



Section 8.0

Alternatives to the Proposed Action



Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Section 8.0

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the identification and evaluation of reasonable alternatives designed to feasibly achieve the most basic objectives of the project, while avoiding or substantially lessening any of the significant environmental effects of the project. In addition, CEQA requires a comparative evaluation of the merits of the alternatives.

Pursuant to Section 15126.6 (f)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives include, but are not limited to, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). Although these factors do not present a strict limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives to be considered, they help establish the context in which “the rule of reason” is measured against when determining an appropriate range of alternatives sufficient to establish and foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

It is important to discuss the General Plan Update process, as that process lead to the selection of the preferred General Plan Land Use Diagram.

Preparation of the General Plan Update has consisted of technical studies, analysis of data and issues, review of alternative development scenarios, and preparation of draft elements that support the Goals and Policies identified through the community outreach program. Following the preparation of the draft elements, recommendations are to be developed and ultimately, the General Plan Update will be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council for review and approval. Environmental review is conducted to evaluate the impacts of the policy program and preferred land use alternative. A Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyzes the impacts and recommended mitigation measures, if necessary.

Community Participation

Several different public outreach efforts for the General Plan Update have taken place in order to obtain direct input from the community, including community workshops, Planning Commission and City Council study sessions, Planning Commission and City Council public hearings, a City Council work session, and website. Community outreach has resulted in information regarding issues and concerns in the community and has assisted in the development of goals and policies for the General Plan Update.



DETERMINATION OF ALTERNATIVES TO BE ANALYZED

Key factors used to determine the range of feasible alternatives to the proposed General Plan Update include the objectives established for the EIR process, along with the community values for the General Plan. The basic objectives of the proposed General Plan Update and General Plan EIR are set forth specifically and in detail in Section 3.5, *Statement of Program EIR Objectives*. With these factors in mind, the following alternatives have been identified for detailed analysis in this section:

- No Project/No Development; and
- Existing General Plan.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Potentially significant impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed General Plan Update are identified in Section 5.0, *Environmental Analysis*, which indicates that the proposed General Plan Update would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality. Implementation of the identified Policies and Policy Actions, or mitigation measures can mitigate all other potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. This section considers alternatives to otherwise avoid or minimize these impacts.

The analysis of alternatives includes the assumption that all applicable Policies, Policy Actions, or mitigation measures associated with the proposed General Plan Update would be implemented with the Existing General Plan Alternative. A description of each alternative and a comparative environmental evaluation to the impacts identified for the proposed General Plan Update is provided below.

8.2 NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

8.2.1 DESCRIPTION

Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that no additional development would occur; thus, the City of Artesia would maintain the status quo of existing land use conditions and levels of development. Table 3-1, *Existing Land Uses*, outlines the City's existing land uses (as of 2010) and indicates the City's housing stock is currently comprised of 4,610 dwelling units (DU). The City's existing population based on 4,610 DU and 3.708 persons per household,¹ is approximately 17,094 persons. Additionally, approximately 2.5 million square feet of non-residential land uses exist in the City, providing an estimated 5,011 jobs. Only a limited amount of vacant land (6.64 acres), which is sparsely located throughout the City, remains.

¹ State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2001-2010, With 2000 Benchmark*. Sacramento, California, May 2010.



Any development that would occur as part of buildout of the proposed General Plan Update would not occur under this Alternative. By definition, this Alternative prohibits the issuance of any further building permits. This situation would void the implementation of any current or future General Plan for the City of Artesia. This would be in direct conflict with California statutes requiring General Plans, the Subdivision Map Act, and the rights of land owners to develop their property.

8.2.2 IMPACT EVALUATION

The following impact evaluation provides a comparison between the existing land use condition and levels of development, which would remain unchanged with the No Project/No Development Alternative, and those associated with the proposed General Plan Update. An analysis is provided for each of the impact areas identified in this EIR. The evaluation is followed by a conclusion.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in any changes to existing land uses or development levels within the City. Under this Alternative, the 6.6 acres of vacant land would remain undeveloped. Additionally, this Alternative would prohibit underutilized parcels from expanding their existing use or constructing a new use on the site. Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, land use conditions would not be updated to reflect current (actual) development conditions within the City, as would occur with the proposed General Plan Update. The proposed General Plan Update would not conflict with the City's existing plans for buildout, nor would it result in conflicts with CEQA statutes. The No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update regarding land use and planning.

