

Owner / Applicant Information

Kevin Halstead
Grain Processing Corporation
1600 OREGON STREET

MUSCATINE IA 52761

Phone 5632644242

Email KEVIN_HALSTEAD@GRAINPROCESSING.COM

Submitter Information

Edwin Rensink
RTM Consultants Inc
6640 Parkdale Place

Indianapolis IN

Phone 3173277700

Email rensink@rtmconsultants.com

Designer Information

Mike Vollbrecht
Shive-Hattery
316 2nd Street SE Suite 500

Cedar Rapids IA

Phone 3193640227

Email mvollbrecht@shive-hattery.com

Project Information

Grain Processing Corporation Maltrin Expansion
1443 South 300 West

Washington IN 47501

County DAVIESS

Project Type New ☐ Addition ☒ Alteration ☐ Existing ☐ Change of Occupancy ☐

Project Status ☒ U F=Filed U or Null=Unfiled

IDHS Issued Correction order? ☒ No Has Violation been Issued? ☒ No

Violation Issued by: NA

Local Building Official

Phone:

Email:

Local Fire Official

Phone:

Email:

Variance Details

Code Name: 12-4-12 Existing Buildings; Additions or Alterations
Rule 4, Section 12(f), GAR

Conditions: The planned Enclosure 305 will be added to existing Enclosure 301/302/303 (constructed in 1997) will exceed IBC limits for allowable area and height for Type IIB (noncombustible, unprotected) Construction. See attached for process description and additional details.

The building is classified as F-1Occupancy (food processing). The facility is a wet corn milling process. Enclosure 305 will house a wet process that is substantially similar to that in the immediately adjacent existing Enclosure 301. The process converts a corn starch liquid slurry to a soluble maltodextrin syrup through the use of a chemical and enzymatic process. The syrup undergoes additional processes before being pumped to other facilities on the site.

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or w

☐ 1 2= Applicant will undertake alternative actions in lieu of compliance with the rule to ensure that granting of the variance will not be adverse to public health, safety, or welfare. Explain why alternative actions would be adequate (be specific).

Facts: 1. A variance to permit nonrated, noncombustible construction was granted for the original construction to which this enclosure will be added in August, 1997.
2. The process in Enclosure 305 involves wet corn in various stages inside the equipment enclosure.
3. The structure will not add any permanently stationed employees. The only person occupying the combined area of 301 and 305 is a single control room operator in 301. There will be infrequent occupancy by 1 or 2 additional runners.
4. Based upon the lack of fire hazard and very low occupancy, the use of nonrated, noncombustible construction will not be adverse to safety.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

☐ Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.

☐ Y Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of major operational problems in the use of the building or structure.

☐ Y Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of excessive costs of additional or altered construction elements.

☐ Imposition of the rule would prevent the preservation of an architecturally or a historically significant part of the building or structure

Facts: The hardship is that the construction of a firewall to separate the addition would not permit the process to function as intended. The hardship for the originally approved variance was stated as the cost of fireproofing and disruption to the process caused by the presence of fireproofing on the building steel.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
712.1, 2014 IBC

Conditions: The planned Enclosure 305 to be added to existing Enclosure 301/302/303 (constructed in 1997) will have unprotected floor openings connecting 3 stories. IBC requires shaft enclosures for floor openings connecting more than 2 stories, or otherwise meet one of the vertical opening applications enumerated in Sec. 712. See attached for process description and additional details.

The building is classified as F-1Occupancy (food processing). The facility is a wet corn

The building is classified as 1 = occupancy (food processing). The facility is a wet corn milling process. Enclosure 305 will house a wet process that is substantially similar to that in the immediately adjacent existing Enclosure 301. The process converts a corn starch liquid slurry to a soluble maltodextrin syrup through the use of a chemical and enzymatic process. The syrup undergoes additional processes before being pumped to other facilities on the site.

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or w

1

2= Applicant will undertake alternative actions in lieu of compliance with the rule to ensure that granting of the variance will not be adverse to public health, safety, or welfare. Explain why alternative actions would be adequate (be specific).

Facts:

1. The process in Enclosure 305 involves wet corn in various stages inside the equipment enclosure.
2. The structure is for support of process equipment and not for human occupancy.
3. The structure will not add any permanently stationed employees. The only person occupying the combined area of 301 and 305 is a single control room operator in 301. There will be infrequent occupancy by 1 or 2 additional runners.
4. Based upon the lack of fire hazard and very low occupancy, the lack of enclosure for floor openings will not be adverse to safety.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

☐

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.

