

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2027 / FY 2028														
Member Name:	Ted Suss													
Due Date:	Friday, July 17, 2026 by 4 p.m. Email to tom.rebman@isonc.mn.gov													
Maximum score per request is 110 points. Scores should be whole numbers, no decimals. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*														
		Criteria												
		1. Proposal “Abstract” and “Design & Scope of Work” summaries are both clearly written and adequately address the Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for fish, game, and wildlife, and/or threatened or endangered species.	3. The timing of this proposal is important and urgent.	4. Proposal will improve or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	5. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes and is likely to produce significant permanent conservation legacy and/or beneficial habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Proposal includes leverage.	9. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	10. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	11. Proposal provides public access, use, or benefit.	Total Score (out of 110 possible points)	Comments / Questions
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10		
PA01	Accelerating the Wildlife Management Area Program - Phase XIX	8	9	8	9	9	8	8	5	8	8	8	88	1)To what degree will existing field tile be blocked or modified to bypass acquired property? 2)To what degree will historic wetlands be restored naturally or by significant earthmoving work? 3) Will provision be made to permit non motorized trails in the future if other funding can be found to purchase right of way from private owner and reimburse OHF for easement rights? How is PILT or not on which acres determined?
PA02	Acquisition and restoration of terrace wetland complex with potential fen characteristic	5	7	5	5	5	5	5	7	5	5	5	59	References to potential fen is fen still there? Can a Fen once destroyed be restored? Land price seems extremely high for landlocked existing wetlands.
PA03	DNR Accelerated Native Prairie Bank Protection-Phase IX	8	9	7	9	9	8	5	0	7	7	7	76	If the land under consideration is already Native Prairie, why is cropped land being discussed. Is this restoration of cropped land back into prairie? If yes, then this does not appear to be protection of existing remnant prairie. If it is conversion back to prairie isnt any land that was once prairie suitable for consideration for this program? At some point the ownersip will pass to a next generation or sold. What if next landowner(s) is totally unwilling to perform any maintenance work such as woody vegetation removal?
PA04	DNR WMA & SNA Acquisition, Phase XIV	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	5	8	8	8	85	1)To what degree will existing field tile systems be blocked or modified to bypass acquired property? 2)To what degree will historic wetlands be restored naturally or by future earthmoving work? 3) Will provision be made to allow regional or state trails to cross the property in the most minimally intrusive way, including possible payment for the acreage used by the trail? How is PILT or not PILT on which acres determined?
PA05	Great Prairie Lakes and Wetlands Restoration Initiative	7	8	7	8	7	7	7	1	6	6	8	72	If this is marginal farmland as stated, price seems high. Will provision be made to allow regional or state trails to cross the property in the most minimally intrusive way, including possible payment from another source for the acreage used by the trail?
PA06	Lower Sioux Prairie and Wetland Habitat Protection and Restoration Project	8	7	5	5	7	5	9	7	4	4	5	66	I really like the objectives of this application, but 12' will fences necessary for bison cut off access and other animal movement? Price of \$15,000 per acre seems high for very marginal farm land, I believe there is a wetland complex or shallow lake on property and using the \$15,000 starting figure might create an artificial expectation. Is LSOHF the right source of \$ to pay for fencing? Fences and sorting pens strike me as being very like buildings that we don't buy.
PA07	Martin County WMA Acquisition Phase 11	8	8	7	9	8	8	8	1	6	7	8	78	Narrative says parcel ID will begin fall of 2027, yet specific parcels are listed? Which is it? Is the land to be acquired currently farmed prime land or marginal land that worth less? This is becoming a huge complex, will provision be made to allow regional or state non motorized trails to cross the property in the most minimally intrusive way, possibly payment for the acreage used by the trail from another source?
PA08	Minnesota Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (MN CREP)	8	9	8	8	8	8	7	8	5	8	6	83	17 parcels 1024 acres suggests parcels are IDd but no list, why? \$10,000,000 request, \$9,000 per acre cost. Tables 5 and 6 only show \$9,803 per acre times 1024 acres. where did the \$8,000,000 federal money go?
