Why pickleball noise mitigation fails: lessons from failure mode analysis

Charles Leahy
Presented at Acoustical Society, Honolulu HI, Dec 2025
In press, Proceedings of Meeting on Acoustics

Abstract

Acoustic engineers are frequently hired to assess pickleball noise and recommend mitigation strategies. Court owners are responsible for implementing those recommendations. However, failures often occur at multiple stages of the process. These include failure to adequately assess the noise, failure to design effective mitigation, failure to implement the recommendations, and failure to enforce operational limits such as paddle type or hours of play. This paper applies the principles of Failure Mode Analysis (FMA) to the problem of pickleball noise mitigation, recognizing it as a system-level challenge that involves not only engineering but also planning, construction, and governance. Qualitative study identifies and categorizes the most common points of failure across real-world mitigation efforts. Failure modes are evaluated in terms of severity, likelihood of occurrence, and how these failures interact and compound one another. Consequences range from minimal noise reduction to neighborhood strife, physical and mental health impacts, decreased property values, lawsuits, and broken trust in government officials. By understanding failure pathways, acoustic engineers can improve the quality and applicability of their recommendations, while court owners may gain clearer expectations of both feasibility and ultimate success of the mitigation. The goal is better outcomes for vulnerable residential populations living near the courts.

1. Introduction

Acoustic engineers are often retained to assess pickleball noise and propose mitigation strategies, yet successful outcomes remain elusive. Court owners, municipalities, and HOAs bear responsibility for implementing these recommendations, but failures occur at multiple stages of the process. These include inadequate assessment of noise conditions, design of ineffective mitigation, incomplete or flawed implementation, and lack of enforcement of operational limits such as paddle restrictions or hours of play.

This paper applies the principles of Failure Mode Analysis (FMA) to pickleball noise mitigation, framing the issue as a system-level challenge that spans engineering, planning, construction, and governance. Using a qualitative review of real-world mitigation efforts, the study identifies and categorizes common points of failure. Each failure mode is evaluated in terms of severity, likelihood of occurrence, and the ways failures interact and compound one another.

Consequences of these failures range from negligible noise reduction to escalation of neighborhood conflict, adverse health impacts, depressed property values, lawsuits, and erosion of public trust in local officials. By mapping these failure pathways, the paper aims to help acoustic engineers improve the robustness and relevance of their recommendations, while providing court owners with clearer expectations of feasibility and success. Ultimately, the goal is to achieve better outcomes for vulnerable residential populations living near pickleball courts.

---

2. Failure Mode Analysis: Definition

Failure Mode Analysis (FMA), also called Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA), is a structured method for anticipating and prioritizing risks in a system. It originated in aerospace and manufacturing, where reliability and safety depend on identifying weak points before they cause harm.

In practice, engineers list possible "failure modes" (ways something can go wrong), identify their causes, and rate each according to three factors: **severity** (how bad the consequence would be), **likelihood** (how often it might happen), and **detectability** (how easy it is to spot before it causes damage). The result is a ranked set of risks that guides prevention and resource allocation.

Although FMA is an engineering tool, the logic will be familiar to those in business, finance, or government. Investors weigh probability of default against potential loss when judging bonds. Insurers assess both frequency and magnitude of claims. Project managers use risk registers to anticipate setbacks, rank them, and focus on the most serious. FMA is simply the engineering equivalent of these practices—an organized way to ask: *Where can this system fail, how bad would it be, and how likely is it?*

---

3. Application of FMA to Pickleball Noise Mitigation Projects

Failure Mode Analysis is most powerful when grounded in real-world evidence. In applying it to pickleball noise, this study draws upon a broad base of experience and documentation, not only from the acoustics literature but also from the lived controversies unfolding across the United States and Canada. The objective is to move beyond theory to a system-level understanding of where and why pickleball noise mitigation breaks down.

A. Stages of Failure
Applied to pickleball noise, FMA helps us move beyond the idea of a single "fix" and instead recognize a chain of linked stages where failures can occur:

1. Assessment – noise may be measured incorrectly or incompletely.
2. Design – mitigation may be modeled for the wrong conditions.
3. Implementation – recommended materials or layouts may be compromised.
4. Enforcement – operational rules (e.g., quiet paddles, hours) may be ignored.

