

KANSAS ULTRARUNNING HISTORICAL FOUNDATION MANUAL / METHODOLOGY

Evidence, Verification, Eligibility, Editorial Standards, Submissions,
Historical Data Integrity, Governance, and Preservation

**Public Beta Edition
October 26, 2026**

Preservation before promotion.

KansasUltrarunningHistory.org

Document Status and Authority

This Manual / Methodology is the Kansas Ultrarunning Historical Foundation's operating framework for historical scope, verified-result eligibility, evidence evaluation, editorial treatment, submissions, corrections, provenance, historical media, data integrity, curatorial practice, and related institutional methodology. It is intended to be public, durable, correctable, and usable by researchers, runners, race directors, organizations, contributors, curators, advisors, and future Foundation leadership.

This public beta edition is designed for public review. Policy language may be refined when review identifies ambiguity, conflict, or a better way to state an existing rule. Refinement does not authorize silent changes to the underlying historical record. Material changes to methodology should be documented through version history.

This Manual governs historical and editorial methodology. The Foundation's corporate bylaws and applicable law govern matters of corporate authority where those subjects differ from historical methodology.

Editorial convention used throughout this Manual: significant policies are stated first as a formal rule, followed by a plain-language explanation and practical examples where examples improve clarity.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Why the Foundation Exists

How to Read This Manual

Part I. Institutional Philosophy and Purpose

- 1. Preservation Before Promotion*
- 2. Mission and Institutional Position*
- 3. What the Foundation Is and Is Not*
- 4. Historical Authority, Uncertainty, and Correction*
- 5. Core Principles*

Part II. Scope, Definitions, and Eligibility

- 6. Definitions*
- 7. Geographic Scope*
- 8. Qualifying Ultramarathon Performances*
- 9. Timed Events*
- 10. Last-Person-Standing and Similar Formats*
- 11. Team and Relay Events*
- 12. Virtual, Remote, and Self-Timed Efforts*
- 13. Fastest Known Times and Personal Route Efforts*
- 14. Official, Unofficial, and Nonqualifying Finishes*
- 15. DNFs and Partial Performances*
- 16. Historical Significance Versus Database Eligibility*

Part III. Evidence, Verification, and Historical Judgment

- 17. Evidence Philosophy*
- 18. Evidence Classes*
- 19. What Different Evidence Can Establish*
- 20. Claim-Status Vocabulary*
- 21. Strong Claims Require Stronger Support*
- 22. Conflicting Evidence*
- 23. Corrections and Newly Discovered Evidence*
- 24. Provenance*
- 25. Citation Standards*

Part IV. Historical Data and Record Integrity

- 26. Relational Historical Model*
- 27. Race Identity*
- 28. Race Editions*
- 29. Performance Records*
- 30. Person and Runner Identity*
- 31. Identity Reconciliation*
- 32. Historical Roles*
- 33. Organizations and Stewardship*

Part V. Historical Content and Media

- 34. Race Histories*
- 35. Person Histories*
- 36. Organization Histories*
- 37. Documents and Publications*
- 38. Historical Media*
- 39. Firsthand Recollections and Oral Histories*
- 40. Milestones and Historical Investigations*

Part VI. Submissions and Corrections

- 41. Public Contribution Is Not Public Editing*
- 42. Submission Categories*
- 43. Results and Corrections*
- 44. Results and Corrections: Real-World Examples*
- 45. Race and Organization History Submissions*
- 46. Articles, Photographs, and Historical Media Submissions*
- 47. General Inquiry*
- 48. Submitter Burden and Foundation Responsibility*
- 49. Receipt, Review, and Response*
- 50. Submission Review Workflow*
- 51. Corrections*

52. Research Retention Versus Public Display

53. Contributor Identity and Attribution

54. Curators

Part VII. Editorial Standards

55. Institutional Voice

56. Fact, Interpretation, and Recollection

57. Living People

58. Founder, Officers, Curators, and Affiliates

59. Language Standards

60. Editorial Selection and Curatorial Discretion

Part VIII. Governance and Independence

61. Corporate Governance

62. Founding Historical Advisory Council

63. Directors, Advisors, and Curators

64. Conflicts of Interest

65. Donors, Sponsors, Partners, and Editorial Independence

66. Sustainability and Continuity

67. The Institution Must Outlive the Builder

Part IX. Preservation, Architecture, and Discoverability

68. Three-Site Historical Ecosystem

69. One Canonical Home

70. Permanent Historical URLs

71. Metadata and Digital Preservation

72. Search, Research, and Machine Readability

73. Backups, Exports, and Long-Term Access

Part X. Policy Administration

74. Manual Authority and Applicability

75. Policy Revision

76. Methodology Change Log

77. Interpretation and Edge Cases

Appendices

A. Definitions Quick Reference

B. Evidence Types and Appropriate Uses

C. Claim-Status Reference

D. Eligibility Examples

E. Submission Examples

F. Provenance Checklist

G. Correction and Version-History Model

H. Governance and Role Matrix

*I. Submission Form Blueprint**J. Internal Submission Status Fields**K. General Inquiry Acknowledgment Model**L. Physical Historical Material Procedure*

Closing Statement

Executive Summary

Why the Foundation Exists

The Kansas Ultrarunning Historical Foundation exists to preserve the historical record of ultrarunning in Kansas as an independent, evidence-driven public resource. Its purpose is not to promote a race, commercial brand, club, individual, or era. Its purpose is to build a durable record that can be examined, corrected, expanded, cited, and handed forward.

This Manual explains how the Foundation turns that purpose into practice. It establishes the rules for historical scope, qualifying performances, evidence and verification, provenance, corrections, identity and data integrity, submissions, editorial treatment, governance, and long-term preservation. The objective is not to make the Foundation look authoritative. The objective is to make its work methodologically trustworthy, transparent, correctable, and verifiable.

Grassroots sports history disappears quietly. Results once printed on paper are discarded. Websites vanish. Race directors retire. Organizations change names or dissolve. Photographs lose captions. Course maps separate from the events they documented. Local newspaper coverage becomes difficult to locate. Families inherit boxes of material without knowing what has historical value. A person may remember exactly what happened and still be unable to prove it forty years later. The Foundation exists because information that is not preserved, connected, and explained eventually becomes inaccessible or is replaced by memory, assumption, and repetition.

For that reason, preservation means more than storing files. A scan without provenance can become an orphaned image. A result without a race identity can become an isolated number. A name without identity reconciliation can become two different people or collapse two people into one. Preservation requires description, relationships, source control, correction history, and enough context that the surviving evidence can still be understood years later.

A historical archive is not the same thing as a results database. A results database can tell a reader that a person was listed with a time or distance. A historical archive should also be able to show what race that performance belonged to, which edition was held, who directed or operated it, which organization was involved, what source supports the result, whether the result was official, whether the course or format changed, what documents survive, what photographs exist, and what later corrections altered the record. The Foundation treats relationships and provenance as part of history, not as technical decoration.

Kansas ultrarunning history also did not begin when modern databases began collecting results, and it did not always use today's language. Earlier long-distance pedestrian contests, challenge formats, and other documented activity may require historical treatment even when modern database categories do not fit cleanly. The archive can preserve that material without pretending that every historical activity maps directly to a modern verified-result record.

The public archive is built around two connected but distinct layers. One is the verified structured record of races, editions, performances, people, roles, and organizations. The other is the broader historical archive of documents, photographs, publications, oral history, recovered results, unresolved questions, and contextual narrative. The two layers inform each other, but they are not interchangeable.

The Foundation's central principle is simple: historical accuracy and evidence matter more than storytelling polish, reputation, nostalgia, convenience, social pressure, or promotional value. A compelling story can be preserved as a story. A recollection can be preserved as recollection. A photograph can be preserved as photographic evidence. None of those forms of evidence needs to be diminished, but none should be mislabeled as something it is not.

The archive does not become authoritative by calling itself authoritative. Nonprofit status does not make a historical assertion true. A famous runner's memory does not automatically outrank a surviving official record. A modern GPS file does not automatically establish a historical race performance. A donor does not purchase favorable treatment. A Foundation officer does not receive special status. Credibility comes from the quality of evidence, the transparency of method, the willingness to preserve disagreement, and the discipline to say 'unknown' when the record does not support certainty.

This Manual deliberately separates historical significance from verified-database eligibility. A subject can matter deeply to Kansas ultrarunning history without qualifying as a verified ultramarathon performance. A relay may matter historically while relay legs remain outside the individual verified-results database. An FKT may be worthy of an editorial story while remaining excluded from Foundation performance totals. An unofficial completion may be historically notable while remaining an unofficial completion. This distinction protects the integrity of the verified record without stripping the broader archive of human context.

That separation also allows the Foundation to handle disagreement and correction without flattening unlike evidence into one claim. The archive can preserve what a person remembers, what a newspaper printed, what a timer recorded, and what later evidence established while identifying the evidentiary status of each. A trustworthy archive is not one that never changes. It is one that can explain what changed, why it changed, when it changed, and what evidence justified the change. Unknown is a valid result. Disputed is a valid status. A correction is evidence that the archive is accountable, not evidence that it has failed.

