



Hancock Park District

HANCOCK PARK DISTRICT BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS Public Meeting Notice and Agenda

Date: Tuesday, February 10, 2026
Location: Brugeman Lodge at Riverbend Recreation Area
9250 Township Road 208, Findlay, Ohio 45840
Time: 3:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

1. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes dated January 13, 2026

Financial Status

1. Review of the Financial Statement dated January 31, 2026, presented by Hancock Park District Business Manager Vicky Stozich

Old Business

New Business

1. 2025-2026 Hunting with Permission Game Management Program Update
2. A request from USI Insurance Services to provide the Hancock Park District Board of Park Commissioners with a price indication and sample proposal for property and casualty insurance coverage
3. Request to approve the Eastpoint Area Agreement, Great Karg Well Historical Site Agreement, Centennial Park Agreement, River Landings Agreement, Riverside Park Waterfront Agreement, Riverwalk Agreement, and the Blanchard River Greenway Trail Agreement
4. Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement with the City of Findlay

Discussion

1. Hancock Park District Report:
 - Director – Gary Pruitt
 - Park Operations Manager – Scott Egbert
 - Naturalist – Michelle Rumschlag
 - Natural Resource Manager – Chad Carroll

Public Input

Adjournment

Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 at 3:30 p.m.; Brugeman Lodge at Riverbend Recreation Area

HANCOCK PARK DISTRICT BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS
Staff Report/Agenda Supplement
February 10, 2026

2025-2026 Hunting with Permission Game Management Program Update: Natural Resource Manager Chad Carroll will be at the meeting to provide an update on the Hancock Park District's 2025-2026 Hunting with Permission Game Management Program.

A request from USI Insurance Services to provide the Hancock Park District Board of Park Commissioners with a price indication and sample proposal for property and casualty insurance coverage: USI Insurance Services would like to provide a price indication and sample proposal for property and casualty insurance coverage to the Hancock Park District Board of Park Commissioners. USI Insurance Services submitted an actual proposal several years ago. Hitchings Insurance Agency, Inc. rebutted the proposal with a comparison of cost and services. A change was not made. Since then, a USI Insurance Services representative has called the Hancock Park District every year to gauge interest in receiving a USI Insurance Services proposal. Like last time, any USI Insurance Services proposal would lead to a comparison of cost and coverages received. And like last time, Hitchings Insurance Agency, Inc. would most likely be involved. The following statistics show the annual premium and premium increases from 2019 to 2025 for the Hancock Park District's Ohio Plan Property and Casualty Insurance:

- The 2019-2020 premium was \$34,325.00, an increase of \$1,145.00/3%.
- The 2020-2021 premium was \$35,446.00, an increase of \$1,121.00/3%.
- The 2021-2022 premium was \$36,626.00, an increase of \$1,180.00/3%.
- The 2022-2023 premium was \$37,674.00, an increase of \$1,048.00/3%.
- The 2023-2024 premium was \$38,737.00, an increase of \$1,063.00/3%.
- The 2024-2025 premium was \$41,259.00, an increase of \$2,522.00/7%.
- The 2025-2026 premium was \$44,676.00, an increase of \$3,417.00/8%.

From: Donnie Biven <donnie.biven@usi.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2026 11:03 AM
To: Gary Pruitt <GPruitt@hancockparks.com>
Subject: Hancock Park District / USI PEP Discussion

Hi Gary,

Thank you for your time on the phone this morning. Per our discussion, I wanted to send you a note, so you have my contact information as well as additional information about the value we bring to our clients. The reason for my outreach is simple; USI Insurance Services would be extremely interested in presenting a proposal for your coverages.

USI Public Sector Group focus on municipalities in the State of Ohio. We currently write over 200+ municipal entities throughout the state. We are well versed in the exposures that are unique to public entities and understand and educate our public entity clients on protections provided to them through the sovereign immunity clause in the Ohio Revised Code and the collateral source laws that are in force to protect the assets of municipalities.

