

FACTS ABOUT: G & M TERMINAL SITE

Site Location

The G & M Terminal is located at 3500-3800 Asiatic Avenue in Baltimore City. Curtis Bay is 800 feet south of the site. The site is comprised of 5.9 acres and is bounded on the north by Northbridge Avenue, on the east by Asiatic Avenue, on the south by South Port Avenue, and on the west by a residential area and Leo Street.

Site History

The site consists of three parcels of property acquired by Joseph P. Comer during 1908 to 1938. Texas Oil Company purchased the property from Mr. Comer in April of 1938. Later, Texas Oil changed their name to Texaco. According to nearby residents and employees, the terminal was constructed by Texaco in the late 1950s. G & M Terminal bought the property in October of 1984. Bank of Baltimore controlled the property after G & M Terminal filed for bankruptcy in 1988. The site was operated as a fuel oil storage facility by Texaco and G & M Terminal.

The site began operations in September 1984 and had a history of product spills. On October 2, 1985, a 30,000-50,000 gallon spill of No. 2 fuel oil occurred adjacent to the site in a leased tank, and leaked through the containment walls into the surrounding area. On October 9, 1985, a line feeding the same tank leaked and an estimated 300-400 gallons of oil was sprayed outside of the containment walls. A visual inspection of the site conducted August 10-12, 1988 revealed numerous patches of oil-stained ground and pools of free-floating product both inside and outside the diked areas. At the northern end of the site, several patches of surface oil contamination were present. The concrete diked area at the south end of the site was significantly contaminated with both oil-saturated soil and free-floating product pools.

Environmental Investigation and Action

In 1988, EA Engineering completed a preliminary site investigation to identify areas of the terminal which had been affected by past oil-handling practices. A soil gas survey, 3 shallow soil borings and 6 monitoring wells were completed to assess soil and groundwater quality.

As of 1989, the site was inactive. The Bank of Baltimore retained Geraghty & Miller to complete a remedial investigation and in August of 1989 submitted a report entitled



Remedial Investigation and Conceptual Design of the Fuel Oil Recovery System. Heavily saturated soils and free product were found in the groundwater. Soil removal and free product recovery were proposed to address the contamination at the site. MDE recommended recovery of all product, recovery of groundwater containing benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene (BTEX) concentrations above 100 ppb, and a soil cleanup level of 100 ppm total petroleum hydrocarbons.

As required by a 1990 Administrative Consent Order between Bank of Baltimore and MDE, an extensive boring/monitoring well installation program was conducted at the site. The majority of contamination was in the south pond area, with a small area of soil contamination identified in a corner of the north pond. The contaminated soil in the north pond was removed in 1991. The Consent Order also required quarterly compliance monitoring and bimonthly reports on product thickness and groundwater elevations.

No free product was ever recovered by the treatment system. In 1992, Bank of Baltimore Title IX, a holding company for the bank, purchased the G&M Terminal property. By December of 1992, the level of total BTEX in the groundwater was 1140 ppb. However, the groundwater recovery system was shut down in January of 1993 with MDE approval. In April of 1993, MDE's Oil Control Program (OCP) declared the site conditions in compliance with the Consent Order and that the treatment system could be removed and the case closed. An OCP letter indicated that the cleanup goal had been revised to require only the removal of liquid phase product.

Current Status

During a 1995 site visit by OCP personnel, a sheen was observed in MW-6 on the site. MDE recommended a sorbent wick be installed in the well and requested that the latest depth, product thickness and gauging information be submitted. First Fidelity Bank, who at the time controlled the property, submitted the requested information. In 1995, after a review of the information, OCP determined that the site conditions were consistent with similar sites in the area, and therefore, the case would not be reopened, nor further response warranted.