The institution is being built to outlive any individual. Policies, source relationships, identity decisions, correction history, editorial practices, and data structures should be understandable to a future curator or director who was not present when the system was created. The goal is not merely to build websites. The goal is to preserve a historical record in a form that can be responsibly handed forward.

How to Read This Manual

The Manual begins with institutional philosophy because the technical rules make more sense when the reader understands what the Foundation is trying to protect. The middle sections then define eligibility, evidence, data integrity, historical content, submissions, and editorial practice. The final sections address governance, preservation architecture, and policy administration.

Significant policy is normally presented in two layers. The Formal Rule states the Foundation's operating standard. The Plain-Language Explanation explains what the rule means in practice. Examples are included when edge cases or common misunderstandings justify them. Examples explain the rule; they do not override it.

The Manual should be read together with the Foundation's published FAQ and submission forms. The FAQ may restate the same policy in question-and-answer form. The forms may summarize requirements before a submission is accepted. Where a short form or FAQ summary appears to conflict with this Manual, the Manual controls unless a later published methodology revision expressly changes the rule.

Part I. Institutional Philosophy and Purpose

These first principles establish what the Foundation is trying to protect before the Manual turns to technical rules. They define the institution's mission, the limits of its authority, and the standards that should remain constant even when individual historical questions are difficult or contested.

1. Preservation Before Promotion

FORMAL RULE. Historical value and evidentiary integrity take priority over marketing value, reputation management, nostalgia, traffic, engagement, fundraising convenience, or promotional interests.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation can tell good stories, publish strong photographs, and create engaging historical features. It cannot improve the story by weakening the evidence. A race does not become more historically important because it is currently popular. A person does not receive more favorable treatment because they are prominent. A difficult fact is not removed because it is inconvenient to a race, organization, founder, donor, or sponsor.

- A surviving race program is preserved because it documents an event, not because its design is attractive.
- A historically important race can be documented even if it no longer exists and has nothing to promote.
- A sponsor may be thanked for supporting preservation work, but sponsorship does not determine how the Foundation describes a historical dispute.

2. Mission and Institutional Position

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation preserves, documents, verifies, organizes, contextualizes, and makes accessible the history of ultrarunning in Kansas. The mission is a commitment to method and preservation, not a claim that the record is already complete.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The archive grows as evidence is found. Missing years, unidentified photographs, unresolved names, conflicting accounts, and unknown relationships are normal conditions in historical work. The Foundation should describe itself as comprehensive in purpose and increasingly comprehensive in holdings, not as omniscient.

3. What the Foundation Is and Is Not

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation is a historical archive and methodology-driven public record. It is not a race calendar, registration platform, coaching business, personal memoir, founder-centered history, commercial race-promotion site, subjective hall of fame, or open repository that converts every claim into an authoritative record.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Current race information may appear when it helps identify or contextualize a historical entity, but the Foundation is not organized around “what race is next.” Its central questions are historical: what happened, who was involved, what changed, what evidence survives, and how confident can the archive be in the resulting claim?

4. Historical Authority, Uncertainty, and Correction

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation states only what the available evidence can support, identifies uncertainty when certainty is not justified, preserves material conflicts, and corrects the record when better evidence is found.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The words “unknown,” “unconfirmed,” and “disputed” are not admissions of weakness. They tell the reader the actual state of the evidence. The Foundation may reach a historical conclusion when one account is better supported, but it does not make conflicting provenance disappear to create a cleaner story.

5. Core Principles

- Preservation before promotion. Historical value outranks marketing value.
- Evidence before certainty. Say only what the available evidence can support.
- Unknown is a valid result. Uncertainty should be visible rather than hidden.
- One canonical home. Information lives where it belongs and is cross-linked elsewhere.
- Relationships matter. History is not only names and times; it is who did what, when, and in connection with whom.
- Corrections strengthen the record. A transparent correction is evidence of integrity, not failure.
- Provenance travels with the evidence. Source origin, format, custody, and context matter.
- Recollection is preserved as recollection. Personal memory is valuable without being mislabeled as independent proof.
- Founder, sponsor, advisor, curator, donor, race director, and subject are treated by the same evidence standards.
- Public contribution is not public editing. Submissions are reviewed evidence inputs, not direct authoritative writes.
- Historical significance is not limited to runners. Directors, founders, organizations, volunteers, timers, photographers, officials, and others belong where the record supports them.
- The institution must outlive the builder. Policies, data, provenance, and governance must be durable enough to hand forward.

Part II. Scope, Definitions, and Eligibility

This Part draws the boundary between the broader historical record and the narrower verified-performance database. It defines the terms the Foundation uses, establishes the exact ultra-distance threshold, and explains how geography, format, official status, and event structure affect eligibility.

6. Definitions

For purposes of this Manual, the following terms are used consistently:

Ultramarathon distance: Any verified distance greater than the standard marathon distance of 42.195 kilometers (26 miles 385 yards). “26.2 miles” may be used in casual explanatory language, but it is not the controlling mathematical threshold.

Race: A continuing event identity that may have one or many editions over time.

Edition: A specific occurrence of a race on a particular date or within a specific year.

Performance: A person’s recorded participation/result within an edition or qualifying historical race context.

Qualifying performance: A verified performance that satisfies the Foundation’s distance, format, status, geographic, and evidence rules for inclusion in the authoritative verified-results database.

Official result: A result treated as official by the authoritative event or results source.

Unofficial result: A result expressly labeled unofficial, non-finishing, post-cutoff, early-start, altered-course, or otherwise outside the event’s official finish rules by an authoritative source.

Person: A historical individual represented in the Foundation’s relational record, whether or not the person is a runner.

Runner: A person with one or more running-related performances or runner history in the Foundation’s scope.

Historical role: A documented relationship such as founder, race director, owner, organizer, timer, official, photographer, volunteer, club leader, or other historically relevant role.

Organization: A club, company, nonprofit, informal organizing body, sanctioning/support entity, or other institution with a documented relationship to Kansas ultrarunning history.

Source: The document, publication, record, photograph, database, correspondence, testimony, or other evidence from which a historical claim is derived.

Provenance: What is known about where evidence came from, who created or held it, what form it is in, how it was obtained, and how it relates to later use in the archive.

Firsthand recollection: A named account from a person describing events they personally experienced or witnessed.

Historical media: Curated photographs, video, audio, scanned ephemera, promotional material, and related documentary media selected for historical value and context.

Verification: The process of determining whether evidence is sufficiently competent, authentic, specific, and relevant to support the claim being made.

7. Geographic Scope

FORMAL RULE. The verified-results database is Kansas-centered. Performances qualify only to the extent that the Foundation can establish qualifying ultramarathon distance within Kansas under the applicable event and evidence rules. Kansas-based people or organizations do not create Kansas performance eligibility merely by participating or operating elsewhere.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The archive is broader than the performance database. A Kansas organization can be historically relevant even when it worked outside Kansas, and a Kansas runner's out-of-state career can provide context in a person history. But verified Kansas performance totals must remain Kansas-specific.

7.1 Events wholly within Kansas

FORMAL RULE. An organized event conducted wholly within Kansas may produce qualifying Kansas performances when all other eligibility requirements are met.

7.2 Events traversing Kansas

FORMAL RULE. An organized race that traverses Kansas may be documented and may produce Kansas-qualifying mileage only when the Kansas segment can be established through authoritative evidence. The Foundation records only the verified Kansas portion for Kansas-specific mileage or performance treatment and does not invent Kansas-specific time or distance by interpolation.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Crossing a state line does not make an entire multi-state race a Kansas performance. The Foundation uses what can actually be established about the Kansas segment.

EXAMPLES.

- A multi-state race includes a documented 31-mile Kansas segment. A runner is authoritatively shown to have completed that segment. The Kansas mileage may qualify if all other rules are satisfied.
- A runner finishes a multi-state race, but no reliable source establishes how many miles of the course were in Kansas. The Foundation does not guess the Kansas mileage.
- A runner DNF'd after leaving Kansas. If authoritative records establish completion of a qualifying Kansas segment before the DNF, that Kansas segment may be considered under the special traversing-Kansas rule. The overall race remains a DNF.

8. Qualifying Ultramarathon Performances

FORMAL RULE. A qualifying ultramarathon performance must exceed 42.195 kilometers, the standard marathon distance. A performance at exactly 42.195 kilometers or less does not qualify. The controlling rule is greater than 42.195 kilometers, not the casual shorthand "26.2 miles."

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The threshold is deliberately exact. The Foundation does not round a marathon into an ultra. If the evidence establishes 42.195 km, it is a marathon and is excluded. If the evidence establishes 42.196 km, it is beyond the marathon threshold and may qualify if every other rule is met.

EXAMPLES.

- 42.195 km: excluded.
- 42.196 km: exceeds the threshold and may qualify.
- 50 km: exceeds the threshold and may qualify.
- A source that says only “26.2 miles” does not, by itself, establish that the performance exceeded the marathon distance. Additional competent evidence is required if the result depends on that distinction.

FORMAL RULE. Distance eligibility alone is not enough. A performance must also satisfy official-status, event-format, geographic, and evidence requirements. Exceeding 42.195 km does not convert an excluded format or unofficial finish into a qualifying result.