USI Public Sector Group is the marketing firm for the Public Entities Pool of Ohio (PEP). PEP writes nothing but municipal business in the State of Ohio. Their focus is on municipal entities, water districts, park and health districts. Their forms are written to address the unique exposures faced by these entities throughout the state. Founded 34 years ago PEP is one of the largest and oldest municipal pools in the state of Ohio. They currently have over 610 members utilizing their services throughout the state. Nationwide over 90% of municipal entities participate in some form of pooling arrangement.

Staff Report/Agenda Supplement, February 10, 2026, continued – page 2

PEP is the largest, most financially secure pool on the state of Ohio. Their rates are stable and have not changed since the inception of the pool 40 years ago. The Public Entity Pool is backed by Lexington, Travelers, Argo Group and GenRe. The AM Best rating for these carriers is a minimum of "A" for each carrier. PEP is independently rated by Demotech. Demotech provides independent financial analysis of insurance pooling structures throughout the United States. PEP has received an "AAA", Unsurpassed rating from Demotech for over 20 contiguous years.

The Public Entities Pool of Ohio has been providing the broadest, most comprehensive insurance coverage for Ohio Municipalities for over 40 years. They take pride in the 99% retention rate of their members. Recently the Ohio Municipal League (OML) endorsed PEP as its preferred insurer for municipalities across the state. In addition to this highly coveted endorsement PEP offers the following to all of its members;

- PEP Grant Program – In celebration of the 30th anniversary of the PEP Pool the PEP Grant Program offers up to \$1,000 in grants for members who buy safety equipment or items that improve safety in their municipality. Some examples include, but are not limited to, mulch for a playground, defibrillators, bullet-proof vests, traffic cones. In 2019 Safety Training became eligible for PEP Grant reimbursement and in 2020 the PEP board allowed Personal Protection Equipment purchases to be an eligible expense.
- PEP Appraisal Program- In 2018 PEP announced that they will be rolling out complimentary appraisal services to all of its members. This service is not offered by any other municipal carrier in the state. The service is being managed by a licensed appraisal company in the state of Ohio and will include all building with values of \$100,000 and over. The appraisals will be shared with the member municipalities to ensure that all municipal building are insured to value.
- Pro-active Risk management – PEP loss control representative meet with all new members within 30 days to review your safety programs and provide inspections. All members of PEP have full access to the PEP Resource Library. This library contains sample policies and procedure for any number of risk management items, safety training videos and white papers all available free of charge to PEP members.

We would very much like to give you a price indication and sample proposal for your coverages. Please let me know if you and the board are interested in looking at a competitive option for your 2026 renewal. I would also welcome being a resource and staying connected for any potential future needs.

Best Regards,
Donnie

DONNIE BIVEN
Vice President, Commercial Property & Casualty
USI Insurance Services
CA License Nos. 4345432 | 0G11911
312 Elm Street, 24th Floor, Cincinnati, OH 45202
513.964.1029 | c: 216.882.4668
donnie.biven@usi.com | www.usi.com

Staff Report/Agenda Supplement, February 10, 2026, continued – page 3

Request to approve the Eastpoint Area Agreement, Great Karg Well Historical Site Agreement, Centennial Park Agreement, River Landings Agreement, Riverside Park Waterfront Agreement, Riverwalk Agreement, and the Blanchard River Greenway Trail Agreement: On May 13, 2025, the Board of Park Commissioners approved the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and changes regarding city-owned parks and trails that are managed and maintained by the Hancock Park District. After meetings and discussions between the City of Findlay and the Hancock Park District on July 17, August 12, and October 2 and after multiple correspondence between the City of Findlay Service-Safety Director and the Hancock Park District Director, agreements have been finalized regarding the proposed changes outlined in the MOU (see Agreements).

Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement with the City of Findlay: As a result of the Memorandum of Understanding, and in response to the proposed changes to the Hancock Park District's management and maintenance of city-owned parks and trails and the City of Findlay's anticipated increase in maintenance responsibilities and costs, the City of Findlay proposed a maintenance cost sharing agreement that would result in the Hancock Park District contributing fifty percent (50%) of the materials cost for large scale repair and restoration projects associated with certain city-owned sections of the Blanchard River Greenway Trail and city-owned structures/facilities at Riverside Park Waterfront within a five-year period. The original proposal from the City of

Findlay asked the Hancock Park District to contribute fifty percent (50%) of the materials cost without knowing the actual cost or project information. The Hancock Park District Director felt that it would be unwise for the City of Findlay to formally submit its original proposal and that it would be highly inappropriate for the Board of Park Commissioners to approve funding in that way and cautioned against it. The proposed Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement retains the City of Findlay's request for cost sharing while giving the Board of Park Commissioners the flexibility to review funding proposals on a case by case basis.

The Board of Park Commissioners should consider the following:

1. The City of Findlay already receives an annual grant from the Hancock Park District (e.g., \$80,244.00 in the last five years), which the City of Findlay has applied toward park improvement projects at Riverside Park: \$20,000.00 in 2025 to replace the seating area near the bandshell with stamped concrete and to install an accessible ramp to the stage, \$15,000.00 in 2024 to extend the bandshell stage by laying brick and paving a six-inch concrete cap, \$22,000.00 in 2023 to restore the main restroom facility and the main electrical building, \$14,780.00 in 2022 to restore the pool house, and \$8,464.00 in 2021 to restore Shelter #15. That is the **first revenue source** from the Hancock Park District.
2. The City of Findlay has gained the Waterfalls Pavilion as a rental facility that typically brings in approximately \$3,600.00 annually based on a \$50.00 rental rate (City of Findlay charges \$55.00). That is the **second revenue source** from the Hancock Park District.
3. The Findlay-Hancock County Community Foundation managed the Robert G. and Mary C. Behne Fund for Riverside Park Waterfront for the Hancock Park District. The fund was established on April 26, 2024. The current balance is \$12,735.05. However, more money may be donated to the fund based on a conversation between the Hancock Park District Director and the donor on November 19, 2025, thereby increasing the annual distribution. The current distribution is \$515.00.

Andrea Reinhart, the donor relations and stewardship manager at the Findlay-Hancock County Community Foundation, was asked by the Hancock Park District Director if the fund could be transferred from the Hancock Park District to the City of Findlay, meaning the City of Findlay would become the recipient of money instead of the Hancock Park District.

Staff Report/Agenda Supplement, February 10, 2026, continued – page 4

She said it could and that changes would be made. Findlay Service-Safety Director Rob Martin was informed about the change and the availability of the new fund and the investment opportunity that would benefit the City of Findlay. That is the **third revenue source** from the Hancock Park District.

The Courier newspaper reported that there may be a plan by the City of Findlay to pursue an agreement with the Findlay-Hancock County Community Foundation to collect and manage contributions for the downtown recreation area. As a 501 (c)(3) nonprofit, the Findlay-Hancock County Community Foundation can issue charitable contribution receipts, allowing donors to claim deductions. Online and small-dollar donations are accepted and can be managed over time, with the potential creation of an endowment for future park upkeep. It was reported that the City of Findlay might make an initial \$10,000.00 seed contribution.

If future funds via the Findlay-Hancock County Community Foundation can benefit the Downtown North River Development Project, then the Robert G. and Mary C. Behne Fund has the potential to benefit Riverside Park Waterfront in the same way.

4. The City of Findlay has gained Zonta Landing Boat Rentals, which is technically the **fourth revenue source** from the Hancock Park District, even though in the past expenses have exceeded revenue (waterfront staff pay rates increased each year by 3% while boat rental rates remained unchanged). It remains to be seen if accepting credit cards as a payment option, providing unattended kayak rental kiosks (lockers that contain the kayak, paddle, and PFD), a refreshment stand, and other operational changes by the City of Findlay will lead to net revenue.
5. Approving the Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement would potentially provide the City of Findlay with its **fifth revenue source** from the Hancock Park District.
6. Should the Hancock Park District remain on the hook financially just because it relinquished control of trails and facilities, thereby transferring responsibility for management and maintenance to the City? Does that act obligate the Hancock Park District in some way?