☒

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of major operational problems in the use of the building or structure.

☐

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of excessive costs of additional or altered construction elements.

☐

Imposition of the rule would prevent the preservation of an architecturally or a historically significant part of the building or structure

Facts:

Enclosure of floor openings is not feasible based upon the great number of openings in floors created by placement of process equipment.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
903.2.4, 2014 IBC

Conditions: The planned Enclosure 305 to be added to existing Enclosure 301/302/303 (constructed in 1997) will not be provided with sprinkler protection, which is required based upon an F-1 Occupancy fire area exceeding 12,000 sq ft. See attached for process description and additional details.

The building is classified as F-1Occupancy (food processing). The facility is a wet corn milling process. Enclosure 305 will house a wet process that is substantially similar to that in the immediately adjacent existing Enclosure 301. The process converts a corn starch liquid slurry to a soluble maltodextrin syrup through the use of a chemical and enzymatic process. The syrup undergoes additional processes before being pumped to other facilities on the site.

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or w

☐ 1 2= Applicant will undertake alternative actions in lieu of compliance with the rule to ensure that granting of the variance will not be adverse to public health, safety, or welfare. Explain why alternative actions would be adequate (be specific).

Facts: 1. A variance to not provide sprinkler protection was granted for the original construction to which this enclosure will be added in August, 1997.
2. The process in Enclosure 305 involves wet corn in various stages inside the equipment enclosure.
3. The structure will not add any permanently stationed employees. The only person occupying the combined area of 301 and 305 is a single control room operator in 301. There will be infrequent occupancy by 1 or 2 additional runners.
4. Based upon the lack of fire hazard and very low occupancy, the lack of sprinkler protection will not be adverse to safety.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

- ☐ Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.
- ☐ Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of major operational problems in the use of the building or structure.
- ☒ Y Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of excessive costs of additional or altered construction elements.
- ☐ Imposition of the rule would prevent the preservation of an architecturally or a historically significant part of the building or structure

Facts: Hardship is the cost for sprinkler protection for an area with very low hazard.

Variance Details

Code Name: Other Code (Not in the list provided)
905.3.1, 2014 IBC

Conditions: The planned Enclosure 305 to be added to existing Enclosure 301/302/303 (constructed in 1997) will not be provided with Class III Standpipes, which is required based upon a building with a floor level located more than 30 feet above grade (3rd floor is 47 feet above grade). See attached for process description and additional details.

The building is classified as F-1Occupancy (food processing). The facility is a wet corn milling process. Enclosure 305 will house a wet process that is substantially similar to that in the immediately adjacent existing Enclosure 301. The process converts a corn starch liquid slurry to a soluble maltodextrin syrup through the use of a chemical and enzymatic process.

slurry to a soluble maltodextrin syrup through the use of a chemical and enzymatic process.
The syrup undergoes additional processes before being pumped to other facilities on the site.

DEMONSTRATION THAT PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ARE PROTECTED:

1=Non-compliance with the rule will not be adverse to the public health, safety or w

1

2= Applicant will undertake alternative actions in lieu of compliance with the rule to ensure that granting of the variance will not be adverse to public health, safety, or welfare. Explain why alternative actions would be adequate (be specific).

Facts:

1. The process in Enclosure 305 involves wet corn in various stages inside the equipment enclosure.
2. The structure will not add any permanently stationed employees. The only person occupying the combined area of 301 and 305 is a single control room operator in 301. There will be infrequent occupancy by 1 or 2 additional runners. The structure is for support of process equipment and not for human occupancy.
3. Based upon the lack of fire hazard and very low occupancy, the lack of Class III Standpipes will not be adverse to safety.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNDUE HARDSHIP OR HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURE:

☐

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of physical limitations of the construction site or its utility services.

☐

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of major operational problems in the use of the building or structure.

☒

Imposition of the rule would result in an undue hardship (unusual difficulty) because of excessive costs of additional or altered construction elements.

☐

Imposition of the rule would prevent the preservation of an architecturally or a historically significant part of the building or structure

Facts:

Hardship is the cost for Class III standpipes for an area with very low hazard.