PA09	Minnesota River Watershed Habitat Conservation Program Phase 2	8	9	7	8	8	8	7	4	7	6	6	78	explain how \$28,000 per parcel for ongoing maintenance is managed. Is that set aside or estimated future cost? is staffing the application stacked on top of staff from prior appropriations, if so, what is current OHF paid staffing for both MLT and GRG
PA10	MN Prairie Recovery Program	7	8	7	7	7	5	7	5	5	5	8	71	If scaling is necessary, prioritize acquisition and easements, I wouldlike a better understanding of what is being done to support claim that 10,000 acres have been enhanced, % fire, % tree removal, etc. Do all of the species cited such as Rusty Patch Bumble Bee already populate these parcels or will restoration improve habitat for potential species expansion? How good is the inventory of existing remnant, never tilled, prairie in these counties? What is reason there is nothing in Redwood and Renville Counties sourounded by other counties as they are two of the most intensively farmed counties in the state?
PA11	Prairie Chicken Habitat Partnership of the Southern Red River Valley - Phase XIII	7	7	7	8	8	7	7	4	6	7	8	76	There is a reference to 320 acre mininum needed size, three acquisitions are smaller, do they connect to existing WMA? Staff seems high, how many PF staff are now on OHF funding? Does restoration go beyond removal of invasives and planting desirable natives? Any reshaping of the earth? How much existing never farmed Prairie remnant is being acquired.
PA12	RIM Buffers for Wildlife and Water - Phase XIII	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	0	6	8	7	75	Are the 6 properties IDd or is that an expected number? Much reference to floodplains, price seems high for floodplain land. Is the \$10,000 per easement for maintenance of OHS funds placed into a special account? please explain. Will provision be made to permit non motorized trails in the future with other funding to purchase right of way from private owner and reimburse OHF for easement rights?
PA13	Western Minnesota Prairie and Wetland Protection Program	9	9	9	8	8	8	7	5	7	7	6	83	How is the fair market value of an easement determined? Is stewardship budget amount placed in a seperate dedicated fund? Does the \$200,000 budget amount for each 40 acre fee acquisition parcel include contract and professional services amounts or is that the estimated purchase price? Will provision be made to permit non motorized trails in the future if other funding can be found to purchase right of way from private owner and reimburse OHF for easement rights?

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2027 / FY 2028														
Member Name:	Ted Suss													
Due Date:	Friday, July 17, 2026 by 4 p.m. Email to tom.rebman@isohc.mn.gov													
Maximum score per request is 110 points. Scores should be whole numbers, no decimals. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*														
		Criteria											Total Score (out of 110 possible points)	Comments / Questions
		1. Proposal "Abstract" and "Design & Scope of Work" summaries are both clearly written and adequately address the Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for fish, game, and wildlife, and/or threatened or endangered species.	3. The timing of this proposal is important and urgent.	4. Proposal will improve or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	5. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes and is likely to produce significant permanent conservation legacy and/or beneficial habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Proposal includes leverage.	9. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	10. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	11. Proposal provides public access, use, or benefit.		
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10		
PRE01	Enhanced Public Land - Grasslands - Phase X	8	8	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	3	57	does drain tile removal mean actual removal of an entire tileline or simply breaking the line and plugging a few feet with non permeable material? While many WMAs need restoration and tree removal, priority ought be on acquiring land at this time, See PA 01. Public access already exists
PRE02	Restoring Minnesota's Prairie Pothole Ecosystem - Phase 1	8	8	4	5	5	5	5	7	5	5	3	60	Is the \$2,000,000 available without this appropriation? Since work will be completed on already acquired property, what is a reasonable time frame from appropriation to completion? I assume Upland prairie restoration costs far less than wetland restoration. Does each wetland need a complete makeover including silt removal for example, or can wetlands be restored by breaking and blocking tile lines, installing ditch plugs, and letting the water accumulate? I prefer we prioritize acquisition over restoration at this time, Public Access already exists.
FA01	Camp Ripley Sentinel Landscape ACUB Protection Program Phase 14	6	6	5	5	5	5	6	0	5	5	3	51	20 easements protecting 1400 acres is an average of 70 acres per. There is little probability of parcels this size being converted to farm land. Can owners log timber under the easements? What is the county zoning in this area, how many houses per what size acreage? Does zoning provide protection? Can an owner retain non easement ownership of one acre to build a house and place the remainder of the property under easement? If so, is there any real benefit to the easement on the remaining property?
