

7.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The project involves the installation and repair of conduit into which fiber optic cable would be placed and construction of ancillary facilities (POPs) in the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles Basin. It is anticipated that the construction associated with conduit placement or repair and ancillary facilities would not overlap with other public or private utility projects during the same timeframe on any given segment of the project. Therefore, because of the temporary nature of the potential effects of the project, there would be no cumulatively considerable impacts as a result of the project.

In addition, because the majority of the proposed POPs would be placed in either existing structures or, in the case of the newly constructed POPs, within railroad rights-of-way, the project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

7.1 AESTHETICS

Upon completion of the project, only POPs located in newly constructed buildings and cable markers would be visible. The POPs would be sited only in areas without sensitive visual resources and would be designed to be unobtrusive. Cable markers indicating the existence of underground fiber optic cable would be installed along the project routes; however, they would be located along the rights-of-way of public roadways or railroads and would be consistent in design and placement with the existing utility markers already present within these disturbed rights-of-way. For these reasons, the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to any impact on aesthetics.

7.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The project would have no impacts or cumulative impacts that would affect agricultural resources.

7.3 AIR QUALITY

The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria air pollutants with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures.

7.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The impacts of the project on vegetation and wildlife are not considered cumulatively considerable for the following reasons:

- Most of the major habitat types the project would affect are abundant in the project study area.
- The project routes are linear and narrow and construction would disturb a small amount of habitat relative to the amount of these habitats available locally and project-wide.
- Activities related to the project are temporary and vegetation would be expected to recover quickly, particularly within disturbed rights-of-way such as roadsides, railroads, and maintained utility corridors.

7.0 Cumulative Impacts

- 1 • POP facilities, while resulting in a small amount of permanent habitat loss, are sited in
2 areas that either do not support habitat (i.e., developed sites), support only ruderal
3 vegetation, or support a common vegetation type, such as annual grassland.

- 4 • Project rights-of-way are already disturbed from original construction and ongoing
5 maintenance activities of other utilities, roads, or railroads.

- 6 • Mitigation measures have been designed and incorporated into the project design and
7 construction approach to avoid or minimize effects on biological resources to less-than-
8 significant levels. Additionally, Metromedia would adopt all of the biological mitigation
9 measures in this document as part of the project.

- 10 • Much of the project study area is relatively urbanized and highly built up, and the project
11 would be located primarily within already disturbed or developed rights-of-way.

- 12 • Impacts on listed species would be avoided through incorporation of the mitigation
13 measures into the project design specifications. Therefore, no cumulative impacts on listed
14 species or their habitats are anticipated.

- 15 • The cumulative impacts of the project on fish or their habitats are expected to be minimal.
16 No direct habitat loss or impairment of passage or migration would occur because
17 Metromedia would use non-invasive drainage crossing methods for flowing sensitive
18 streams (i.e., crossings would not require in-water work or structures). Metromedia would
19 implement measures to minimize the potential for long-term chronic erosion and stabilize
20 site conditions and minimize the potential for accidental spills of materials to surface
21 waters to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, no cumulative impacts on fish populations
22 or their habitats are anticipated.

23 **7.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

24 Site record and literature searches and archaeological field surveys indicate that the project is
25 unlikely to have any significant cumulative impacts to cultural resources. The excavation and
26 ground disturbances, individually and cumulatively, would not be likely to affect the oldest,
27 largest, greatest, or most significant type of prehistoric or historic resource in the regions under
28 study. Moreover, the potential for avoidance is great and standard mitigation measures are
29 expected to reduce unavoidable impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, the cumulative
30 effect of the anticipated levels of impacts to known and potential archaeological sites is not
31 considered significant.

32 **7.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

33 Development in California has the cumulative impact of bringing additional people into potential
34 contact with geologic hazards. In some instances, such as where mass grading occurs, a project
35 may directly contribute to increased landslide hazard or soil erosion within that particular region.