7. When the Hancock Park District became responsible for city-owned parks and trails beginning in 1976, the agreement was that the Hancock Park District would develop, operate, manage, maintain, and improve parks and trails at its own expense. In fact, the Hancock Park

District was involved heavily in the original development of trails and facilities, including the initial funding followed by decades of maintenance, management, and improvements.

Those trails and facilities and the value of those trails and facilities have been in essence donated to the City of Findlay. For example, since 2023, the Hancock Park District administered the following improvements: \$14,000.00 for a metal roof at Zonta Landing, \$9,550.00 for chimney/masonry repairs at the Waterfalls Pavilion, \$17,000.00 for site amenities at Zonta Landing and at the Waterfalls Pavilion, \$8,475.00 for tandem kayaks (2) - 2023, pedal boats (6) - 2025, and safety ropes (2) - 2025 at Zonta Landing, and \$31,100.00 for wood decking replacement on the Brugeman Bridge, which is part of the Blanchard River Greenway Trail.

These improvements, which have been donated to the City of Findlay, have value: \$80,125.00. Circumstances have now placed trails and facilities that were once the responsibility of the Hancock Park District in the hands of the City of Findlay. Perhaps it is simply the city's turn to be responsible for those trails and facilities, including improvements and the funding required to make those improvements.

Staff Report/Agenda Supplement, February 10, 2026, continued – page 5

8. The Hancock Park District's Community Park Improvement Program grants were designed to help villages and cities in Hancock County make park improvements. An argument can be made that those annual grants could be applied to the improvement of facilities at Riverside Park (like they have been in the past) and to the improvement of the Blanchard River Greenway Trail without the Hancock Park District providing additional park improvement grants per the Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement.
9. An early precedent was set regarding cost sharing, including Riverside Park and the Riverwalk plus in-kind contributions toward the Blanchard River Greenway Trail. There are two notable examples of cost sharing related to early Riverside Park development projects: Riverside Park Waterfront Development - 1980, City of Findlay contribution - \$55,000.00, Hancock Park District contribution - \$178,000.00 and Riverside Park Improvements/South Entry and Bandshell Renovations - 1999, City of Findlay contribution - \$10,000.00, Hancock Park District contribution - \$78,499.00.

There has also been in general a longstanding partnership between the City of Findlay and the Hancock Park District. And even though changes have been made, that partnership continues in the name of parks and recreation for Findlay and Hancock County. Cost sharing in the limited context of the Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement could be considered part of an ongoing partnership.

10. Would the Hancock Park District consider contributing money toward the redevelopment of the Riverwalk or maybe even the new downtown park as part of a City of Findlay fundraising campaign? If so, then how is that any different than what is being proposed in the Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement? Just because the Hancock Park District relinquished control of facilities and trails does not mean that it no longer values those facilities and trails and is no longer committed to the big picture (i.e., the benefits of parks and recreation to the community).
11. If an argument can be made for and against the proposed Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement (i.e., there is an absence of a definitive, slam dunk position either way), then approving the proposed Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement would certainly buy some time. By approving the agreement, the Board of Park Commissioners would commit to nothing except to agree to entertain funding proposals in the future limited to the next five years.

The Board of Park Commissioners is most likely faced with one of two decisions:

1. If the Board of Park Commissioners cannot justify cost sharing and if it does not feel a sense of obligation to help the City of Findlay pay for large scale repair and renovation projects and if it is

not interested in appealing the City of Findlay regarding its cost sharing proposal, then the Board of Park Commissioners should not approve the Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement.

2. If the Board of Park Commissioners is conflicted about what to do or it is willing to at least entertain cost sharing based on actual project details and estimated project costs, then approving the Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement would be appropriate (see Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement).

Note: Findlay City Safety-Service Director Rob Martin and Findlay City Engineer Jeremy Kalb will be at the meeting. Rob expressed a particular interest in discussing the Maintenance Cost Sharing Agreement: *“The only agreement that I would like to have more discussion around with the Board is the maintenance cost sharing agreement. I am fine with it how written but want to have dialogue with HPD Board and you on what that looks like in their mind.”*