FA02	Mississippi Headwaters Habitat Corridor Project Phase 11	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	6	7	3	66	Maps do not specify where excity esements are being sought. referencing the 75% protected goal, how close are any of these sub watersheds and how much closer will this appropriation get a waterehd to that goal. Can an owner retain non easement ownership of one acre to build a house and place the remainder of the property under easement? If so, is there any real benefit to the easement on the remaining property? Is logging permitted on the easement property?
FA03	MN Forests of the Future Phase XI South East Blufflands to Northern Forests Protection	8	9	8	9	9	7	7	5	7	8	5	82	Does working forest equal logging permitted? If yes shoud some parcels be set aside to permit eventual old growth forest to come into existence? Will entire pacels be acquired or placed under easement or will small areas be excluded to permit the owner to build a house in the woods? Will provision be made to permit non motorized trails in the future if other funding can be found to purchase right of way from private owner and reimburse OHF for easement rights?
FA04	Pine and Leech Watershed Phase IV Forest Habitat Protection	8	7	9	8	8	7	8	0	7	7	7	76	Does a forest stewardship plan allow any logging? Will easements be for entire parcels only or allow an opt out for a house in the woods (Wilderness homestead)? Can these parcels be developed into wilderness homesteads with county zoning providing pretecton? confirm that all private land under easement will actually be open to public use?
FRE01	DNR Statewide Forest Enhancement-Phase 7	8	8	7	8	8	8	7	0	8	8	3	73	How often does a section of forest need to be enhanced or restored?
FRE02	Enhancing Black Ash Forests for Resilience and Habitat	8	8	9	8	8	8	7	5	6	8	3	78	per acre cost seems high, what % of the black ash forest statewide that is being lost does this address?
FRE03	Metro Forests for Minnesota Wildlife and Communities	8	6	5	5	6	6	6	5	4	4	3	58	Cost seems extravegant, land is already publicly owned so no new acres protected.
FRE04	Minnesota Forest Recovery Project	8	6	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	5	5	62	Impressive list of sites. Isn't post burn recovery part of nature taking its course? Which parcels are actualy on tribal land?
WA01	Accelerating the Waterfowl Production Area Program - Phase XIX	8	7	8	7	7	7	6	8	7	7	7	79	how secure is the federal money? is it in a reserve for this type of acquisition? How much of this is prime farmland verses marginal?
WA02	RIM Wetlands - Restoring the most productive habitat in Minnesota	7	7	8	7	7	7	6	0	5	6	5	65	Acreage is very specific, did I miss the location list? Land in CRP is typically lower quality yet price is high, seems to reflect prime farmland.
WA03	Shallow Lake & Wetland Protection & Restoration Program	9	8	8	7	7	7	8	5	6	8	8	81	restoring drained and farmed wetlands is a plus/ Are NAWCA Funds secure from cancelation? All for acquisition?
WRE01	Accelerating the USFWS Habitat Conservation Easement Program	7	6	5	7	6	6	7	5	5	6	3	63	Narrative says land is already protected. If this land is already hayed or pastured and will continue, what will the money be used to accompolish? Are all new easement acres purchased with USF&W money
WRE02	DNR Shallow Lakes and Wetland Enhancements Phase 19	7	6	6	5	5	6	6	0	5	5	3	54	All restoratin on already owned land. Support critical projects such as replacing FAILED WCS. Not supporting reshaping the land by moving earth except to create berms for more wetlands.
WRE03	DNR Statewide control and reduction of invasive Phragmites Phase I	6	6	7	6	6	5	5	7	5	5	3	61	67 acres? handout says every known stand of phragmites will be controlled but the map suggests that 67 acres would barely touch the surface.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2027 / FY 2028														
Member Name:	Ted Suss													
Due Date:	Friday, July 17, 2026 by 4 p.m. Email to tom.rebman@isonc.mn.gov													
Maximum score per request is 110 points. Scores should be whole numbers, no decimals. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*														
		Criteria												
		1. Proposal “Abstract” and “Design & Scope of Work” summaries are both clearly written and adequately address the Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for fish, game, and wildlife, and/or threatened or endangered species.	3. The timing of this proposal is important and urgent.	4. Proposal will improve or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	5. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes and is likely to produce significant permanent conservation legacy and/or beneficial habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Proposal includes leverage.	9. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	10. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	11. Proposal provides public access, use, or benefit.	Total Score (out of 110 possible points)	Comments / Questions
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10		
WRE04	Living Shallow Lakes and Wetlands Enhancement & Restoration Initiative	7	7	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	3	59	No additional lands protected. Already public or protected lands. If these landa are being returned to nature, why so much expense building WCS and other landscape changes? significant funds for personell.