8.1 Boundary Precision and Source Language

FORMAL RULE. When eligibility depends on the marathon boundary, the Foundation requires evidence precise enough to establish that the recorded distance exceeded 42.195 kilometers. Rounding, casual labels, or shorthand do not override the exact rule.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A source may use “26.2 miles” as a conventional label for a marathon. Because that shorthand is not mathematically identical to the full marathon distance, it cannot be stretched into proof that a result exceeded the threshold. When the underlying event was actually 50K, 50 miles, 100K, or another clearly ultra distance, no boundary ambiguity exists. The precision requirement matters only when the source sits at or near the cutoff.

The exact threshold applies across formats. A fixed-distance event, timed event, last-person-standing format, or historical result does not receive a different mathematical cutoff because of tradition or event naming. The Foundation’s threshold is a data-integrity rule, not a marketing label.

9. Timed Events

FORMAL RULE. A timed event is not automatically an ultramarathon performance. Each individual result qualifies only when the authoritative recorded distance for that individual exceeds 42.195 kilometers and all other eligibility rules are met.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Six-hour, twelve-hour, twenty-four-hour, forty-eight-hour, and similar events are event formats, not automatic ultra finishes. One runner may qualify and another may not in the same event.

EXAMPLES.

- Runner A records 50.0 km in a six-hour event: may qualify.
- Runner B records 41.8 km in the same six-hour event: excluded from the verified ultramarathon performance database.
- The event itself remains historically documentable even if some or all individual results fail the ultra-distance threshold.

10. Last-Person-Standing and Similar Formats

FORMAL RULE. In last-person-standing, backyard-style, or repeated-loop formats, only completed authoritative distance counts toward eligibility. A performance qualifies only when the completed recorded distance exceeds 42.195 kilometers and the result is otherwise official and eligible.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation does not credit an uncompleted loop merely because a runner started it. The result must be based on the event's official method of recording completed distance.

11. Team and Relay Events

FORMAL RULE. Relay and team performances are excluded from the authoritative individual verified-results database. The event, team, organization, participants, and historical significance may still be documented editorially or in race history when relevant.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A team can collectively cover ultramarathon distance without any one participant completing an individual qualifying ultramarathon. The Foundation does not convert shared distance into individual ultra finishes.

EXAMPLES.

- A four-person relay covers 100 miles. The relay can be part of Kansas ultrarunning history, but the four relay legs are not four verified individual ultramarathon finishes.
- A runner's relay leg exceeds 42.195 km. The Foundation still treats the performance as a relay/team performance and excludes it from the individual verified-results database unless a distinct, separately official individual event/result exists.

12. Virtual, Remote, and Self-Timed Efforts

FORMAL RULE. Virtual, remote, self-timed, and comparable self-administered efforts are excluded from the authoritative verified-results database, even when the reported distance exceeds 42.195 kilometers.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The database is designed around organized, independently documented performance records. A virtual event can be meaningful to a participant and may be historically relevant to a broader story, especially in periods when event formats changed, but it is not treated as the same evidentiary category as an official in-person race result.

13. Fastest Known Times and Personal Route Efforts

FORMAL RULE. Fastest Known Time efforts, personal route attempts, training efforts, and comparable non-race efforts are excluded from the authoritative verified-results database and are not counted in runner totals, race totals, records, or leaderboards. GPS, Strava, Garmin, or comparable personal tracking data does not convert such efforts into Foundation-verified race results.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation is not an FKT registry. An FKT or personal effort may still matter historically and may be discussed in an editorial article when properly sourced. Editorial coverage does not certify the effort or move it into the results database.

EXAMPLES.

- A historically significant route effort supported by GPS may be discussed in an article as a documented personal effort. It remains outside verified race-result totals.
- A Garmin file showing 50 km does not add a missing race finish to a runner's Foundation profile.

14. Official, Unofficial, and Nonqualifying Finishes

FORMAL RULE. An authoritative source designation of “unofficial finish,” post-cutoff completion, early-start result, altered-course completion, or comparable non-official status excludes the performance from the authoritative verified-results database and from qualifying totals, records, and runner history as an official finish.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation does not renegotiate a race's official finish rules after the fact. If the authoritative source says the result was unofficial, the Foundation preserves that status rather than upgrading it because the person covered the distance or because the effort was impressive.

EXAMPLES.

- A runner covers 100 miles after the official cutoff and is listed by the event as an unofficial finisher: excluded from official qualifying finishes.
- A participant starts early under a special arrangement and the official results designate the result unofficial: excluded from official totals.
- A historically notable unofficial completion may be discussed in a race history with its status clearly labeled. Narrative significance does not convert it into an official result.

14.1 Preservation of Excluded Source Records

FORMAL RULE. An excluded or unofficial source record should remain traceable internally when it has historical or audit value. Exclusion from qualifying public totals does not require destruction of the underlying source record.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation may need to know that an unofficial result existed in a source so future imports, corrections, or historical research do not accidentally recreate it as an official finish. Preserving source status protects both the person and the database. The record can be excluded from qualifying totals while its provenance remains available for review.

Preserving excluded source status also supports narrative history. A later historian may need to understand why an apparent performance is missing from a runner's official total. The answer should be recoverable from source status rather than guessed from absence.

15. DNFs and Partial Performances

FORMAL RULE. A DNF is not an official finish and is not counted as one. Partial distance completed in a DNF is not treated as a qualifying finish merely because it exceeds 42.195 kilometers, except where a separately defined and authoritatively recorded performance category or the traversing-Kansas rule specifically supports a Kansas historical record.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation preserves what the source says happened. “Covered more than a marathon before dropping” is not the same thing as “finished an ultramarathon.”

16. Historical Significance Versus Database Eligibility

FORMAL RULE. Historical significance and verified-database eligibility are separate determinations. Exclusion from the verified-results database does not prohibit historically relevant editorial treatment, and editorial treatment does not create database eligibility.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. This distinction allows the Foundation to document the sport honestly without weakening the definition of a verified result. FKTs, relay events, virtual events, unofficial completions, unusual personal efforts, sub-threshold performances, and other excluded items can still help explain how Kansas ultrarunning developed.

16.1 Historical Subjects That Do Not Fit Modern Result Categories

FORMAL RULE. The broader historical archive may document organized long-distance activity relevant to Kansas ultrarunning history even when the activity predates modern ultramarathon terminology or does not map cleanly to the verified-results database.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Historical preservation should not erase early activity simply because participants used different words or formats. The Foundation can document what occurred, how far the surviving evidence indicates people traveled, how the activity was organized, and why it matters. Database inclusion remains governed by the separate performance rules in this Manual.

Where the surviving evidence cannot establish a modern qualifying performance, the archive should say exactly that. Historical relevance does not require forcing an old event into a category the sources cannot support.

Part III. Evidence, Verification, and Historical Judgment

Once scope is established, the next question is how the Foundation knows what it says it knows. This Part explains how evidence is evaluated for the specific claim at issue, how uncertainty and conflict are displayed, and how provenance, citation, and correction keep historical conclusions traceable.

17. Evidence Philosophy

FORMAL RULE. Evidence is evaluated according to the claim being made. No source type is universally strongest for every historical question. The Foundation considers competence, authenticity, specificity, contemporaneity, independence, provenance, and corroboration.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Official results may be strongest for an official finishing time. A certified course record may be better for measured distance. Organizational minutes or correspondence may be better for establishing why a decision was made. A photograph may be strongest for establishing physical presence. The right question is not “Which source class always wins?” but “What source is competent to establish this fact?”

17.1 Factors Considered in Evidence Evaluation

When the Foundation evaluates evidence, it considers several dimensions together rather than relying on a single label such as “primary source” or “official.”

- Competence: Is this source capable of establishing the specific fact at issue?
- Authenticity: Is the item what it appears to be, and can its origin be reasonably established?
- Specificity: Does the source identify the relevant person, race, edition, date, distance, role, or relationship clearly enough to support the claim?
- Contemporaneity: Was the evidence created at or near the time of the event, or years later?
- Independence: Is the source independent of the person or organization whose claim it supports, or is it a firsthand/self-interested account that should be attributed accordingly?
- Provenance: Can the Foundation explain where the evidence came from and what happened to it before it reached the archive?
- Corroboration: Do other competent sources support or contradict the same claim?
- Completeness: Does the source contain the entire relevant record, or only a selection, transcription, excerpt, award list, or partial page?

These factors are not a mathematical scoring system. They are a disciplined way to explain why one source may be persuasive for one question and weak for another.

18. Evidence Classes

The Foundation uses evidence classes as practical descriptions of recurring source types, not as a universal strongest-to-weakest ladder. Each class has characteristic strengths and limitations, and its value still depends on the claim being evaluated.

18.1 Original and Derivative Forms

FORMAL RULE. When practical, the Foundation distinguishes an original source object from scans, photographs, photocopies, transcriptions, extracts, database imports, and later reproductions derived from it.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A clean scan of an original results sheet may preserve nearly all relevant information. A typed transcription can introduce spelling or numeric errors. A cropped screenshot may omit the date or event title needed to identify the page. The fact that a derivative copy is less ideal does not make it unusable; it means the archive records what form it has and evaluates the resulting limitations.