Breakdowns early in the chain ripple forward. For example, if noise is measured only by average decibel levels instead of peak impulsive impacts, then the mitigation design will underestimate the real exposure, barriers will underperform, and neighbors will remain distressed. Even the best design can fail if court owners substitute cheaper materials or bow to political pressure against enforcement.

B. Sources and Methods for the Analysis

This analysis is informed by a wide range of sources that extend well beyond technical acoustics. The author's earlier papers, including *Preliminary Analysis of 79 Pickleball Noise Consultant Reports by 36 Consultants* and *Improving the Persuasiveness of the Pickleball Noise Consultant Report*, provide a foundation of documented consultant practices, successes, and shortcomings. Since those publications, the collection has grown to include more than 140 consultant reports prepared by over three dozen acoustical engineers. Additional evidence comes from nuisance lawsuits filed in multiple states, public records requests, and the extensive media coverage of neighborhood controversies. Zoom recordings of city council and planning commission meetings, along with accompanying agendas and staff reports, illustrate how decision makers respond to consultant recommendations in real time. Conversations with players, neighbors, litigants, attorneys, and consultants reveal the human dimension of conflict—why some mitigation measures are resisted, diluted, or ignored altogether.

The analysis is also shaped by the professional careers of the authors, who bring decades of experience with engineering projects, governance, and regulatory oversight. One author's background in the automotive industry includes direct experience with design underperformance, product liability, and the critical importance of testing against worst-case conditions. The other author's service at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) involved regulatory processes where community health, environmental standards, and enforcement were paramount, and where failure to anticipate unintended consequences could have national implications. Together, these perspectives reinforce that pickleball noise mitigation is not only a technical challenge but a governance problem, requiring careful attention to both engineering rigor and the institutional frameworks in which decisions are made.

Defining Success and Failure

In setting out a framework for failure mode analysis, it is important to clarify what we mean by "success" and "failure." Our purpose here is not to issue hard findings on ultimate outcomes, but rather to map the possible pathways where projects can break down. Even so, several reference points for success and failure emerge from the record.

Success as Judged by Neighbors' Lived Experience

A recurring theme in the case studies is that many problems were triggered by the conversion of tennis courts into pickleball courts. When complaints persisted despite mitigation efforts, the common remedy was to revert the courts back to tennis. From the neighbors' perspective, the test of success is straightforward: noise is mitigated to the extent that complaints subside or disappear. Conversely, it is a clear sign of failure when complaints remain sustained—surfacing in news stories, petitions, and repeated appearances at city council meetings.

Success as Judged by Engineers

Consultants and acoustical engineers tend to define success in technical terms. Yet, there is no consensus on how to diagnose or evaluate pickleball noise: measurement methods differ, as do the types of mitigation recommended. Engineers often acknowledge that they do not control or even know how their recommendations are implemented by cities or court owners, and that responsibility for follow-through lies elsewhere. In this light, engineers may consider their work a success if the recommended barriers or rules are acoustically reasonable, even if complaints persist afterward.

Success as Judged by Cities and Court Owners

For municipalities, HOAs, or other court owners, success is often framed through the lens of compromise and risk management. Cities may consider a project "good enough" once they have installed barriers, adjusted hours, or imposed equipment rules—believing they have balanced community interests. This perspective carries an inherent bias: if neighbors continue to complain, officials may view them as unreasonable rather than recognizing the persistence of the underlying acoustic problem. In some cases, "success" is thus defined less by actual noise relief and more by whether the city can defend its actions as adequate.

Closing Observation

These diverging perspectives illustrate why defining success and failure is itself part of the challenge. What neighbors experience as ongoing harm, engineers may treat as an implementation gap, and cities may dismiss as an unreasonable demand. The lack of a shared standard for evaluation means that the same project can be judged simultaneously as a success and a failure—creating fertile ground for the very failure pathways this study seeks to trace.

Limitations of the Study

This paper presents a qualitative analysis aimed at identifying the pathways by which pickleball noise mitigation projects fail. The focus is on describing the mechanisms of breakdown rather than quantifying how frequently these failures occur or assessing their relative severity. In other words, the study does not attempt to measure incidence rates or rank the consequences of failure across cases.