WRE05	Mud River Enhancement Phase II	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	7	4	4	3	50	Problem caused by drainage, yet see no plan component that addresses changing farming practices to reduce runoff and preserve project benefits,
WRE06	Otter and Campbell Lakes Habitat Enhancement and Restoration Phase 1	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	3	50	no new public land. Are upstream lands managed in a way to prevent residementation?
HA01	2027 Riparian Habitat Protection In the kettle and Snake River Watersheds	8	7	7	7	7	6	8	5	7	7	9	78	How many parcels would actually be developed in a way that results in construction if not placed under easement? Would part a parcel still see construction of a "house in the woods" on non RIM acres?
HA02	2027 St. Croix Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Phase 8	8	7	8	8	7	7	8	1	7	7	9	77	Are all of the parcels eligible for development. Are any of these parcels protected by Bluff setbacks?
HA03	Cannon River Watershed Habitat Protection and Restoration Program - 16	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	0	Conflict
HA04	Dakota County Habitat Protection/Restoration Phase IX	8	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	6	6	8	79	County is covering personel costs. If full funding is not received, I prefer funding acquisition.
HA05	Fisheries Habitat Protection on Strategic North Central Minnesota Lakes - ML2027	7	8	8	8	8	7	7	5	7	8	8	81	Since this is a growing complex in Lake Country, Will provision be made to allow regional or state trails to cross the property in the most minimally intrusive way, including possible payment from another source for the acreage used by the trail?
HA06	Metro Big Rivers Phase 17	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	4	6	8	9	81	Acquisition is high priority when lands become available. Restoration costs seem high and should take backseat to purchase or easement of additional property. For any parcel in the Minnesota River basin, provision should be made for continued extension of the Minnesota Valley State Trail or connecting regional trails across or along the acquired parcles, Especially Blakely Bluffs.
HA07	Protecting Minnesota's Lakes of Outstanding Biological Significance - Phase 6	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	4	7	7	7	79	Most funds for acquisition to protect lakeshore and near laek watersheds. Buy anything it when it is available!
HA08	RIM Priority Habitat	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	0	6	7	7	74	How many of the 178,000+ CRP acresreferenced in the narrative do you expect to be re-enrolled by owners? Little of this looks like prime farmland based on maps and pictures, yet cost is close to prime land price. If property remains in private ownership, how is the \$10,000 per easement spent for stewardship.
HA09	Southeast Minnesota Protection and Restoration Phase 15	8	8	6	8	7	8	7	4	6	7	7	76	Personell over 10%. Support acquisition and esacements. Most of funds for last 4 years are unspent. This suggests timing is not that crucial. How is the value of easement established? is there the same appraisal process to determine sale value before negotiation on easement value commences?
HA10	Wild Rice Shoreland Protection Phase X	8	8	7	6	7	7	7	0	8	8	7	73	Are the 12 parcels ID'd or is that an estimate of the number these funds will acquire? Are entire parcels placed under easement or just shoreline? How subject are these parcels to development?
HRE01	Anoka Sand Plain Habitat Enhancement and Restoration - Phase 11	7	6	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	55	No additional public land therfore no additional public access. Significant unspent funds that are not waiting for property aquisitons.
HRE02	Beaver Creek Habitat Restoration	6	6	6	7	6	6	8	2	6	5	3	61	Already public access. No additional public land . Unusual reason for restoration, to set up a research project. Does this restoration truly improve the habitat or just make it look nicer?
HRE03	Daylighting Phalen Creek - Phase 2	8	8	7	8	6	7	7	5	6	6	3	71	In the metro area. high % of leverage is confirmed. No additional public land or public access. Quality of habitat to be improved.
HRE04	DNR Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Phase 10	7	8	7	8	7	6	7	5	6	6	3	70	Support those projects that restore fish passage. Significant unspent funds perhaps could fund the burn and invasive removal portion of the request. Not certain of how habitat is improved as a result of the Necktie channel project.