18.2 Official Does Not Mean Infallible

FORMAL RULE. An official source is strong evidence of what the responsible event or organization officially recorded. It is not immune from demonstrated error.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Official results sometimes contain misspellings, duplicate people, incorrect ages, transposed times, wrong statuses, or other mistakes. The Foundation can correct a documented error when stronger evidence supports the correction while preserving the official source as part of the provenance trail.

18.3 Secondary Databases as Research Sources

FORMAL RULE. Aggregated databases and later compilations may be used for discovery, comparison, and verification support, but their imported or normalized data should not be treated as automatically superior to surviving event-level or contemporary evidence.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A later database may be the only convenient path to an older result, and it can be extremely valuable. The Foundation still preserves the database source and, where possible, identifies the underlying edition or original publication from which the data appears to have come.

The Foundation commonly works with the following evidence classes. The order below is descriptive, not a universal ranking.

Official race results and timer records: Strong for official participation, finishing status, time, distance as recorded, and order. Limitations include transcription errors, incomplete fields, missing context, and the possibility that the recorded distance or status requires separate interpretation.

Contemporary race documents: Entry forms, instructions, course maps, waivers, director correspondence, and event materials are strong for intended date, format, rules, course description, and organizer information. They may describe what was planned rather than what ultimately occurred.

Race programs, flyers, newsletters, and organizational publications: Useful for names, schedules, roles, promotion, course descriptions, organizational relationships, and contemporary framing. Promotional claims still require verification.

Contemporary newspapers and magazines: Useful for dates, named participants, quotes, public reporting, context, and sometimes results. Reporting errors and selective coverage remain possible.

Photographs and audiovisual material with provenance: Strong for visible presence, environment, signage, people, objects, and physical context. A photograph does not automatically establish a full result, exact date, or unseen circumstances.

Organizational records, minutes, and correspondence: Strong for governance, ownership, decisions, role assignments, and institutional relationships when authentic and contemporaneous.

Published retrospective accounts: Useful for later historical synthesis and leads. Their value depends on sources, distance from the events, and whether they distinguish documented fact from recollection.

Named firsthand recollections and oral histories: Essential for human experience, motivations, undocumented relationships, and leads. Memory can be sincere and still be incomplete or mistaken. Recollection is preserved as recollection unless independently supported.

Later secondary databases and compilations: Useful for discovery, cross-checking, and identifying potential results. They may contain imported errors, normalized names, missing statuses, or unknown provenance. Database presence alone does not settle a disputed claim.

Personal tracking data and self-reports: Useful as leads or contextual evidence in appropriate editorial settings, but insufficient by themselves to create authoritative verified race results under the Foundation's database rules.

19. What Different Evidence Can Establish

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation matches evidence to the fact being asserted and does not ask a source to prove more than it is competent to prove.

EXAMPLES.

- Official results can establish that the event recorded Runner A as an official finisher in 9:12:33. They do not, by themselves, establish who designed the course.
- A race application can establish the advertised course and rules. It does not prove the course was run exactly as advertised on race day.
- A photograph can establish that a person was present at a location when the photograph's date and provenance are known. It does not, by itself, establish that the person finished the race.
- A race director's recollection can explain why a course changed. When the reason is not documented elsewhere, the archive should attribute that explanation to the director rather than presenting it as independently confirmed fact.

20. Claim-Status Vocabulary

FORMAL RULE. Claim-status labels describe the state of the evidence. They are not prestige grades and should not be manipulated to make the archive appear more complete.

Confirmed: Supported by evidence competent and sufficient for the specific claim.

Reported: Stated by a credible identified source but not independently verified to the level required for “Confirmed.”

Recalled: Based primarily on a named firsthand memory or oral-history account.

Disputed: Materially conflicting evidence or accounts remain unresolved, or the Foundation has reached a better-supported conclusion while preserving a significant contrary account.

Unconfirmed: A claim has been found in a source or submission but lacks sufficient support for confirmation.

Unknown: The Foundation has not located evidence sufficient to answer the question.

21. Strong Claims Require Stronger Support

FORMAL RULE. Superlative and priority claims such as first, earliest, oldest, only, record, inaugural, longest-running, and similar historically consequential labels require stronger support than ordinary descriptive facts. When exhaustive proof is unavailable, the Foundation uses qualified language that accurately describes the evidence located to date.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The difference between “the first” and “the earliest documented through surviving evidence” is substantive. The first claims completeness about all prior history. The second states what the evidence currently supports.

EXAMPLES.

- Preferred when research is incomplete: “the earliest documented Kansas example located by the Foundation to date.”
- Not preferred without exhaustive support: “the first ultramarathon ever held in Kansas.”
- A race may call itself “the oldest” in promotional material. The Foundation may quote that claim as the race’s claim while independently evaluating whether the historical evidence supports it.

22. Conflicting Evidence

FORMAL RULE. When material sources conflict, the Foundation preserves the conflict and its provenance. The Foundation may weigh the evidence and state which account is better supported, but it does not silently erase a material contrary source or convert uncertainty into false unanimity.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Historical judgment is allowed. Silent reconciliation is not. The archive should be able to explain why it reached a conclusion and what evidence points the other way.

23. Corrections and Newly Discovered Evidence

FORMAL RULE. When new evidence materially changes a published fact, identity, status, relationship, result, or historical conclusion, the current record is corrected and the material correction is documented. The prior provenance trail is preserved.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The point of version history is not to preserve every typo forever. It is to preserve historically meaningful changes so a future researcher can understand how the record evolved.

EXAMPLES.

- A newly located official results sheet changes a runner's time. Update the result and retain a note identifying the previous source and the new controlling evidence.
- A spelling correction that resolves a source-system misspelling can be recorded as an identity/data correction without turning the public page into a bureaucratic change log.
- A new document proves that a different organization operated a race during certain years. Update the relationship dates and preserve the source that caused the change.

24. Provenance

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation records provenance to the extent reasonably available, including what the material is, who created it if known, who held it, who submitted it, its original or copy status, its format, relevant dates, and any known chain of custody or transcription history.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Incomplete provenance does not automatically make material useless. It changes how confidently the material can be used. The Foundation records what is known and what is not.

EXAMPLES.

- A scan of an original race program held by a former race director should identify the holder and that the physical original still exists, if known.
- A typed transcription of handwritten results should identify who transcribed it and whether it was checked against the original.
- A newspaper clipping with no publication name or date may be retained as a research lead while those details are investigated.

24.1 Baseline Results-Data Provenance

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation's canonical results database was initially assembled by combining historical results data published by DUV Ultra Marathon Statistics, UltraSignup, and Ultrarunning Magazine. These sources are treated as inputs to the Foundation's historical record rather than as automatically controlling authorities; overlapping records are reconciled, conflicts are reviewed, and individual records may be corrected when stronger evidence is found.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation did not begin with a single outside database. It combined records from DUV, UltraSignup, and Ultrarunning Magazine into one canonical Foundation dataset, compared overlapping information, and continues to refine that record as additional historical evidence becomes available.

EXAMPLES.

- If DUV and UltraSignup differ on a runner name, event date, distance, time, or status, the Foundation reconciles the records rather than simply copying one source.
- An Ultrarunning Magazine results page or race report may confirm, clarify, or correct an older result or event detail represented differently in another source.

25. Citation Standards

FORMAL RULE. Published historical claims should identify the source closely enough that a reasonable reader or future curator can understand what evidence supports the statement and, when practical, locate the source again.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Citation detail should fit the source. A newspaper item should identify publication and date when known. An official results file should identify event, edition/date, and source/holder or archive. An oral history should identify the person and date of the interview or submission. A web source should retain enough information to identify the page and retrieval context when relevant.

25.1 Citation Should Match the Claim

Citation is not decoration. A source reference should be close enough to the claim that a future reader can tell what the source is supporting. Long historical narratives may use grouped citations where appropriate, but a material claim about a first, record, disputed date, race-director relationship, or correction should not force the reader to guess which source supports it.

25.2 Source Descriptions

When a formal bibliographic citation would obscure rather than help, the Foundation may use plain source descriptions that preserve the critical elements: publication or producing organization, item title or event, date, page or result location when known, holder or archive when relevant, and whether the Foundation used an original, scan, transcription, database record, or web capture.

25.3 Citations Do Not Convert Opinion Into Fact

A cited promotional statement remains a promotional statement. A cited recollection remains a recollection. A citation proves that the source said something; it does not automatically prove that what the source said is historically correct. The Foundation's prose should preserve that distinction.

Part IV. Historical Data and Record Integrity

Evidence becomes durable only when it is attached to stable identities and relationships. This Part explains how the Foundation separates races from editions, performances from people, source records from canonical records, and historical roles from runner-only data while preserving an auditable path back to the evidence.

26. Relational Historical Model

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation separates historical entities and relationships rather than flattening them into a single results list. A race is distinct from an edition; an edition is distinct from a performance; a person is distinct from a runner-only record; and organizations and historical roles are represented as dated relationships.