36 The project consists of the installation of fiber optic conduit and cable through trenching and
37 subsurface boring. The project would not expose people to substantial risk of loss, injury, or death
38 relative to seismic and geologic hazards; result in substantial soil erosion; potentially result in

1 landslides or other mass movement; create substantial risks due to expansive soils; or produce
2 wastewater from septic tanks, sewers, or other disposal facilities. The contribution of the project to
3 cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

4 **7.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

5 The project is not expected to make a cumulatively considerable contribution toward hazards or
6 hazardous materials impacts. Contaminated soils or other materials may be unexpectedly
7 encountered along some of the project routes and would require appropriate handling and
8 disposal by a licensed contractor. The characteristics and the volume of hazardous materials that
9 could be unexpectedly encountered during construction cannot be determined in advance. Some
10 materials encountered along the project routes may be recyclable, which would reduce any
11 possible impact on hazardous waste disposal/landfill capacity to a less-than-significant level. The
12 cumulative impact of disposal of contaminated materials unexpectedly encountered along the
13 project routes is considered a less-than-significant impact because of regulatory safeguards that
14 limit exposure and require controlled handling and disposal.

15 **7.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

16 The cumulative effect of potential temporary construction-related impacts would be minimal.
17 Because the direct and residual effects of construction spoils and disturbed soil erosion would be
18 minor, no cumulative impacts would be expected. Successful stormwater pollution prevention
19 would result in no cumulative construction-related impacts. No operational cumulative impacts
20 are anticipated regarding flooding or drainage due to the below-ground nature of the project and
21 the minimal amount of new impervious surfaces associated with POPs located outside of
22 floodplain boundaries.

23 **7.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING**

24 From the perspective of land use impacts, the only long-term evidence of the project would be
25 newly constructed POPs and cable markers posted along the proposed conduit alignments. The
26 proposed project would not result in any physical division of established communities or
27 neighborhoods and would not be located in areas with habitat conservation or natural community
28 conservation plans. The project would comply with all applicable local land use plans and
29 regulations. Accordingly, the cumulative effects of the project on land use are expected to be less
30 than significant.

31 **7.10 MINERAL RESOURCES**

32 The project would have no impacts or cumulative impacts on mineral resources.

33 **7.11 NOISE**

34 With mitigation measures implemented as part of the project, the impact at each of the newly
35 constructed (stand-alone) POP sites, except the Hayward POP site, would be 1 DNL or less, and as
36 such, would not be a cumulatively considerable contribution to overall noise levels. At the
37 Hayward POP site, the project-specific impact would be reduced to less than significant. The
38 cumulative impact would be essentially the same as the project impact since no other new

1 stationary noise sources would be constructed in the immediate area and since the closest roadway
2 (O'Neil Avenue) is not a road used by through-traffic (since it dead ends near the site) and would
3 thus not experience increases in noise from cumulative increases in traffic volumes.

4 **7.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING**

5 The project would have no impacts or cumulative impacts that would affect population and
6 housing.

7 **7.13 PUBLIC SERVICES**

8 The project would need no public services. It would therefore have no cumulative impact on
9 public services.

10 **7.14 RECREATION**

11 The project would have no long-term or cumulative impacts on recreational facilities or resources.
12 Any disruption of recreational resources would result from temporary construction activities
13 lasting (at a particular recreational site) from 1 to 3 days.

14 **7.15 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC**

15 Cumulative construction-related traffic impacts with other construction projects would depend on
16 the timing of individual projects with coinciding locations. The project would not result in any
17 increase in vehicular traffic beyond the temporary increases described in Impact 6.15-1. The
18 project may result in temporary obstructions of traffic, but the traffic plan to be implemented
19 would minimize the impacts of such obstructions on traffic flow and emergency access. As a
20 result, the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to traffic impacts.

21 **7.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

22 The project would have no cumulative impacts on utilities or service systems. The project would
23 need no utilities or service systems except for a minimal amount of electrical power at the POP
24 sites.