POPULATION, HOUSING, AND GROWTH

This Alternative would result in the City neglecting its obligation to maintain a current Housing Element. The Housing Element includes the City's plan for attempting to meet its share of the region's future housing needs, as required by State law and mandated by the State of California Housing and Community Development (HCD). Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the City would not develop any additional housing units, which would not allow the City to meet its quantified objectives for housing as outlined in the Housing Element. Opportunities to diversify employment in the City would also be lost through this Alternative, as no additional development in the City would occur. The City's population growth expected to result from implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not result in any significant impacts. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update regarding population, housing, and growth.



AESTHETICS AND LIGHT/GLARE

The No Project/No Development Alternative would result in no net change to the landform and visual character of the area given that no development beyond existing levels would be permitted. Further, redevelopment areas would remain in their current state, as redevelopment would not occur. The addition of a Community Development and Design Element to guide the future physical development in the City and provide for a high-quality visual image would also not occur with this Alternative. Thus, the aesthetic character of the City would remain as it exists today. In this regard, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

According to Section 5.4, *Traffic and Circulation*, none of the study roadway segments in Artesia are currently operating at a deficient LOS (LOS D or worse). Under the No Project/No Development Alternatives these roadways would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS. With implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, two study roadway segments Pioneer Boulevard (SR-91 to Artesia Boulevard) and Norwalk Boulevard (south of South Street) are forecast to operate at a deficient LOS (LOS D or worse). However, with the proposed General Plan Update, mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce the traffic impact to a less than significant level. In this regard, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

AIR QUALITY

Implementation of this Alternative would result in no new development that could result in an increase in air quality impacts. Development pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update would result in significant unavoidable impacts related to short-term construction emissions; long-term mobile and stationary source emissions; short-term cumulative impacts; and General Plan buildout cumulative impacts. All other impacts for the proposed General Plan Update can be mitigated to less than significant levels. Thus, this Alternative would eliminate the significant unavoidable impacts generated by the proposed General Plan Update, since the projected growth in population/development would not occur. The No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

NOISE

Implementation of this Alternative would result in no new development that could result in an increase in noise impacts. Potential noise impacts associated with project mobile sources and cumulative mobile sources would not occur with this Alternative. Development pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update would result in additional noise from construction activities and the resulting increase in traffic associated with future development. However, it is important to note that under this Alternative regional through traffic would continue to adversely impact the roadways in Artesia, and thus increase noise levels in the City without the benefit of mitigation. While an increase in noise levels associated with an increase in population/development would



not occur under this Alternative, noise levels would continue to increase as result of regional through traffic. The No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMIC CONDITIONS

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in new development, thereby resulting in an increase in population. Potential new development would be located throughout the City. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not permit any new development and therefore, an increase in the number of structures/people potentially exposed to substantial adverse effects associated with severe ground shaking and exposure to liquefaction would not occur. In this regard, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan Update.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

This Alternative would not result in an increase in the population/development in the City, as no development would occur under this Alternative. Thus, there would not be an increase in water demand or impermeable surface coverage. Under this Alternative, no new or additional development that could be impacted by potential hydrology and drainage impacts. The No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in the expansion or development of facilities that could impact the health and safety of Artesia residents and employees. However, the proposed General Plan Update would result in the implementation of Policies and Policy Actions designed to maintain public health and safety in addition to building and safety standards compliance, which would minimize risk. Although compliance with Policies, Policy Actions, and regulatory standards would reduce the potential threat associated with hazardous material use, disposal and transport with the proposed General Plan Update, impacts would be reduced with this Alternative. Therefore, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in direct or indirect impacts to archaeological resources, as this Alternative would not involve further development within the City. However, compliance with identified mitigation measures would reduce the potential impacts from the General Plan Update to a less than significant level. Thus, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be considered neither environmentally inferior nor superior to the proposed project in this regard.