Core relationship patterns include:

- Race → Edition → Performance → Person
- Person → Historical Role → Race and time span
- Organization → Relationship → Race and period of involvement
- Race → Founder/Director/Owner/Organizer lineage
- Runner profile → Verified Kansas performances → Race links
- Race profile → Edition history → Related people, organizations, documents, and media

27. Race Identity

FORMAL RULE. A continuing race retains a stable canonical race identity unless the evidence supports that a distinct event was created. Name changes, sponsor changes, director changes, ownership changes, ordinary course changes, or organizational transitions do not automatically create a new race identity.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The archive should document continuity and change rather than multiplying races every time branding changes. When continuity itself is disputed, the Foundation records the evidence and applies historical judgment transparently.

28. Race Editions

FORMAL RULE. Each occurrence of a race is represented as an edition with its own date/year, distances or formats, location/course information where known, results coverage, and related sources. Missing or canceled years are not silently treated as editions.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A race can have a twenty-year history while individual editions differ dramatically. Keeping the edition layer separate allows the Foundation to show when formats, directors, organizations, courses, or result coverage changed.

29. Performance Records

FORMAL RULE. Every authoritative performance record should preserve its source relationship, qualification status, official/unofficial status where available, event/edition identity, person identity, and material correction history. Imported source data is evidence input, not infallible truth.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation may combine data from multiple result systems, publications, timers, or historical documents. Source identifiers should be retained so the origin of a record can be reconstructed after normalization and deduplication.

29.1 Source Layer and Canonical Layer

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation should preserve raw or source-level result information separately from normalized canonical display where practical. Normalization improves public usability but should not erase the source value that produced the normalized record.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A source may spell a name incorrectly, abbreviate a race, round a distance, or use a legacy status code. The public record can display the corrected canonical name while the internal source layer preserves what the source actually contained.

29.2 Qualification Status Is a Foundation Decision

FORMAL RULE. A source result can exist without qualifying for public verified totals. Import, discovery, or source presence is not the same thing as eligibility.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. This is why unofficial finishes, relay entries, sub-threshold timed performances, virtual results, and other excluded records may remain traceable internally while being omitted from qualifying totals. The archive should be able to explain exclusion rather than making excluded evidence vanish.

30. Person and Runner Identity

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation maintains canonical person identities while preserving source-specific names and identifiers. Spelling variants, nicknames, initials, married/previous names where appropriately documented, source-system errors, and duplicate source records are reconciled only when the evidence supports that they refer to the same individual.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The public should see one coherent person where the evidence supports one person, but the underlying archive must retain enough source information to explain how records were linked. Convenience is not a sufficient reason to merge people.

31. Identity Reconciliation

FORMAL RULE. Identity merges require affirmative evidence sufficient to support common identity. Ambiguous records remain separate or are held for review. Identity decisions must be reversible and auditable; source records are not destroyed merely because they have been linked to a canonical person.

31.1 Evidence Used for Identity Matching

Identity evidence can include source identifiers, full names, initials, nicknames, hometowns, age or age-group information, repeated race participation, known historical relationships, and other source-linked facts. No single field is universally decisive. The strength of a merge depends on the combination and consistency of the available evidence.

31.2 False Merge Risk

FORMAL RULE. When the cost of a false merge is significant and evidence is ambiguous, the Foundation prefers temporary separation or review over a forced merge.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A false merge can invent a runner history that never existed by combining two people's performances. A duplicate record is inconvenient; a fabricated composite person is historically worse. The system should therefore preserve ambiguity until enough evidence exists to resolve it.

31.3 Correction of Identity Decisions

Identity work is not finished merely because a database import has been deduplicated once. New race results, obituaries, club records, photographs, family information, or direct corrections may later show that a previous identity link was wrong or that two previously separate identities belong together. Those changes should be treated as normal data corrections with preserved source linkage.

EXAMPLES.

- Same uncommon name, same hometown, overlapping race history, and matching source identifiers may strongly support a merge.
- Two runners share a common name but appear in different locations and races with no linking evidence. They remain separate.
- A known misspelling in one source can be normalized to the canonical spelling while preserving the source spelling for provenance.
- If a previous merge is later shown to combine two people, the Foundation splits the canonical record and documents the correction.

32. Historical Roles

FORMAL RULE. A person may be historically represented through documented non-runner roles, including founder, race director, owner, organizer, timer, official, photographer, volunteer, club leader, historian, or other supported role. A role is tied to the entity and time period it actually applies to.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Race history is built by more than finishers. The person model therefore should not force every historically relevant person into a runner-only structure.

33. Organizations and Stewardship

FORMAL RULE. Organization histories are Foundation-curated records. Ownership, operation, stewardship, sponsorship, support, sanctioning, or other organization-to-race relationships are represented with the relationship type and applicable time period where the evidence supports them. Organizations do not self-edit authoritative Foundation pages.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A race can be founded by one person, directed later by another person, owned or operated by different organizations over time, and supported by additional entities. Those distinctions are historically meaningful and should not be collapsed into vague statements such as "run by Organization X" across all years.

Part V. Historical Content and Media

The verified-results database is only one layer of the Foundation's work. This Part governs the broader historical archive: race, person, and organization histories; documents and publications; photographs and other media; firsthand recollections; and milestone investigations that require careful contextual treatment.

34. Race Histories

FORMAL RULE. Race histories are permanent historical dossiers, not promotional landing pages. They document known editions, dates, formats, results coverage, course changes, participant history, role lineage, organizational relationships, documents, media, unresolved gaps, and material corrections.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A race history should remain useful even when the race no longer exists. Current promotional language may be documented as a source when historically relevant, but the Foundation writes in its own historical voice.

35. Person Histories

FORMAL RULE. Person histories distinguish verified performance data, documented historical roles, sourced biographical context, firsthand recollection, and interpretation. Profiles are not tributes, attacks, or popularity rankings.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A runner may have a rich Kansas performance history. A non-runner may be historically important as a director, founder, timer, organizer, or photographer. The Foundation documents the role supported by evidence rather than forcing every person into the same template.

36. Organization Histories

FORMAL RULE. Organization histories document the institution's verified relationships, periods of activity, relevant races, people, source material, and changes over time. Organization representatives may submit corrections or material, but the Foundation retains editorial control over the historical record.

37. Documents and Publications

FORMAL RULE. Documents and publications are preserved and described as sources with metadata and provenance. The Foundation distinguishes the historical facts derived from a source from the separate question of whether the underlying copyrighted page, photograph, or document will be reproduced publicly.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Old programs, newsletters, maps, newspaper clippings, magazine results, correspondence, and similar material can be indispensable even when the archive ultimately displays only a citation, excerpt, description, or limited reproduction rather than the complete item.

38. Historical Media

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation’s Historical Media collection is curated, representative, and documentary. Submission does not create a right to publication. Media is selected for historical value, evidentiary usefulness, context, quality, provenance, and relationship to the archive.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation is not trying to become an unlimited photo dump or mirror every external gallery. A small number of well-identified images can be more historically useful than hundreds of unlabeled images. Comprehensive external galleries may be linked when useful while the Foundation preserves representative media with context.

38.1 Minimum Descriptive Metadata

FORMAL RULE. Historical media should be published with enough descriptive metadata to make the item useful as history. When known, the record should identify date or approximate date, location, event, people shown or heard, creator/photographer, contributor/source, related entities, and material uncertainty.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A photograph captioned only “old race photo” has limited archival value. The same image becomes significantly more useful when it is tied to a race edition, date range, named people, and provenance. Unknown fields should remain unknown rather than being guessed.

38.2 Promotional Material as Evidence

FORMAL RULE. Promotional material may be preserved as historical evidence of how an event or organization presented itself. Promotional claims are attributed to the source and are not automatically adopted as Foundation conclusions.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A flyer calling a race “Kansas’s oldest ultra” can be historically valuable even if the Foundation has not established that claim. The flyer proves that the race made the claim at that time. It does not, by itself, prove the claim was correct.

38.3 External Galleries and Large Collections

When a contributor or race organization maintains a large, stable external gallery, the Foundation may preserve selected representative media and link to the larger collection rather than duplicating every item. The Foundation’s own holdings should remain curated, contextualized, and connected to the historical entities they document.

EXAMPLES.

- A photograph showing an identifiable early course feature, runners, signage, or race operation may have high documentary value.
- A promotional race poster can be preserved as promotional material. Its promotional claims are not automatically adopted as historical facts.
- Twenty near-identical finish-line photos may be represented by a smaller curated selection with a link to a larger external gallery where appropriate.

39. Firsthand Recollections and Oral Histories

FORMAL RULE. Named firsthand accounts are preserved as firsthand evidence and clearly distinguished from independently documented fact. The Foundation may edit, excerpt, contextualize, or compare a submitted recollection consistent with the submission terms, but it does not fabricate quotations or alter the contributor's meaning.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A person who submits an article, interview, or recollection does not receive a guaranteed publication decision, individualized status response, or second approval cycle before publication. The Foundation may contact the contributor when clarification would materially improve the record, but follow-up is discretionary.

39.1 Recollection Is Not Self-Verification

The archive values memory precisely because many parts of grassroots sports history were never formally documented. That value does not require pretending memory is independently verified. A named recollection can remain historically useful even when other evidence is absent, incomplete, or contradictory.