What we can do, however, is highlight illustrative case studies that show how individual breakdowns can cascade into broader collapse. For example, errors in initial noise assessment often led to flawed design assumptions; once barriers or enclosures were installed under those

assumptions, they underperformed, leaving community complaints unresolved. In such cases, enforcement pressures mounted, and the eventual outcome was closure of courts. These examples are not statistical proof but serve to demonstrate the sequential and compounding nature of failure modes.

---

4. Failure in Assessment – noise may be measured incorrectly or incompletely

A. Designing for average rather than peak noise
Some consultants rely on average sound levels (Leq) or maximum short-term values (Lmax) rather than true peak levels (Lpeak). This approach understates the sharp, impulsive character of paddle-ball impacts—the very quality that triggers neighbor complaints. It is comparable to designing a bridge for average truck weights instead of the heaviest truck allowed.

B. Baseline measurements taken at the wrong times
Noise surveys are sometimes conducted during busy daytime hours, when ambient levels from traffic or construction are already high. This masks the real problem, which is that pickleball play often occurs on evenings, weekends, and holidays when neighborhoods are otherwise quiet.

C. Measuring at the house instead of the property line
Sound levels at the wall of a house may be several decibels lower than at the legal property boundary where the neighbor's right to quiet enjoyment begins.

D. Reliance on ordinance thresholds instead of annoyance research
Local ordinances often set generous dB limits intended for traffic or industrial sources. These thresholds are poor proxies for human annoyance with impulsive recreational noise.

E. Modeling only for the "complaining neighbor"
Cities may request that modeling be limited to the household that has formally complained. This neglects the reality that the closest or most exposed property often experiences the worst impact.

F. Reducing assessment to decibels alone
Pickleball sound is highly impulsive, tonal, and sharp. These psychoacoustic factors are measurable, yet many assessments ignore them and report only decibel levels.

G. Ignoring contextual and historical exposure
Communities where residents have endured years of play without relief are sensitized. Prevention and cure are different problems, yet assessments often fail to make this distinction.

---

5. Failure in Design – mitigation may be modeled for the wrong conditions

A. Designing for average rather than peak play
Designs that target average conditions underestimate the real source strength. Barriers sized for "typical" hits will fail when players strike hard overhead shots.

B. Using daytime ambient as the baseline
Design goals are sometimes set relative to noisy daytime conditions, which makes mitigation appear more effective on paper. Yet the true test is whether noise is masked during quiet evening and weekend hours.

C. Relying on oversimplified propagation models
Free or low-cost propagation software often assumes that barriers block all direct sound without leakage. In practice, noise "flanks" around the ends and over the top.

D. Misplacing the modeled source height
Some models assume that all shots occur at 1.5 meters, the height of a soft dink. But decisive overhead "put-away" shots can exceed 2 meters.

---

6. Failure in Implementation – recommended materials or layouts may be compromised

A. Substituting lower-performance materials
Even when engineers specify barriers with high Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings, owners may substitute cheaper products with inferior performance.

B. Scaling back during construction
Plans may call for continuous barriers, but contractors or owners reduce their height, length, or density to save money or preserve sightlines.

C. Political pressure and local opposition
Even when designs are sound and materials available, local player groups or pickleball ambassadors may oppose construction. Political lobbying can delay, dilute, or prevent installation.

---

7. Failure in Enforcement – operational rules may be ignored

A. Quiet paddle rules without monitoring
Cities or HOAs may adopt policies requiring “quiet” paddles, but without consistent enforcement these rules become symbolic.

B. Play-hour limits without enforcement
Posting hours of operation is meaningless if courts remain unlocked and unmonitored.

C. Exempting municipal properties from zoning or noise limits
Some cities apply zoning and noise regulations to private developers but exempt their own parks and recreation departments. This double standard undermines public confidence.

---

8. Accumulation of Failures

A. Cascading technical weaknesses
When noise is assessed using average levels instead of peak values, the design is already compromised. If, in addition, the owner substitutes cheaper materials, the system underperforms even further.