PUBLIC SERVICES/PARKS AND RECREATION

Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would result in no new or additional impacts to public services and parks and recreation facilities since no new development would occur. The level of service and demand for service would remain similar to what currently exists within the City. Impacts to public services and parks and recreation facilities with implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would be less than significant. However, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not increase the City's population, further impacting public services and parks and recreational facilities. Thus, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative does not represent the true demand to utilities and service systems based on current conditions. Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would provide a comprehensive inventory of existing utilities and service systems and the levels of service provided to the City. Growth associated with the proposed General Plan Update would exceed the growth anticipated with the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative. Therefore, the level of service and demand for service would be less with the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative than the proposed General Plan Update. Although, the Policies and Policy Actions in the proposed General Plan Update would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level, the General Plan Update would introduce new residents to the City, further impacting existing systems. Thus, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

CONCLUSION

The No Project/No Development Alternative would result in no change to the existing conditions within the City of Artesia. Therefore, no new or additional environmental impacts would result directly from this Alternative. However, the No Project/No Development Alternative would prevent the City from making needed improvements to existing properties, infrastructure, and public services. Existing conditions under this Alternative would be maintained at first, but due to an increased dependence on developer fees to provide new and improved infrastructure, property and areas would remain unimproved. Additionally, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in any changes to existing land uses or development levels within the City and would conflict with the City's existing plans for buildout.

8.3 EXISTING GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE

8.3.1 DESCRIPTION

As required by Section 15126.6 (e) of the CEQA Guidelines, the Existing General Plan Alternative describes buildout of the City of Artesia in accordance with existing zoning and General Plan land use designations and policies of the current General Plan, which was adopted



in 1993. The Existing General Plan encompasses the same geographic area as that in the proposed General Plan Update. This Alternative assumes that ultimate buildout of the existing General Plan would occur. Table 5.1-1, 1993 General Plan, outlines the City's designated land uses, at buildout of the currently adopted *1993 General Plan*. As indicated in Table 5.1-1, the 1993 General Plan designates approximately 523 acres for residential land uses, with a development potential of approximately 5,376 dwelling units (DU) and a resultant population projection of approximately 19,934 persons (based on 3.708 persons per household) at buildout.² Additionally, approximately 240 acres are designated for non-residential land uses, with a development potential of approximately 7.5 million square feet (SF).

This Alternative assumes that the Existing General Plan would continue to provide outdated information regarding several issues, such as land uses, traffic conditions, community noise levels, air quality data, public services and utilities levels of service, and population and housing. The General Plan Update proposes the revisions to the Existing General Plan, as outlined in Section 3.5.1, Components of the Proposed General Plan Update.

8.3.2 IMPACT EVALUATION

The following impact evaluation provides a comparison between the current City of Artesia General Plan, adopted in 1993, and the proposed General Plan Update. An analysis is provided for each of the impact areas identified in this EIR. The evaluation is followed by a conclusion.

LAND USE

The proposed General Plan Update revises the existing Land Use Element by updating the land use database and by updating Goals and Policies that direct the future growth of the City based on current issues and opportunities. The existing General Plan Alternative would allow for development based on existing land use designations and growth identified in the existing 1993 General Plan. Table 5.1-4, Comparison of General Plan Update and 1993 General Plan, compares the existing 1993 General Plan to the proposed General Plan Update. As indicated in Table 5.1-4, the 1993 General Plan proposes 428 more DU and 4.5 million more SF of non-residential land uses, when compared to the proposed General Plan Update. However, land uses throughout the City have changed over time, and may not be reflective of the Existing General Plan's land use designations. Therefore, under the Existing General Plan Alternative, the existing Land Use Element would continue to provide outdated information that does not reflect the current conditions of the City. In this regard, the Existing General Plan Alternative is inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

POPULATION, HOUSING AND GROWTH

Two objectives of the proposed General Plan Update are to update the City's environmental baseline conditions to 2010 and to update the General Plan development projections to the year 2030. Development projections would include projections for dwelling units, non-residential

² State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2001-2010, With 2000 Benchmark*. Sacramento, California, May 2010.



