STUCCO FUTURES

Rain Screen Technology and the 2024 IRC

May 8, 2026

The May 8, 2026 Stucco Futures session brought together about 22 plastering contractors, building envelope consultants, technical bureau representatives, code and standards professionals, and manufacturers. A manufacturer of entangled filament drainage products presented on rain screen components for residential and multi-family stucco, followed by open discussion of field experience in Florida, Southern California, and Texas.

The Question

As the 2024 IRC requires a drainage and ventilation space behind stucco, how can the industry meet the requirement without compromising embedment, cost, or workmanship?

The Code Has Changed

- IRC 2024 Section R703.7.3.2 requires a minimum 3/16 inch (5mm) space exterior to the air and weather barrier behind all stucco and masonry claddings in Moist (A) and Marine (C) climate zones.
- Compliance can be met by maintaining that space or by providing a drainage material with at least 90% efficiency per ASTM E2273 or Annex A2 of ASTM E2925.
- The code does not require drainage mat specifically, but mat is the most practical way to reliably maintain the space.
- 38 states have adopted IRC 2024.

The presenter noted that a water droplet can be up to 2.4mm wide, so a gap of at least 3mm is needed for passive drainage, and ventilation requires at least 4.8mm of airspace. Products with 1mm surface features, such as "drainable house wraps," cannot provide either. The presenter also advocated for ASTM E2925, which is more comprehensive than E2273, as the performance floor. For stucco, the relevant compliant categories are entangled mesh and dimple sheets, each with a bonded filter fabric that keeps scratch coat out of the drainage cavity.

Drainage and Ventilation as a System

Drainage mat alone is not a rain screen. Effective moisture management needs three parts working together: drainage mat over the air and weather barrier, a weep at the base of the wall, and a ventilation accessory at the top. In the traditional two-layer WRB assembly, the mat replaces the sacrificial layer of building paper, since its filter fabric performs the mortar-deflection role.

On continuous insulation assemblies, the mat goes immediately exterior to the air and weather barrier: over the CI if the panel is taped and sealed as the barrier, or behind the CI if raw polystyrene is used without a surface WRB. The presenter drew a parallel to the EIFS industry of the 1990s, which resisted drainage requirements until codes and the market overruled it, and urged the stucco industry to raise the bar collaboratively rather than treat drainage as a threat.

What the Discussion Revealed

Embedment loss. One Florida plastering professional raised the most substantive field concern. When lath is fastened through a drainage mat, the mat's resiliency can let the lath ride back toward the wall as the fastener cinches, compromising the quarter-inch embedment that protects the wire from corrosion. In humid, salt-laden coastal climates, exposed metal in a ventilated cavity is a real corrosion risk. The group weighed several mitigations:

- A paper layer over the mat would not stop the lath from cinching tight and adds another compressible layer.
- Longer fasteners do not change the cinching dynamic.
- Furring nails as a structural standoff are technically correct but prohibitively expensive.

Other contractors reported adequate embedment with self-furring lath over drainage mat, and another saw embedment loss only in the immediate vicinity of overdriven screws, with adequate embedment within three inches. The consensus view was that fastener discipline is controllable and applicator practice matters more than the assembly specification.

Ventilation in practice. The same Florida contributor questioned whether chimney-effect airflow works on multi-story walls with horizontal interruptions at floor lines and no mid-wall venting. The presenter agreed the code requires a space, not a mat, and that rain screen is one solution that may not suit every climate or configuration.

The primary WRB still comes first. One contractor stressed that drainage mat is a secondary system, and that the wall will still fail if the primary weather barrier is not executed correctly. Declining workmanship was named as the root cause of many failures, and several participants cautioned against treating symptoms by layering in more components. The same participant asked whether mat could add condensation risk through a thermal discontinuity, a dew point question that remains open.

Embedment history. One member observed that embedment has eroded as assemblies have grown more complex: sheathing already made it harder, and drainage mat adds another layer between lath and substrate. In 1930s construction, with lath directly over framing, scratch coat was forced through the lath and keyed into the framing.

Cost and competitive pressure. A technical bureau representative noted that three-coat stucco over CI with drainage mat is approaching cost parity with EIFS, eroding stucco's traditional price advantage. A contractor added that every fastener through a stucco WRB assembly is a potential penetration, and that risk is a real cost. The presenter cautioned that low price contributed to the EIFS moisture crisis of the late 1990s and that stucco should not be chosen because it is cheap. Participants agreed that architects increasingly default to fiber cement when stucco and EIFS feel too complex or expensive.

The design community gap. Designers often conflate stucco over continuous insulation with EIFS. Much of the generation that learned from the 1990s moisture problems has left production roles. One suggestion was for associations such as RAINA to create shared CEU presentations that multiple members could deliver to architectural firms. Remote lunch-and-learn formats have lowered the barrier to architect engagement.

Regional differences. The Florida perspective crystallized into an explicit call for regionally differentiated details and guidance: what works in Arizona does not work in coastal Florida. Details need explanations, not just drawings, so designers understand the reasoning and adapt it rather than copy and paste it into inappropriate conditions. A Florida lath and plaster bureau has begun documenting regional requirements.

What It Means in Practice

Meeting code is the minimum. Rain screen assemblies need a well-executed primary WRB, a complete drainage and ventilation path from weep to top vent, disciplined fastening to protect embedment, and details written for the region where they will be built.

What Remains Unresolved

- How can embedment be reliably achieved when lath is fastened over compressible drainage mat?
- Does drainage mat increase condensation risk by creating a thermal discontinuity?
- How effective is ventilation on multi-story walls without mid-wall venting?

Industry Initiatives

- One member is developing a white paper on common stucco application failures and their solutions, pairing each failure with multiple solution pathways, for publication in a national venue. Contributors and case studies from a range of regions are welcome. A related case study on cement plaster failures in schools was scheduled for a CSI regional meeting, with a fuller version planned for the National CSI Conference in October.
- Another member proposed a national stucco resource guide through AWCI, drawing on its chapter associations to consolidate details and design guidance with the rationale for each, including regional variations, similar to the unified technical communication achieved by the EIFS industry.
- The April 2026 edition of CSI's magazine includes an article on rethinking stucco wall design for changing codes.

What do you think?

Let us know at www.clarkdietrich.com/stuccofutures, or on LinkedIn, Instagram, or Facebook #stuccofutures