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The goal is to find out whether disc golf could have the same kind of winning under-par numbers as golf; while still offering enough birdies.

So, I set out to find how the Preserve could to be adjusted to get either $10 \%$ or $25 \%$ birdies for a 1000rated player on every hole. I used the Preserve because it is notoriously birdie-able, and because it has the physical room to actually make radical adjustments to hole lengths.

The chart below shows the results as they were recorded at the event. I picked a round rating of 1060 to represent what a winning score might be. The scores for 1060 are extrapolations from the scores of the highest-rated players.

| Event Par and Length |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 1000 | 1060 |
| Hole | Par | Length | Birdies | Ave | Ave |
| 1 | 4 | 708 | 50\% | 3.61 | 3.24 |
| 2 | 3 | 318 | 28\% | 2.88 | 2.57 |
| 3 | 3 | 408 | 42\% | 2.63 | 2.48 |
| 4 | 4 | 746 | 18\% | 4.07 | 3.67 |
| 5 | 3 | 275 | 36\% | 2.73 | 2.51 |
| 6 | 4 | 695 | 7\% | 4.40 | 4.09 |
| 7 | 3 | 390 | 46\% | 2.58 | 2.30 |
| 8 | 5 | 1,111 | 40\% | 5.06 | 4.52 |
| 9 | 3 | 406 | 66\% | 2.46 | 2.16 |
| 10 | 5 | 1,158 | 52\% | 4.61 | 4.17 |
| 11 | 3 | 375 | 47\% | 2.80 | 2.72 |
| 12 | 4 | 760 | 15\% | 4.13 | 3.68 |
| 13 | 3 | 348 | 33\% | 2.84 | 2.52 |
| 14 | 5 | 1,058 | 14\% | 5.50 | 4.88 |
| 15 | 4 | 738 | 31\% | 3.80 | 3.41 |
| 16 | 3 | 402 | 39\% | 2.72 | 2.36 |
| 17 | 3 | 243 | 50\% | 2.61 | 2.43 |
| 18 | 5 | 942 | 54\% | 4.54 | 4.04 |
| Total | 67 | 11,081 | 37\% | 63.96 | 57.76 |
| To Par |  |  |  | -3.04 | -9.24 |

Obviously, experts should not be expected to score 3 throws better than errorless play per round. And, these pars do produce winning-under-par scores much bigger than would be seen in big golf events.

But, we are trying to find out if correct disc golf pars can produce winning-under-par numbers like golf's. It tells us nothing to see that inflated pars will not produce winning-under-par scores like golf's. So, rather than super-size the course to justify the inflated pars which were set for the event, we should first take the easier step of adjusting pars to be equal to the PDGA Guidelines.

The chart below shows what would have happened if par had been set according to the Guidelines.

| Guideline Par with Event Lengths |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Hole | Par | Length | Birdies | 1000 <br> Ave | 1060 <br> Ave |
| 1 | 3 | 708 | $0 \%$ | 3.61 | 3.24 |
| 2 | 3 | 318 | $28 \%$ | 2.88 | 2.57 |
| 3 | 3 | 408 | $42 \%$ | 2.63 | 2.48 |
| 4 | 4 | 746 | $18 \%$ | 4.07 | 3.67 |
| 5 | 3 | 275 | $36 \%$ | 2.73 | 2.51 |
| 6 | 4 | 695 | $7 \%$ | 4.40 | 4.09 |
| 7 | 3 | 390 | $46 \%$ | 2.58 | 2.30 |
| 8 | 4 | 1,111 | $0 \%$ | 5.06 | 4.52 |
| 9 | 2 | 406 | $0 \%$ | 2.46 | 2.16 |
| 10 | 4 | 1,158 | $0 \%$ | 4.61 | 4.17 |
| 11 | 3 | 375 | $47 \%$ | 2.80 | 2.72 |
| 12 | 4 | 760 | $15 \%$ | 4.13 | 3.68 |
| 13 | 3 | 348 | $33 \%$ | 2.84 | 2.52 |
| 14 | 5 | 1,058 | $14 \%$ | 5.50 | 4.88 |
| 15 | 4 | 738 | $31 \%$ | 3.80 | 3.41 |
| 16 | 3 | 402 | $39 \%$ | 2.72 | 2.36 |
| 17 | 3 | 243 | $50 \%$ | 2.61 | 2.43 |
| 18 | 4 | 942 | $13 \%$ | 4.54 | 4.04 |
| Total | 62 | 11,081 | $23 \%$ | 63.96 | 57.76 |
| To Par |  |  |  | 1.96 | -4.24 |

This simple step by itself brings the winning-under-par score within the typical range of golf winning scores of about 4 or 5 under par per round.

One issue is that there is a par 2. Even if we call \#9 a par 3, the winning score relative to par still looks like a golf score. However, as par $2 s$ can never be birdie-able enough, in the next step I'll solve for the adjustments needed to hole \#9 which will create enough birdies as a par 3.

Next, we adjust each hole to generate a targeted percentage of birdies - within the bounds of Guideline pars.