HRE05	DNR Fish Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Phase 1	8	8	7	8	8	7	7	2	6	6	3	70	Two FTE for five years? high support for lake connectivity projects. high scores are for connectivity projects. no new public access
HRE06	DNR Irish Creek Watershed Enhancement, Phase 1	8	8	8	8	9	7	8	0	7	7	3	73	high personel costs. What exactly is done to improve moose forage habitat?
HRE07	DNR Roving Crew 4	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	9	9	3	84	This is where I feel invasive removal projects ought to be funded. Pick the Highest priorty of need for this work across all projects and areas.
HRE08	Enhancing Agate Bay's Coastal Wetland Habitat along the Lake Superior Shore in Lake County, Minnesota	7	3	3	3	3	3	6	8	3	3	3	45	This does not seem to fit our programming purpose.

Lessard-Sams Outdoor Heritage Council Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet - ML 2027 / FY 2028														
Member Name:	Ted Suss													
Due Date:	Friday, July 17, 2026 by 4 p.m. Email to tom.rebman@isohc.mn.gov													
Maximum score per request is 110 points. Scores should be whole numbers, no decimals. Enter "COI" in the "Total Score" field if not evaluating a proposal due to a conflict of interest.*														
		Criteria												
		1. Proposal "Abstract" and "Design & Scope of Work" summaries are both clearly written and adequately address the Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How.	2. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for fish, game, and wildlife, and/or threatened or endangered species.	3. The timing of this proposal is important and urgent.	4. Proposal will improve or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	5. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes and is likely to produce significant permanent conservation legacy and/or beneficial habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	6. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	7. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	8. Proposal includes leverage.	9. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	10. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	11. Proposal provides public access, use, or benefit.	Total Score (out of 110 possible points)	Comments / Questions
ID#	Program Title	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10	Max points: 10		
HRE09	Knife River Habitat Rehabilitation Project-PH VIII	7	7	5	6	5	6	5	5	5	5	3	59	will this project ever be completed? a few thousand feet on miles of river. the river is already public.
HRE10	Little Cannon River Stream Habitat Restoration - Construction Phase	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	0	conflict
HRE11	Minnesota Marine Art Museum LSCOHC Proposal	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	0	Conflict with one of the partners
HRE12	Minnesota Statewide Trout Habitat Enhancement & Protection - Construction	8	6	3	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	3	56	Significant unspent funds from several yers. No new public access. This looks like an excellent long term plan covering numerous streams over multiple future funding cycles.
HRE13	Protection and Resiliency in the Rainy River Headwaters	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	7	5	5	3	55	Is this not a road improvment project that will benefit habitat rather than a habitat project?
HRE14	Restoring priority habitats for Hennepin County's sensitive wildlife	8	8	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	5	7	75	while no additional public land or public access is included, there are few opportunities to expand public land in the metro area. Projects in the metro area are somewhat limited to restoration and enhancement. Nearby population density results in high level of public use and benefit.
HRE15	Swift Coulee Channel Restoration/ Enhancement - Phase 2	6	6	6	5	5	5	4	8	4	3	3	55	This looks like a drainage system improvement or repair project that should be paid for with assesment to the benefitting property. Construction of a two-stage ditch is supposed to reduce sediment transfer. Good drainage design should minimize sediwemtn transfer and dbe paid for within the drainage proeject costs. Narrative states this project will enable farming BMPs, they can be implimented now. I see no enforicable commitment to use BMPs on adjacent ag land. Support funding only for RIM purchase portion of the project which appears to have been done with ML24 funds. .
HRE16	Tamarac River Enhancement Project - Phase 1	7	4	4	6	4	4	7	6	3	3	3	51	This ditch exists for the benefit of the adjacent drained farmland. Collapsing side wall repairs should be handled as maintenance or seperable repairs. restoring meander ought be part of designing a Drainage improvement project that does not negatively affect downbstream.
CPL	Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program ML27/FY28	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	7	9	0	79	Excellent program. Does Legislative limit to metro area reduce need for funds?
O1	2027 Contract Management	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	7	9	0	79	necessary
O2	2027 Restoration Evaluations - ML 2027	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	7	9	0	79	necessary
O3	DNR Core Functions in Partner-led OHF Acquisitions	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	7	9	0	79	necessary