

From: [Jay Ingram](#)
To: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 4/7/26 Little League and ARPD MOU
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2026 9:11:02 PM

Hello City Council,

As neighbors of Littlejohn Park, we have concerns with the MOU as well as the process getting up to this point.

Questions/Concerns:

- Are we correct in assuming this MOU did not go to the Recreation and Parks Commission? If so, that is an unfortunate missed public outreach opportunity, one that could have addressed some of the MOU's shortcomings.
- The two community meetings were sold as "proposed changes to the park." Those familiar with the process knew these changes were not "proposed" rather a done deal.
- ALL and ARPD said this will be a trial period for ALL and the neighbors. We don't believe this is a trial because the costly infrastructure improvements would say otherwise. With all the ARPD parks there must be a better field for this age group.
- Three weeks into the season the weekend parking is a nightmare and causing frustration with the other neighbors. We are aware other neighbors have voiced their concerns to you. We haven't seen too many families walking from Sweeney Park or Wind River as the parking plan suggests. We already have an impacted and highly used neighborhood park.
- The MOU, section 2.A.i. We believe ALL should not have exclusive use. The City owns the field and does not need to request use of it. Is there precedent for this type of use, i.e. does the city request use of other ARPD owned facilities. This language is backwards.
- Please do not allow ANY amplified music at all.
- Why does the MOU go to 2/15/27 if section 2.A. Says October 31 (assuming 2026, but MOU not clear).
- Should this MOU, or a modified version be approved, PLEASE require ALL and ARPD to meet again in December/January timeframe with neighbors so year one can be evaluated. Again, ALL told neighbors this year is a trial period - so treat it that way please.

Thank you,
Jay and Jill Ingram

From: [Laura Gamble](#)
To: [Amy Wooldridge](#)
Cc: [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#); [Justin Long](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Item 5-D on the April 7th agenda
Date: Friday, March 27, 2026 5:50:03 PM

I would prefer to discuss over email. Looking forward to learning more.

Laura Gamble

On Fri, Mar 27, 2026 at 5:41 PM Amy Wooldridge <AWooldridge@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Hi Laura,

Justin and I would be happy to meet with you directly to address your concerns. It may be easier than via email. Please let me know if you are interested.

Thank you.
Amy

On Mar 27, 2026, at 1:52 PM, Laura Gamble <lgamble05@gmail.com> wrote:

Those families didn't do that - wouldn't that be grounds for terminating the MOU?

Typed with two thumbs.

On Mar 27, 2026, at 1:35 PM, Amy Wooldridge
<awooldridge@alamedaca.gov> wrote:

Hello Ms. Gamble,

We understand your concerns and will share a comprehensive response next week. Regarding the parking signs, the way that the signs are worded is confusing and we have already asked them to change the signs. The intent is to make it clear that those parking areas are only for residents and not for Little League. Those families are clearly instructed, and over the last two weeks were directed, to Sweeney Park and Wind River parking lots.

Thank you,
Amy

Amy Wooldridge
Assistant City Manager
City of Alameda
(510) 747-4709
awooldridge@alamedaca.gov
www.alamedaca.gov

From: Laura Gamble <lgamble05@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 27, 2026 10:50 AM
To: CITYCOUNCIL-List <CITYCOUNCIL-List@alamedaca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Item 5-D on the April 7th agenda

As a quick follow-up, I drove over to the spot designated in the agreement for Little League parking and observed many signs saying public parking is not allowed and that those who park there will be towed.

This agreement is throwing the Littlejohn Park neighbors under the bus.

On Thu, Mar 26, 2026 at 6:46 PM Laura Gamble
<lgamble05@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Alameda City Council Members,

I am writing as a concerned resident regarding Item 5-D on the April 7th agenda, the proposed MOU between the City of Alameda and Alameda Little League Baseball for the use of Littlejohn Baseball Field. While I support Little League baseball in our community and recognize the inherent value that they bring to our community, I have serious concerns about this agreement and the process with which we arrived at it (which I have already expressed to you), and I urge the Council to address before approving it.

Many of us have already engaged with staff about these concerns. I personally offered to walk through the specific challenges that I thought needed to be addressed for the neighborhood to feel good about these changes, and that offer was ignored. No surprise but I do not feel that this MOU addresses those concerns!

The League Has Been Operating Without an Executed Agreement

Perhaps most troubling is the fact that the League has already been using Littlejohn Field for several weeks without a fully executed agreement in place. This raises fundamental questions:

How was the League permitted to occupy and operate on public property without Council approval or a signed agreement? Who authorized this use, and under what authority? The Council should demand a clear accounting of how this situation arose before approving any agreement that would retroactively legitimize it. This does not smell like a fair process.

This is not a minor procedural concern. Public assets belong to all Alameda residents, and the process by which they are allocated matters. Allowing a private organization to take exclusive control of a public park without an executed agreement sets a troubling precedent.

Violations Have Already Occurred

During the weeks the League has been operating without authorization, violations have already taken place, including what appear to be violations of the City's mobile vending ordinance related to concessions. If the League cannot comply with basic requirements during an unauthorized use period, the Council should seriously question whether this MOU includes sufficient safeguards to ensure compliance going forward.

Accountability Mechanisms Are Inadequate

The MOU requires the League to respond to neighborhood concerns within 24 hours, but it says nothing about what happens if those concerns are never actually resolved. A response is not a resolution. Under the current language, the League could acknowledge a complaint within 24 hours, take no further action, and still be in technical compliance with the agreement. There are no intermediate steps, no escalation process, no required remediation timeline, and no consequences short of full termination.

Full termination is a drastic and politically unlikely outcome, particularly mid-season. In practice, this leaves neighbors with no meaningful recourse. The Council should require the MOU to include a graduated enforcement framework with specific, enforceable consequences for repeated or unresolved violations. Nobody in the neighborhood wants Little League to not operate in LJP - we want a pathway for concerns and issues to be remedied that don't involve canceling the contract.

The Public Has No Clear Way to Engage

The MOU does not specify how members of the public are supposed to raise concerns in the first place. There is no designated contact, no complaint process, and no requirement that concerns be tracked or reported back to the City. Residents

are left without a clear pathway to participate in the accountability process that the agreement claims to offer.

Parking Enforcement Is a Termination Trigger in Name Only

The MOU states that failure to comply with the parking plan is grounds for immediate termination. While this sounds strong on paper, it is not a realistic enforcement tool. The City is unlikely to terminate a youth sports agreement mid-season over parking violations, no matter how disruptive those violations are to the surrounding neighborhood. Without intermediate enforcement options such as required corrective action plans or suspension of use privileges, the parking provision offers residents no practical protection.

What I Am Asking the Council to Do

I respectfully urge the Council to take the following actions before approving this MOU.

- Require a full explanation of how and why the League was permitted to use public property without an executed agreement, and what violations occurred during that unauthorized period.
- Amend the agreement to include a clear, graduated enforcement framework with specific consequences for unresolved neighbor concerns and repeated violations.
- Establish a clear public complaint process that specifies how residents can submit concerns, who is responsible for tracking them, and how and when the City will respond.
- Strengthen the parking compliance provisions to include intermediate enforcement steps rather than relying solely on the threat of full termination.

Our neighborhood deserves an agreement that meaningfully protects public access and residents' quality of life, not one that places the burden on neighbors while offering no practical recourse when problems arise. These things can all coexist with a thriving Little League.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Laura Gamble

Typed with two thumbs.