To figure out how much to adjust each hole, we look at the scoring distributions across all player ratings. Find which player rating had scores which correspond to the targeted percent of birdies. Then we look at how the average score at that rating compares to the 1000-rated average. We can then use the fact that average score is pretty much a linear function of both player rating and length of hole to compute how much to adjust the hole. At The Preserve the average score of a 1000 -rated player goes up by one throw for every additional 327 feet in length.

The chart below shows the hole lengths that would result in $25 \%$ birdies for each hole. (Or as close as possible if the adjustment needed is larger in magnitude than what can be reasonably extrapolated.) The scores for 1060 are the scores from the first table, plus (or minus) one throw for every 354 feet of added (or subtracted) distance.

| Guideline Par (no 2) Lengths set for 25\% Birdies |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1060 |
| Hole | Par | Length | Birdies | 1000 Ave | Ave |
| 1 | 3 | 475 | 19\% | 2.90 | 2.58 |
| 2 | 3 | 346 | 25\% | 2.97 | 2.65 |
| 3 | 3 | 482 | 25\% | 2.86 | 2.69 |
| 4 | 4 | 695 | 25\% | 3.92 | 3.53 |
| 5 | 3 | 327 | 25\% | 2.89 | 2.65 |
| 6 | 4 | 564 | 25\% | 4.00 | 3.72 |
| 7 | 3 | 482 | 25\% | 2.86 | 2.56 |
| 8 | 4 | 817 | 13\% | 4.16 | 3.69 |
| 9 | 3 | 597 | 25\% | 3.04 | 2.70 |
| 10 | 4 | 905 | 25\% | 3.84 | 3.46 |
| 11 | 3 | 514 | 25\% | 3.22 | 3.11 |
| 12 | 4 | 705 | 25\% | 3.96 | 3.52 |
| 13 | 3 | 405 | 25\% | 3.01 | 2.68 |
| 14 | 5 | 969 | 25\% | 5.23 | 4.63 |
| 15 | 4 | 773 | 25\% | 3.91 | 3.51 |
| 16 | 3 | 467 | 25\% | 2.92 | 2.55 |
| 17 | 3 | 355 | 25\% | 2.95 | 2.75 |
| 18 | 4 | 843 | 25\% | 4.23 | 3.76 |
| Total | 63 | 10,720 | 24\% | 62.85 | 56.74 |
| To Par |  |  |  | -0.15 | -6.26 |

Note that this does not change the total length by much, and it produces about the same overall percent of birdies as merely setting par according to the Guidelines.

One wonders if there is an advantage to spreading the birdies evenly over all the holes; or is it more interesting to have a variety of holes where it is easier or harder to get a birdie?

When all the holes offer about a $25 \%$ chance of birdie, the resulting 1060 score of more than 6 under par per round may be too much under. The chart below shows how far we could push the course to produce less-far-under winning scores, but with each hole still offering some chance to birdie. The target was to have each hole offer a $10 \%$ chance of birdie.

| Guideline Par (no 2) Lengths set for $10 \%$ Birdies |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  | 1000 | 1060 <br> Ave |
| Hole | Par | Length | Birdies | 1000 | ave |
| 1 | 3 | 522 | $10 \%$ | 3.05 | 2.71 |
| 2 | 3 | 496 | $10 \%$ | 3.43 | 3.07 |
| 3 | 3 | 580 | $10 \%$ | 3.16 | 2.96 |
| 4 | 4 | 806 | $10 \%$ | 4.25 | 3.84 |
| 5 | 3 | 433 | $10 \%$ | 3.21 | 2.95 |
| 6 | 4 | 672 | $10 \%$ | 4.33 | 4.03 |
| 7 | 3 | 581 | $10 \%$ | 3.17 | 2.84 |
| 8 | 4 | 842 | $10 \%$ | 4.23 | 3.76 |
| 9 | 3 | 751 | $13 \%$ | 3.52 | 3.14 |
| 10 | 4 | 1,026 | $10 \%$ | 4.21 | 3.80 |
| 11 | 3 | 606 | $20 \%$ | 3.50 | 3.37 |
| 12 | 4 | 821 | $10 \%$ | 4.31 | 3.85 |
| 13 | 3 | 599 | $11 \%$ | 3.61 | 3.23 |
| 14 | 5 | 1,102 | $10 \%$ | 5.63 | 5.00 |
| 15 | 4 | 888 | $10 \%$ | 4.26 | 3.84 |
| 16 | 3 | 588 | $10 \%$ | 3.29 | 2.89 |
| 17 | 3 | 501 | $10 \%$ | 3.40 | 3.16 |
| 18 | 4 | 1,035 | $10 \%$ | 4.82 | 4.31 |
| Total | 63 | 12,849 | $11 \%$ | 69.36 | 62.75 |
| To Par |  |  |  | 6.36 | -0.25 |

This shows that a course can have pars compatible with the PDGA guidelines and have a range of winning-under-par scores. All the way from about zero under to more than 6 under. That brackets what is typically seen in golf.

Thus, the answer is Yes, a course can use the disc golf definition of par and can be fine-tuned to generate winning scores relative to par which are similar to golf. In fact, merely using the disc golf definition of par will produce winning scores about as much under par as is seen in golf.