B. Financial costs without results
Communities often invest substantial funds in studies, barriers, and quiet equipment policies. When failures accumulate, the money is spent but the annoyance remains.

C. Governance breakdowns
Each failed stage erodes trust. A flawed assessment makes residents suspicious of consultants; poor design makes them doubt engineers; implementation compromises make them distrust owners or contractors; lax enforcement makes them lose confidence in city officials or HOA boards.

D. Social conflict and litigation
Accumulated failures deepen divisions between players and neighbors. Lawsuits become more likely, with neighbors pursuing nuisance claims or CEQA challenges as a last resort.

E. Health and quality of life impacts
Prolonged exposure to intrusive sound, combined with frustration at ineffective remedies, amplifies stress, sleep disturbance, and resentment.

Table 1. Failure Mode Analysis of Pickleball Noise Mitigation

Stage	Failure Mode	Cause / Example	Consequence	Severity	Likelihood
Assessment	Average noise measured instead of peak	Using Leq or Lmax instead of Lpeak	Understates annoyance; design targets too low	High	High
	Baseline taken at wrong times	Daytime only, not evenings/weekends	Noise impact understated	High	Medium
	Measured at house not property line	Wrong measurement location	Legal and perceptual exposure understated	Medium	Medium
	Reliance on ordinance thresholds	Local code allows high dB but ignores annoyance	Compliance without relief	High	High
	Ignoring psychoacoustic/contextual factors	Sharpness, impulsiveness, sensitization not considered	Real-world annoyance persists	High	High
Design	Designing for average not peak play	Modeled for soft dinks, not overhead smashes	Barriers too short/ineffective	High	High
	Using daytime ambient as baseline	Setting goals relative to noisy daytime	Under-design for quiet evening hours	High	Medium
	Oversimplified propagation modeling	Free software assumes no flanking	Barriers underperform	Medium	High
	Wrong source height in modeling	1.5 m instead of 2+ m	Sound bypasses barrier	High	Medium
Implementation	Substitution of cheaper materials	STC 17 barrier used instead of STC 28	Effectiveness cut in half	High	Medium
	Scaling back construction	Reduced barrier height/length	Noise leaks around/over barrier	High	Medium
	Political blocking of construction	Opposition from players/ambassadors	No mitigation installed	High	Medium

Stage	Failure Mode	Cause / Example	Consequence	Severity	Likelihood
Enforcement	Quiet paddle rule unenforced	No monitoring of equipment use	Loud paddles return	High	High
	Play-hour restrictions unenforced	Courts left open, no supervision	Off-hour noise persists	High	High
	Municipal self-exemption	City exempts own parks from zoning/noise rules	Erodes trust; no relief	High	Medium

---

9. Conclusion

Pickleball noise mitigation frequently fails not because of a single mistake, but because weaknesses accumulate across the entire chain of assessment, design, implementation, and enforcement. Failure Mode Analysis provides a structured lens to understand these breakdowns, showing how technical shortcomings, governance gaps, and social dynamics interact to undermine success.

The consequences are serious: persistent annoyance, health impacts, wasted financial resources, loss of property value, litigation, and erosion of public trust. By explicitly identifying the failure pathways, this paper highlights opportunities to intervene earlier and more effectively.

For engineers:

- Design to the *peak conditions* of play, not the averages.
- Incorporate psychoacoustic metrics such as sharpness and impulsiveness, not just decibels.
- Clearly communicate both the capabilities and the limits of any proposed mitigation.

For court owners and municipalities:

- Commit to *implementation fidelity*—avoid downgrading materials or layouts.
- Treat mitigation as more than a one-time construction project by ensuring long-term enforcement of paddle restrictions and hours of play.
- Budget realistically for solutions that match the severity of the problem.

For planners and policymakers:

- Recognize that noise mitigation is not just an engineering exercise but a governance challenge.
- Apply zoning and operational standards equally to public and private facilities.
- Establish transparent processes so that residents understand how decisions are made and what protections they can expect.

Ultimately, protecting the quality of life for vulnerable residential populations requires treating pickleball noise as a **system-level risk**. By adopting a Failure Mode Analysis perspective, stakeholders can anticipate where breakdowns are most likely, set realistic expectations, and design mitigation strategies with a higher chance of success.
