free of absorbed water, EPS and XPS R-values get higher as the mean temperature gets colder. However, when EPS absorbs water, its R-value actually decreases or, goes lower. Re-examine Figures 6a through 6d and see that wet EPS has more R-value loss at 40°F mean temperature compared to the loss at 75°F mean temperature.

Re-examine Fig. 6e and see that the R-value for wetted XPS at 40°F mean temperature remains higher than the R-value at 75°F mean temperature. Why? Because of the dramatically lower water absorption rate of XPS. The XPS absorbed virtually no water.

R-Value Warranty Claims, EPS versus XPS

Warranties are often another confusing point when comparing R-value claims. Some EPS manufacturers claim their product has an R-value that is comparable to XPS. The EPS claims are based on EPS achieving and retaining 100 percent of claimed R, and, based on it never getting wet. Table 2 shows the warranted R-value comparison that is always based on dry insulation.

Data presented in this bulletin shows that EPS gets wet and loses R. Therefore, the shaded columns in Table 2, although not claimed in warranties, show what the R-value claims might be if they were based on real in-service wet conditions. In real applications, particularly below grade, insulation gets wet. Recognition of real world conditions is important when assessing performance.

Table 2

Warranted R-Value Comparison (at 75°F mean temperature)				
	Published R	Dry R Warranty	Wet R	Wet R Warranty
FOAMULAR® XPS	5.0	90% = 4.5	4.92	90% = 4.43
EPS (2.4 pcf)	4.2	100% = 4.2	3.36	100% = 3.36

Notes: Lower density EPS will have a lower R than shown in this table. Shaded columns are not based on actual warranty claims, but are projections of what warranty claims might be if actual in-service wetting was considered.

EPS warranted R-value per inch varies from 3.1 (ASTM C578 Type XI) to 4.3 (Type XV). EPS warranties are sometimes prorated with dollar value coverage diminishing as the warranty progresses toward



For Foam Plastic Insulation, Extrusion Matters Performance Equals Resisting Water XPS Performs Better Than EPS

Technical Bulletin

termination. Others invalidate warranty coverage if water absorption exceeds 3 percent. None address the reduced EPS R-value that results from in-service water absorption.

Water Absorption in Actual Below Grade Contact

Although laboratory test data enables controlled and repeatable product comparisons between EPS and XPS, it is useful to conduct ad-hoc ground contact experiments to verify the real differences that are exposed by laboratory testing.

As explained in this bulletin, lab data repeatedly demonstrates that EPS absorbs more water than XPS. To further verify, a limited scope ground contact study was conducted using multiple samples of EPS and FOAMULAR® XPS buried in an outdoor 12" deep trench. The samples were exposed to the ambient ground water in an otherwise unremarkable commercial building yard condition. During the three week study one sample per week was removed from the trench and weighed to determine the amount water absorbed. The results (Table 3) show that the EPS samples of different densities immediately absorbed ground water at varying rates while the XPS sample absorbed virtually no water during the study.


Table 3

Water Absorption, Limited Ground Contact				
Sample	Density (pcf)	Water Absorption (% vol)		
		Week 1	Week 2	Week 3
EPS	1.62	1.77	3.50	3.57
EPS	2.71	0.86	0.65	0.88
FOAMULAR® 250	1.60	0.0	0.0	0.0

Freeze-Thaw Cycling Damages Wet Insulation

Below grade Insulation gets wet. Wet soil and insulation is often subjected to dozens if not hundreds of freeze-thaw cycles per winter season. Water expands when it freezes. When water is absorbed into the open void structure of EPS insulation it freezes and expands, breaking bonds between beads and opening the EPS structure to increasing amounts of water intrusion during the next cycle. More water absorbed during subsequent cycles results in increasingly greater expansion which leads to further reductions in R-value as the cycles continue over the life of the product. FOAMULAR® XPS maintains its closed cell structure, and maintains its resistance to water absorption even under punishing freeze-thaw cycling (See Fig. 8).

Figure 8: Water Absorption After Freeze-Thaw Cycling



Samples fully submerged in water during freezing and thawing.

EPS Sample ID: Sample 70 is ASTM C578 Type II, density 1.64 pcf; 71 was identified as Type IX by its manufacturer; but measured 1.62 pcf which is a high density version of Type II; 72 is Type XIV, 2.55 pcf; 73 is Type XV, 2.71 pcf

Extrusion Matters

Some highway specifications are written to say, "Insulation Board shall be AASHTO M230, Type VI, except that extrusion is not required and the maximum water absorption by weight is 10%."