square footage, population, and employment. The Existing General Plan Alternative does not reflect the most current population, employment, and housing numbers or projections, nor does it provide quantitative population, employment, and housing projections for future years. The population, housing, and employment data in the Existing General Plan is outdated. In contrast, the proposed General Plan Update reflects the current trend of Los Angeles County and overall regional development. Furthermore, the proposed General Plan Update maintains a planning horizon, which extends to 2030, which is realistic based on present growth trends and capacities. Therefore, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

AESTHETICS AND LIGHT/GLARE

As the City is primarily built out, new development within the City would occur on existing vacant land (6.6 acres), through infill development on underutilized parcels, or through redevelopment of currently developed land. Similar areas would be developed under the Existing General Plan or the proposed General Plan Update. However, the proposed General Plan Update would involve more development of non-residential and employment uses, and a greater number of residential uses when compared to the Existing General Plan. Additionally, the proposed General Plan Update would involve a Community Development and Design Element with specific Goals, Policies, and Policy Actions to improve and/or maintain the aesthetic quality of the City. Therefore, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

According to Section 5.4, *Traffic and Circulation*, none of the study roadway segments in Artesia are currently operating at a deficient LOS (LOS D or worse). With implementation of the proposed General Plan Update, two study roadway segments Pioneer Boulevard (SR-91 to Artesia Boulevard) and Norwalk Boulevard (south of South Street) are forecast to operate at a deficient LOS (LOS D or worse). It is anticipated that significant impacts would occur under the Existing General Plan Alternative due to the anticipated growth (5,376 DU and 7.5 million SF of non-residential uses at buildout). With the proposed General Plan Update, mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce the traffic impact to a less than significant level, and these same mitigation measures would apply to the Existing General Plan Alternative. Thus, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

AIR QUALITY

New development within the City would occur on existing vacant land, through infill development on underutilized parcels, or through redevelopment of currently developed land. The proposed General Plan Update would involve the development of a greater number of residential dwelling uses and non-residential square footage when compared to the Existing General Plan. Accordingly, it is anticipated that the proposed General Plan Update would generate fewer air quality impacts as the Existing General Plan. Under either the Existing General Plan or proposed General Plan Update, significant unavoidable impacts would occur



during construction and operation. Additionally, cumulative construction and operational impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Thus, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

NOISE

New development within the City would occur on existing vacant land, through infill development on underutilized parcels, or through redevelopment of currently developed land. The proposed General Plan Update would involve the development of fewer residential dwellings and non-residential square footage when compared to the Existing General Plan. Therefore, it is anticipated that the proposed General Plan Update would generate fewer noise impacts as the Existing General Plan, including noise impacts associated with traffic traveling within and through the City. Both the Existing General Plan and proposed General Plan Update include policies and measures to mitigate noise impacts with the exception of noise from the increase in traffic. Cumulative impacts associated with mobile source noise impacts would also occur. Thus, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMIC CONDITIONS

Due to the nature of geologic conditions, and the time scale at which they are measured, information regarding geologic conditions is largely unchanged from the Existing General Plan. Impacts on new development within the City would not increase with the proposed General Plan Update or the Existing General Plan, as building codes and standards would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. However, the proposed General Plan Update would result in an overall decrease in population when compared to the Existing General Plan Alternative. Therefore, the General Plan Update would expose fewer people to potential seismic impacts. Therefore, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Community Development and Design Element and the Community Resources and Wellness Element of the proposed General Plan Update provide updated information regarding groundwater resources and storm drainage in the City of Artesia. Additionally, the General Plan Update proposes updated Policies and Policy Actions, which mitigate potential impacts to groundwater resources and water quality. Since the City is primarily built out, potential water quality degradation from surface runoff/erosion associated with forecasted growth under the Existing General Plan Alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan Update. However, the General Plan Update would result in approximately less population growth when compared to the Existing General Plan Alternative. Thus, when compared to the Existing General Plan, a fewer number of persons and structures would be exposed to potential risks. Therefore, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.



HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would update information regarding hazards and hazardous materials within the City, thus providing the citizens of Artesia with increased public safety as applicable safety strategies and actions would be implemented beyond those in the Existing General Plan. The General Plan Update would allow for less development of non-residential uses when compared to the Existing General Plan Alternative. The General Plan Update would include Policy and Policy Actions that would reduce potential impacts from non-residential uses that would potentially use, store or dispose of hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials for the Existing General Plan are considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

New development within the City would occur on existing vacant land, through infill development on underutilized parcels, or through redevelopment of currently developed land. Development under the Existing General Plan Alternative and/or proposed General Plan Update could result in potential impacts to unidentified archaeological resources, as development of vacant sites would occur under either Alternative. With the proposed General Plan Update, mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce the cultural impact to a less than significant level, and these same mitigation measures would apply to the Existing General Plan Alternative. Thus, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

PUBLIC SERVICES/PARKS AND RECREATION

The Existing General Plan does not represent the true level of service demand based on current conditions. Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would provide a comprehensive inventory of existing public services and the levels of service provided to the City. The proposed General Plan Update would involve the development of fewer residential dwelling uses and less non-residential square footage when compared to the Existing General Plan. Therefore, the proposed General Plan Update would result in an overall decrease in population when compared to the Existing General Plan Alternative. The Existing General Plan Alternative would potentially generate a greater number of students and involve a greater demand for park acreage when compared to the General Plan Update. Thus, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The Existing General Plan does not represent the true level of demand based on current conditions. Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would provide a comprehensive inventory of existing utilities and service systems and the levels of service provided to the City. The proposed General Plan Update would involve the development of



fewer residential dwelling uses and less non-residential square footage when compared to the Existing General Plan. Although impacts would be less than significant under the Existing General Plan Alternative, this Alternative would involve greater demand for water, greater wastewater and solid waste generation, and greater demand for electricity and natural gas when compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Thus, the Existing General Plan Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed General Plan Update in this regard.

CONCLUSION

The Existing General Plan Alternative would result in similar environmental impacts as the proposed General Plan Update for traffic and circulation; air quality; noise; hazards and hazardous materials; and cultural resources. However this Alternative may generate higher impacts than the proposed General Plan Update with respect to Land Use; Population, Housing and Growth; Aesthetics and Light/Glare; Geology, Soils and Seismic Conditions; Hydrology and Water Quality; Public Services/Parks and Recreation; and Utilities and Service Systems.

It is the intent of the proposed General Plan Update to provide new information based on current conditions within the City and to provide strategies and actions that address current conditions. The conditions evaluated under the Existing General Plan Alternative would not serve the City as effectively as the proposed General Plan Update and provides environmental data that is inferior to the proposed General Plan Update.

8.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that an Environmentally Superior Alternative be identified; that is an alternative that would result in the fewest or least significant environmental impacts.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would result in no change to the existing conditions within the City of Artesia. Thus, the No Project/No Development Alternative could result in the eventual deterioration of existing conditions within the City. This could lead to the disrepair of existing buildings and infrastructure that could result in safety impacts. No new or additional environmental impacts would result directly from this Alternative. However, the No Project/No Development Alternative is rejected as the environmentally superior alternative for the following reasons. First, this Alternative would prevent the City from adequately mitigating potentially significant impacts or making needed improvements to existing properties, infrastructure, and public services. Existing Conditions under this Alternative would be maintained, but not improved. Second, the No Project/No Development Alternative fails to accomplish the project objectives. Third, it is the intent and objective of the proposed General Plan Update to produce new information based on current conditions in the City. Thus, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not serve the City as adequately as the proposed General Plan Update. In conclusion, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed General Plan Update, and is not selected as the environmentally superior alternative.



As it is the intent of the proposed General Plan Update to provide new information based on current conditions within the City the Existing 1993 General Plan evaluated under the Existing General Plan Alternative would not serve the City as adequately as the proposed General Plan Update. Overall, the Existing General Plan Alternative would result in greater environmental impacts when compared to the proposed General Plan Update. With respect to meeting the stated objectives of the General Plan Update and EIR, the proposed General Plan Update includes Goals and Policies to guide long-term development throughout the City. In conclusion, the Existing General Plan Alternative is not considered environmentally superior when compared to the proposed General Plan Update, and is also not selected as the environmentally superior alternative.

Based on the analysis of each of the alternatives, the proposed General Plan Update is the environmentally superior alternative.