39.2 Editing and Context

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation may edit submitted narrative for length, grammar, organization, and contextual clarity while preserving the contributor's substantive meaning. Material quotations should remain faithful to the submitted or recorded words.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation is not obligated to publish a submission verbatim. A ten-page recollection may become an excerpt inside a race history, a shorter firsthand account, or a source for several documented facts and attributed memories. The editorial form is controlled by the Foundation unless a specific contribution agreement states otherwise.

EXAMPLES.

- A former race director describes why a race changed location. If no documentary source confirms the reason, the statement may be published as that director's recollection.
- A runner recalls finishing an event, but no independent source confirms the result. The recollection may be preserved in narrative history; it does not create a verified database finish.

40. Milestones and Historical Investigations

FORMAL RULE. Milestone investigations apply heightened evidence standards to firsts, records, earliest-known activity, race longevity, major transitions, and comparable claims. The Foundation publishes the basis for the conclusion and identifies meaningful uncertainty or limitations.

Part VI. Submissions and Corrections

The archive depends on material held by runners, race directors, organizations, families, publications, and other contributors. Public contribution is essential, but it does not mean public editing. This Part establishes the intake paths, evidence burdens, review process, attribution rules, correction standards, and practical boundaries that protect both contributors and the authoritative record.

41. Public Contribution Is Not Public Editing

FORMAL RULE. Public submissions are evidence inputs for Foundation review. No public submission directly writes into the authoritative database, edits a race or person profile, changes an organization history, or compels publication.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation welcomes material because community-held evidence is essential to the archive. That does not mean the archive is crowdsourced in the sense that anybody can overwrite it. Foundation review is the control that protects the record.

42. Submission Categories

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation uses defined submission paths so each type of material is evaluated under the appropriate standard. The principal public categories are Results / Corrections; Race & Organization History; Articles / Photos / Historical Media; and General Inquiry.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. One Foundation-wide Submissions & Corrections system may present these paths through conditional fields. Contextual links from race, runner, organization, or other archive pages may bring a user into the same system with relevant information preselected or identified.

42.1 One System, Different Evidentiary Lanes

A single public Submissions & Corrections entry point can serve the whole Foundation, but the form should branch according to the category selected. A result correction requires precise result evidence. A historical photograph requires contextual metadata and provenance. A general inquiry requires neither the same fields nor the same proof. Treating every submission identically would either make simple historical contributions unnecessarily burdensome or make database corrections dangerously loose.

42.2 Required Acknowledgment of Standards

FORMAL RULE. Where a submission category has material eligibility or evidence requirements, the form may require the submitter to acknowledge the applicable rules before submission. The acknowledgment confirms that the submitter understands the standards; it does not waive Foundation review.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The purpose of the checkbox is not legal theater. It reduces avoidable submissions that plainly violate published policy and gives the Foundation a clear basis for closing submissions that ignore the rules.

43. Results and Corrections

FORMAL RULE. A result addition or correction must identify the runner/result at issue, the race and edition, the requested change, and competent supporting evidence. The submitter bears the burden of proof and completeness. A solo personal self-report does not create a missing verified result.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. If a person says, “I ran this in 1998,” the statement may be a useful lead or recollection. It is not enough by itself to add an authoritative finish. The Foundation requires a source that is competent to establish the result.

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation does not promise to contact race directors, timers, publications, or other third parties to repair an incomplete result submission. A deficient submission may be declined, closed, held, or discarded without individualized follow-up.

43.1 Minimum Required Information

A usable Results / Corrections submission should ordinarily identify: the runner/person; the race; the edition year or date; the distance/format; the current record if one exists; the requested addition or correction; the source; the publication, timer, event, or archive details needed to evaluate that source; and the supporting file, link, image, citation, or other evidence when available.

FORMAL RULE. A submission that omits information necessary to identify the result or evaluate the evidence may be closed without Foundation research to fill the gaps.

43.2 Corrections to Names and Identities

Identity corrections should explain both the display correction and the linkage evidence. “My name is spelled this way” may be useful, but when the archive is reconciling decades of source records the Foundation may also need evidence that the misspelled source entry is the same person. The objective is not merely spelling accuracy; it is preservation of the correct performance history.

44. Results and Corrections: Real-World Examples

EXAMPLES.

- Accepted-type evidence: an official timer PDF identifies the runner, race, edition, distance, official status, and result. The Foundation can evaluate the requested addition directly.
- Accepted-type evidence: a digitized Ultrarunning Magazine results page identifies the edition and result and the publication/date can be documented.
- Potentially accepted after evaluation: a contemporary newspaper prints a full result list with enough event detail to identify the race and edition.
- Not sufficient by itself: “I remember finishing.” Recollection is not an independent result record.
- Not sufficient by itself: a Strava activity or Garmin screenshot.
- Not sufficient by itself: a social-media post repeating a result without source provenance.
- Excluded even with distance evidence: the authoritative source labels the performance an unofficial finish.

- Excluded by format: a relay/team performance or virtual/self-timed effort.
- Below threshold: an official timed-event result of 42.195 km or less.
- Identity correction: a source misspells a runner's surname. The submitter provides the official source plus competent identity evidence linking the misspelling to the canonical person. The Foundation corrects the canonical display while preserving the source spelling.

45. Race and Organization History Submissions

FORMAL RULE. Race and organization history submissions should identify the historical entity, the fact or relationship being added or corrected, the applicable dates or period when known, and the supporting source or firsthand basis. Organizations and race representatives may contribute evidence but do not control the resulting Foundation history.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A former director can provide invaluable information about ownership, course changes, director succession, or organizational history. The Foundation evaluates and contextualizes that material under the same evidence rules used for everyone else.

45.1 Historical Roles and Relationships

Submissions about founders, directors, owners, clubs, race-operating entities, or other roles should include the relationship being asserted and the period to which it applies. "Organization X ran the race" is less useful than evidence showing whether Organization X owned, operated, sponsored, timed, supported, or otherwise related to the race during specific years.

45.2 Firsthand Organizational Knowledge

A director or officer may submit firsthand knowledge of an organization or race history. The Foundation should preserve the fact that the account comes from that person and compare it with surviving documents where available. A firsthand account can be highly valuable without being mislabeled as independent documentation.

46. Articles, Photographs, and Historical Media Submissions

FORMAL RULE. Articles, photographs, documents, and historical media are accepted for consideration when they have clear and substantial relevance to Kansas ultrarunning history and enough context to evaluate their historical, documentary, or archival value. Article submission is an editorial pathway distinct from verified-result submission.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Articles section may include Foundation research, historical analysis, first-person accounts, interviews, recollections, race or organization history, and documented endurance efforts that help explain Kansas ultrarunning. Publication preserves and presents material; it does not automatically convert every claim in an article into a Foundation-verified database fact.

46.1 Article Relevance and Scope

FORMAL RULE. An article must have a meaningful and substantial connection to Kansas ultrarunning history. Residence in Kansas, membership in a Kansas organization, or participation by a Kansas runner does not by itself establish sufficient editorial relevance when the article's actual subject is unrelated to Kansas ultrarunning.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The question is not merely whether a Kansan was involved. The question is whether publishing the article materially helps preserve, explain, document, or contextualize ultrarunning history in Kansas.

EXAMPLES.

- A documented solo crossing of Kansas, an FKT attempt on a historically relevant Kansas route, or a firsthand account of a Kansas ultra race may warrant editorial consideration even when the effort is outside the verified-results database.
- A Kansas resident's account of an unrelated Grand Canyon trip or Pikes Peak climb does not become Foundation editorial material merely because the author lives in Kansas.
- An out-of-state event may be discussed when it materially explains the history of a Kansas runner, race director, organization, race lineage, or other Kansas ultrarunning subject.

46.2 Supporting Evidence for Articles

FORMAL RULE. Evidence supporting an article is evaluated for editorial credibility, context, and historical value rather than under the identical eligibility standard used for the authoritative verified-results database. GPS or Garmin records, photographs, firsthand accounts, contemporaneous social posts, correspondence, newspaper coverage, published articles, race documents, official results, and comparable material may strengthen an article submission even when one or more of those sources would be insufficient by themselves to establish a verified database performance.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Better-supported submissions are easier to evaluate and more useful to future researchers. A Garmin file may help document a personal route effort for an article; it does not turn that effort into a verified Foundation race result. The more competent supporting evidence a contributor can provide, the stronger the editorial submission becomes.

FORMAL RULE. Publication of an article does not certify an FKT, personal route effort, unofficial completion, self-reported result, or other excluded performance as a Foundation-verified result, record, or leaderboard entry.

46.3 Editorial Selection and No Publication Entitlement

FORMAL RULE. Submission creates no right to publication. The Foundation retains discretion to publish, edit, excerpt, defer, hold, or decline submitted material based on Kansas relevance, historical or archival value, originality, supporting evidence, completeness, provenance, duplication, writing quality, rights considerations, available editorial resources, and current institutional priorities.