As this paper explains the extrusion process results in a continuous and closed cell structure while the EPS molding process results in an open void structure. Specifying "Type IV" which is an extruded type, but not requiring the insulation to be extruded, forfeits the water resisting benefits of extruded.

This paper has also explained that EPS, an open void rigid insulation board, absorbs significant amounts of water that results in lost R-value. When absorbed water freezes and expands, EPS bead bonds break and open further resulting in increased water absorption and lost structural integrity.

When insulation R-value, and structural durability are important for your below grade, under pavement project, then water resistance is important. When water resistance is important, the extrusion process is important, because water gets into below grade/under pavement applications.

Water can migrate under pavement from above, and it can migrate through soil from below. Although soil moisture content varies seasonally, moisture is always present to some degree in soil. Among the reasons that projects have under pavement insulation is that the underlying soil is poorly drained or holds moisture, resulting in a high moisture content, thus making it, and the pavement above it, susceptible to freeze-thaw cycling/heaving. Dry soil is not as susceptible to freeze-



For Foam Plastic Insulation, Extrusion Matters Performance Equals Resisting Water XPS Performs Better Than EPS

Technical Bulletin

thaw driven heaving because there is no/little water to freeze. Generally dry/well drained road bed conditions have little reason to insulate. However, where it is impractical/impossible to de-water/drain the existing soil bed (meaning poor soil conditions), the other option is to limit the freeze-thaw cycles by insulating. Insulation extends the time to freeze, and extends the time to thaw, thereby limiting cycling.

Another aspect of cold air and cold ground surface temperatures is that it “draws” the moisture to it. So, if there is water in the ground, it will migrate to the surface. Freezing of water in the “pores” of soil begins at grade level as heat is removed from the earth by flowing out of the soil to the cold air mass. As the heat flows, it takes with it moisture that eventually begins to freeze at the surface, forming a frozen impermeable ice lens. The ice lens builds as more heat/moisture flows to it.

An insulation's ability to perform in these punishing conditions depends on its ability to effectively resist water absorption like XPS.

Ask Questions. Compare Properties.

This bulletin demonstrates the importance of asking questions to insure that published product claims are directly comparable. It is important to understand significant differences between the extrusion and the expansion process, and between closed cell and open void structure, and to ask about the differences and the claims.

FOAMULAR® Extruded Polystyrene Insulation

Owens Corning manufactures a complete line of FOAMULAR® Extruded Polystyrene Insulation (XPS) products for use in all types of geotechnical and building construction. Manufactured to meet ASTM C578, and AASHTO M230, the primary difference between FOAMULAR® XPS products is compressive strength. All FOAMULAR® products are water resistant, closed

cell, extruded polystyrene. FOAMULAR® XPS has compressive strengths of 15, 25, 40, 60 and 100 psi. The variety of products provides different strengths for use in walls where there is almost no compressive load; or, intermediate strength product for use with modest loads such as around foundations, or in low slope roofs; or, high strength product suitable for use under high load pavement, floors or plaza decks. FOAMULAR® XPS products have an R-value of 5 per inch of thickness, and due to their closed cell structure they resist water absorption, maintaining a high R-value for reliable long term service.

Contact Owens Corning at 1-800-GET-PINK®, or visit www.OCBuildingSpec.com for more information.

References:

1. ASTM C578, Standard Specification for Rigid, Cellular Polystyrene Thermal Insulation; ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959
2. AASHTO M230, Standard Specification for Extruded Foam Board (Polystyrene)
3. ASTM C272. Standard Test Method for Water Absorption of Core Materials for Sandwich Constructions
4. ASTM C518, Standard Test Method for Steady-State Thermal Transmission Properties by Means of the Heat Flow Meter Apparatus
5. ASTM D6817, Standard Specification for Rigid Cellular Polystyrene Geofoam

Please contact 419-248-6557 for additional information. Email: gettech@owenscorning.com

Disclaimer of Liability

Technical information contained herein is furnished without charge or obligation and is given and accepted at recipient's sole risk. Because conditions of use may vary and are beyond our control, Owens Corning makes no representation about, and is not responsible or liable for the accuracy or reliability of data associated with particular uses of any product described herein. Nothing contained in this bulletin shall be considered a recommendation.



OWENS CORNING FOAM INSULATION, LLC
ONE OWENS CORNING PARKWAY
TOLEDO, OHIO 43659
1-800-GET-PINK®
www.owenscorning.com

Pub. No. 10018681. Printed in U.S.A. June 2013. THE PINK PANTHER™ & ©1964-2013 Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc. All Rights Reserved. The color PINK is a registered trademark of Owens Corning. ©2013 Owens Corning. All Rights Reserved.

