EXHIBIT 4 TO THE THIRD AMENDMENT

EXHIBIT GG

Preservation Guidelines

[ ATTACHED ]
**Dry Dock 4 Preservation Guidelines**

**A Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation (Applicable Provisions)**

1. A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property will be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve existing historic materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection and properly documented for future research.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. The existing condition of historic features will be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in composition, design, color, and texture.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

**Dry Dock 4: Guiding Principles**

- The proposed treatment of Dry Dock 4 shall follow the requirements outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the United States Navy, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the California State Historic Preservation Officer regarding the interim leasing and disposal of historic properties on the former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in San Francisco, California, under which the lease agreements require tenants to follow the recommended practices of the SOI Standards in maintaining or adapting these historic properties for use.

- Proposed treatment of Dry Dock 4 shall follow the treatment plan and methods developed for CP-HPS2 that has been previously found to conform to the SOI Standards (Lada Kocherovsky and Richard Sucre, Memorandum regarding Secretary of the Interior’s Standards Evaluation of Proposed Treatments for Dry Docks 2, 3, and 4, October 5, 2009, prepared by Page & Turnbull for Therese A. Brekke, Lennar Urban) and are outlined by Moffatt & Nichol in a series of reports:

  - Moffatt & Nichol, Candlestick Point/Hunter’s Point Redevelopment Project, Proposed Shoreline Improvements (September 2009);

  - Moffatt & Nichol, *Hunter’s Point Shoreline Structures Rapid Reconnaissance Investigation* (June 2009); and


- Dry Dock 4 is identified in the National Register of Historic Places as a structural resource under the applicable criteria of “event: architecture engineering” and, more specifically, with an area of
significance related to military engineering. The Standards for Preservation and Guidelines for Preserving Historic Buildings apply not only to historic buildings, but also to a variety of historic resource types eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, including buildings, sites, structures, objects, and districts. Accordingly, proposed modifications to Dry Dock 4 shall comply with the Standards for Preservation outlined in the SOI’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings,[1] which require conformance with the above Standards for Preservation.

**Dry Dock 4: Preservation Guidelines**

- Preservation Guidelines for Dry Dock 4 have been developed to guide the preliminary design of the improvements associated with Dry Dock 4. These guidelines may be refined as part of the final design provided the following occurs:
  - All character-defining features, materials, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship of Dry Dock 4 would be permanently retained;
  - The bridge and abutment design and construction process would not permanently and irreversibly remove character-defining features or materials of the dry dock or its setting;
  - The two bridge spans would not permanently and irreversibly alter character-defining features of the dry dock;
  - The open visual character of Dry Dock 4 and the spaces and spatial relationships between the water-filled dry dock and adjacent deck around the dry dock whose outer limits are defined by the location of the bollards that surround the dry dock would be permanently retained;
  - Grading required to protect the site from sea level rise may require that the bollards surrounding the dry dock would be temporarily removed, but they would be returned to a location that retains the horizontal, spatial relationship between the bollards and the dry dock;
  - The installation of seating around the dry dock would occur on top of the land surface and would be provided in a manner that integrates the seating with a gradual raise in the proposed grade of the surrounding dry dock to accommodate sea level rise and would not permanently and irreversibly remove any character-defining materials or features;
  - The seating would preserve the open visual character of the landscape and the spaces and spatial relationships between the dry dock and its setting;
  - While the open visual character of the landscape and the spaces and spatial relationships between the dry dock and its setting would be preserved, the design would still allow for active and passive recreational uses;
  - The design would be modern in character and differentiated from the historic structure, and no changes would be made that would create a false sense of historical development or add conjectural features;
  - The design would be differentiated from the old and would be contemporary and industrial in aesthetic and utilitarian in the use of materials;
  - The design would be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing protect the integrity of the dry dock and setting;
  - The design would not obscure the character-defining features, spaces, spatial relationships, or views of the dry dock; and
  - The design would be reversible to allow the new construction to be removed in the future, which would ensure that the integrity and significance of Dry Dock 4 would not be materially impaired.
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