FORMAL RULE. Publication of one article does not create a precedent requiring publication of another article concerning the same or a similar subject. Similar submissions may differ materially in documentation, historical significance, context, completeness, originality, or usefulness to the archive.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. “You published their Kansas crossing, so you must publish mine” is not an editorial rule. The Foundation applies published criteria consistently, but editorial selection necessarily involves curatorial judgment. Declining or deferring an article does not change the verified database, and publishing an article does not create special database status.

46.4 Minimum Context for Photographs, Documents, and Historical Media

FORMAL RULE. Photographs, documents, and historical media should include enough contextual information to evaluate historical value and provenance. The Foundation may require submitters to acknowledge submission standards and provide a minimum factual and contextual threshold before material is accepted for review.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A media submission should not be “here is a photo, good luck.” To the extent available, the Foundation should know what it shows, approximately when and where it was created, who created or holds it, how the submitter obtained it, what race, person, organization, or historical subject it relates to, and what uncertainty remains.

The submission pathway should collect, when available: the event or subject; approximate date; location; people depicted or discussed; photographer or creator; current holder; how the submitter obtained the material; file format; whether an original survives; related race, person, or organization; rights or publication information; and any uncertainty the submitter knows about.

46.5 Physical Originals

FORMAL RULE. Physical originals are accepted only by prior arrangement. The ordinary submission workflow is digital. A submitter with physical material that cannot reasonably be submitted digitally should first describe the material through the submission form and wait for Foundation instructions before sending or delivering anything.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation may arrange to scan, borrow, receive, return, or, where separately agreed, retain physical material. No one should mail or deliver boxes of historical material without prior coordination. The form may include a choice such as “I have physical historical material that cannot reasonably be submitted digitally” followed by a description field.

47. General Inquiry

FORMAL RULE. General Inquiry is a controlled intake category, not a blind public inbox and not a way around published submission requirements. The inquiry form requires categorization and should direct users to the Manual and FAQ before submission.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation’s public contact model is forms-based. Common policy questions should be answered by published methodology rather than recreated by email one person at a time.

FORMAL RULE. The automated acknowledgment confirms receipt only. It does not promise individual follow-up. The Foundation triages inquiries according to relevance, completeness, published policies, and available capacity. Inquiries already answered by the Manual/FAQ, unsupported claims, incomplete requests, or matters outside scope may receive no individual response.

47.1 No Public Catch-All Email

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation does not publish a general catch-all email address as an alternate route around the forms-based intake system. Public contact is routed through defined forms so inquiries arrive with the category and minimum information needed for triage.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. This does not prevent the Foundation from using email internally or from replying by email when appropriate. It means the public intake architecture should not encourage people to bypass the submission rules by sending unstructured messages to a generic inbox.

47.2 Read the Manual and FAQ First

The General Inquiry form should make clear that the Foundation has published detailed methodology and a comprehensive FAQ. Questions already answered there may be closed without a custom response. This is particularly important for recurring disputes about eligibility, self-reports, virtual efforts, FKTs, unofficial finishes, relays, and evidence requirements.

48. Submitter Burden and Foundation Responsibility

FORMAL RULE. The submitter is responsible for providing enough information and evidence for the Foundation to evaluate the requested action. The Foundation is responsible for applying its standards consistently; it is not responsible for completing the submitter's research.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. This keeps the submission system scalable and fair. The same rule applies to famous runners, longtime race directors, first-time contributors, Foundation friends, critics, donors, and strangers.

EXAMPLES.

- “You can ask the old race director, he remembers me” is not a complete result submission.
- “Here is the official results PDF, page 3, showing my name and time; the database currently omits the result” is a reviewable submission.
- A complaint that a rule is “too strict” does not create an exception. The Foundation may revise policy prospectively if the policy itself is flawed, but it does not negotiate one-off eligibility.

49. Receipt, Review, and Response

FORMAL RULE. Submission receipt is not verification, acceptance, correction, publication, or a promise of individual status updates. Material may be accepted for research while remaining unpublished. Incomplete, unsupported, duplicative, noncompliant, or out-of-scope submissions may be closed or discarded without individual response.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The acknowledgment exists so the submitter knows the form was received. It is not a ticketing-system promise that every submission will generate a correspondence thread.

49.1 Recommended Automated Acknowledgment Standard

The acknowledgment should state, in substance: this is an automated confirmation of receipt only; it is not acceptance, verification, publication, or a promise of individual follow-up; the Foundation receives and triages submissions according to relevance, completeness, evidence, and published policy; submitters should review the Manual and FAQ; incomplete, unsupported, noncompliant, already-answered, or out-of-scope matters may receive no individual response; and the Foundation may contact the submitter if a genuine issue remains and follow-up would materially assist the archive.

49.2 No First-Come Processing Promise

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation may prioritize submissions according to historical significance, evidence vulnerability, completeness, active research needs, database integrity, available capacity, or other mission-related reasons. Submission order does not create a guaranteed processing order.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A complete correction affecting hundreds of linked results may reasonably be reviewed before a routine low-impact submission received earlier. A deteriorating physical source may justify rapid attention. The Foundation's obligation is consistent methodology, not a public queueing promise.

50. Submission Review Workflow

Submission review is a controlled triage and evidence-evaluation process. The Foundation records enough internal status to reconstruct material decisions while avoiding any implication that every submission creates a public ticket, appeal, or guaranteed correspondence thread.

50.1 Review Outcomes

A submission can produce several legitimate outcomes: accepted and published; accepted as evidence but not publicly displayed; accepted and held for future research; incorporated into a correction; held pending additional evidence; declined as unsupported or out of scope; closed as duplicative or already resolved; or discarded when it fails the published minimum requirements.

50.2 Internal Status Tracking

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation should maintain enough internal status information to reconstruct what happened to a material submission without turning the public website into a ticketing system.

Useful internal fields include submission category, received date, submitter identity, related entity or entities, review status, evidence status, provenance status, reproduction/publication status, assigned reviewer when applicable, disposition, publication link when applicable, and correction/version-history references.

The Foundation's practical review sequence is:

1. Receive submission and automated acknowledgment.
2. Confirm submission category and basic scope.
3. Check minimum completeness and required acknowledgments.
4. Identify the related race, edition, person, organization, historical subject, or media anchor.
5. Evaluate provenance and source competence.
6. Apply eligibility and evidence rules.
7. Use curator or second-person review when needed for ambiguity, conflict, identity resolution, or a direct conflict of interest.
8. Accept, hold, request clarification at Foundation discretion, decline, or close.
9. Archive/catalog retained evidence and preserve source metadata.
10. Publish or update the public record when appropriate.
11. Record material corrections/version history and contributor credit choices where applicable.

51. Corrections

FORMAL RULE. Corrections are treated as contributions to the historical record, not as complaints. A correction is accepted when the evidence supports the change under the same standards that govern the original record.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A person does not receive a lower burden merely because the subject is their own result, their own race, or their own organization. Likewise, the Foundation does not defend an existing entry merely because changing it is inconvenient.

52. Research Retention Versus Public Display

FORMAL RULE. Permission for the Foundation to receive, retain, compare, research, and archive a submitted copy is distinct from the decision to reproduce that material publicly. Material may have historical research value even when public reproduction rights are uncertain or publication is not currently appropriate.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation may use a newspaper clipping, magazine page, photograph, newsletter, or other submitted source to evaluate historical facts while separately deciding what portion, if any, will be displayed publicly. Citation and description can preserve research value without requiring every source object to be reproduced in full.

52.1 Copyright and Reproduction Treatment

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation distinguishes historical use of facts and source information from public reproduction of the underlying expressive work. Citation alone is not treated as a universal reproduction rule, and nonprofit status is not treated as an automatic exemption. Public display decisions are made case by case using permission, public-domain status, fair use or another appropriate legal basis where applicable, and the practical historical purpose of the use.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation expects to rely heavily on historical results, magazine coverage, newspaper clippings, race reports, photographs, and similar sources. Those materials can support historical research and citation even when the Foundation chooses not to display a complete copyrighted page or image. The Manual intentionally does not attempt to write a comprehensive copyright treatise; unusual legal questions can be addressed when they arise.

53. Contributor Identity and Attribution

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation requires a real submitter identity and a usable contact method for public submissions. Fully anonymous submissions are not accepted through the ordinary submission system. Public attribution is optional unless the nature of the published material requires identification of the source itself.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation should know who sent the material even when the person prefers not to have their name displayed publicly. Internal identity strengthens provenance, permits necessary follow-up, and discourages bad-faith submissions. Public privacy and internal accountability are separate questions.

53.1 Internal Identity Versus Public Credit

The submission form should distinguish the identity information the Foundation requires internally from the public credit preference. A contributor can therefore help establish provenance without being required to have their name displayed next to every item they submit.

53.2 Contact Information

FORMAL RULE. A usable contact method is required so the Foundation can ask a material question when necessary. Providing contact information does not create a promise that the Foundation will respond or open a correspondence thread.

53.3 Bad-Faith or Identity-Misleading Submissions

The Foundation may decline or disregard a submission when the submitter provides false identity information, impersonates another person, repeatedly attempts to evade published rules, or otherwise undermines the integrity of the intake process. The historical merits of independent evidence may still be evaluated separately if the evidence itself has archival value.

EXAMPLES.

- A contributor provides their real name and email but selects “do not publicly credit me.” The Foundation may retain their identity internally while omitting public contributor credit.
- A person attempts to submit a disputed historical claim without identifying themselves to the Foundation. The ordinary submission is not accepted.
- A named oral history cannot logically be published as a firsthand account without identifying the speaker; if the contributor does not want the account attributed, the Foundation may retain the lead but should not present it as a named firsthand source.

54. Curators

FORMAL RULE. A curator is a trusted volunteer or designated participant who assists with historical research, source evaluation, transcription, identification, organization, or contextualization. Curators are distinct from ordinary contributors and do not have unilateral authority to edit or rewrite the archive.

FORMAL RULE. Curators should complete a short practical verification process demonstrating that they can responsibly perform the historical work for which they will assist. Unless a curator opts out, the Foundation may publicly list verified curators with a one-sentence biography and general area of contribution or expertise.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Curator status is practical trust, not a hierarchy of prestige. The Foundation does not need elaborate titles, committees, or credential barriers to recognize reliable historical help.

54.1 Curator Verification

The practical verification process may include a short sample task such as evaluating a source, transcribing a historical result, identifying provenance fields, or explaining how a claim should be classified. The objective is to confirm judgment and reliability, not to impose academic credential requirements.

54.2 Curator Review Is Not Public Appeal

FORMAL RULE. Curator review is an internal historical process used when the Foundation needs additional expertise or a second set of eyes. A submitter does not have a right to demand curator review or select the curator who evaluates a disputed claim.

54.3 Public Curator Listing

Unless a curator opts out, the Foundation may list the curator publicly with a short biography and area of contribution or expertise. Public listing recognizes participation and increases transparency about who helps the archive; it does not confer authority to speak for the Foundation on every historical question.

Part VII. Editorial Standards

Accurate data can still be misrepresented by careless language. This Part governs how the Foundation writes about people, events, uncertainty, firsthand memory, affiliated subjects, and contested history so that narrative clarity never erases evidentiary distinctions.

55. Institutional Voice

FORMAL RULE. Foundation editorial writing uses an authoritative but accessible historical voice. It avoids promotional hype, unnecessary academic jargon, first-person founder narration, and dramatic embellishment that outruns the evidence.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The default voice is third-person institutional history. First-person belongs inside clearly attributed recollections, quotations, interviews, or primary-source material.

56. Fact, Interpretation, and Recollection

FORMAL RULE. Published material distinguishes documented fact, attributed report, firsthand recollection, interpretation, disputed evidence, and unresolved questions when the distinction matters to a reasonable reader.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The archive does not need to attach a label to every ordinary sentence, but it must never allow narrative flow to erase an important evidentiary distinction.

57. Living People

FORMAL RULE. Living people are documented under the same evidence standards as historical figures. Verifiable public facts and sourced historical roles may be published without subject approval. Living subjects do not possess a blanket prepublication veto or approval right over Foundation profiles or historical conclusions.

FORMAL RULE. When a person submits an article, interview, recollection, document, or media item under the Foundation's submission terms, the Foundation is not required to return the resulting editorial treatment for a second approval before publication. The Foundation must represent attributed words and meaning accurately and may seek clarification when useful.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A correction right is not an approval right. A living person can challenge an error with evidence. They cannot require the Foundation to suppress well-supported history merely because they dislike the way the record reads.

57.1 Corrections by Subjects

A living subject may use the same correction process as anyone else and may be uniquely positioned to supply documents, names, dates, or firsthand context. The subject's proximity to the history is relevant evidence, but it does not eliminate the Foundation's responsibility to evaluate the evidence independently.

57.2 Private Information

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation does not add private personal detail merely because it is interesting. Personal information should have a legitimate historical connection and a supportable source. The archive’s purpose is Kansas ultrarunning history, not unrestricted biography.

58. Founder, Officers, Curators, and Affiliates

FORMAL RULE. Foundation officers, founders, curators, advisors, affiliated organizations, and supporting entities are subject to the same evidence and editorial standards as every other historical subject. Direct involvement is disclosed when material to credibility or interpretation.

FORMAL RULE. A person should not be the sole editor or final reviewer of their own disputed historical profile or a contested claim in which they have a direct personal stake. A second reviewer, curator, officer, or other appropriate reviewer should be used when practical.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Independence does not require artificial underrepresentation. If an affiliated person or organization is historically significant, that history belongs in the archive. The goal is proportional, evidence-supported documentation, not promotion or suppression.

59. Language Standards

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation avoids unsupported superlatives, assumed consensus, false precision, promotional adjectives presented as historical judgment, hagiographic treatment, and loaded criticism unsupported by evidence.

EXAMPLES.

- Avoid: “the greatest Kansas ultrarunner.” The Foundation is not a subjective hall of fame.
- Avoid: “everyone knew the race was the hardest.” Attribute the claim or describe measurable facts instead.
- Avoid: “the first” when the evidence supports only “the earliest documented to date.”
- Acceptable: quoting a race flyer that called an event “the toughest in Kansas,” when clearly identified as promotional language from that source.

60. Editorial Selection and Curatorial Discretion

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation retains discretion over what to research, prioritize, publish, excerpt, defer, or decline. Curatorial discretion must be exercised consistently with scope, historical value, evidence quality, provenance, rights considerations, duplication, available resources, and institutional priorities, not personal favoritism or pressure.

FORMAL RULE. Neither the Board nor the Advisory Council functions as a public appeals panel for routine submission disputes. Internal review may be used when the Foundation believes additional judgment is warranted, but submitters do not have a right to escalate ordinary rejected submissions to advisors or directors.

60.1 Rules-Based Database and Curated Articles

FORMAL RULE. Verified database inclusion is governed by the Foundation’s stated eligibility and evidence rules. Article publication is a separate curated editorial determination made within the standards of this Manual. Publication or nonpublication does not alter the database treatment of a performance, and database eligibility does not create an automatic right to editorial publication.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The verified database answers a rules-based question: does this record satisfy the published requirements for inclusion? The Articles section answers a different question: is this material sufficiently relevant, supported, useful, and appropriate for the Foundation to publish as part of the broader historical archive? Those systems inform each other but are not interchangeable.

Part VIII. Governance and Independence

Historical independence depends not only on evidence rules but also on how authority, advice, funding, and conflicts are handled. This Part distinguishes the roles of directors, advisors, curators, contributors, donors, sponsors, and partners and states the boundaries that keep support separate from historical conclusions.

61. Corporate Governance

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation’s legal Board of Directors retains corporate and fiduciary authority. Historical methodology, editorial practice, and archive operations function within that governance structure but are documented separately so historical standards remain transparent and durable.

62. Founding Historical Advisory Council

FORMAL RULE. The Founding Historical Advisory Council is advisory, not governing. Advisory members provide perspective, historical knowledge, challenge, source leads, and optional review of selected methodology or historical questions. They do not assume director liability, routine operational authority, mandatory fundraising duties, or an obligation to endorse Foundation conclusions.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The purpose of the Council is not to borrow respected names as decoration. Its value is independent historical judgment and the ability to challenge assumptions before weak methodology hardens into convention.

62.1 Participation Expectations

Participation may include occasional requests for perspective on methodology, unresolved historical questions, source identification, institutional blind spots, or other issues where experienced judgment would improve the archive. Participation does not require routine meetings, administrative work, a financial contribution, fundraising, or endorsement of sponsors, donors, or individual Foundation conclusions.

62.2 Founding Designation

FORMAL RULE. The “Founding” designation records participation during the Foundation’s formation and launch period. It is historical recognition of that role and does not imply permanent operational authority as the advisory body evolves.

62.3 Challenge Is Part of the Role

Advisors add value when they identify weak assumptions, missing sources, oversimplified narratives, or methodological blind spots. Agreement is not the purpose of the Council. Thoughtful challenge is one of the reasons it exists.

63. Directors, Advisors, and Curators

FORMAL RULE. Directors govern the corporation. Advisors advise. Curators assist with historical work. Contributors supply material. These roles may overlap in one person, but the authority attached to each role remains distinct.

64. Conflicts of Interest

FORMAL RULE. Potential historical conflicts are managed through disclosure, consistent standards, and additional review when appropriate. Personal involvement does not disqualify evidence, and personal involvement does not grant special authority over the conclusion.

EXAMPLES.

- A former race director's account of their own race is valuable firsthand evidence. It is still identified as their account unless independently corroborated.
- A Foundation officer who was also a race director may provide source material but should not be the sole reviewer of a disputed claim about that race.

65. Donors, Sponsors, Partners, and Editorial Independence

FORMAL RULE. Financial or operational support does not purchase database inclusion, favorable coverage, historical status, editorial approval, suppression of contrary evidence, or influence over historical conclusions.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation may publicly recognize donors, partners, or sponsors for supporting preservation work. Recognition is separate from historical judgment.

65.1 Recognition and Historical Treatment Are Separate

A donor or Foundation Partner may be recognized on a support page, in an annual report, or in another appropriate institutional context. That recognition does not move the donor's race higher in the archive, convert a disputed claim into a confirmed one, guarantee an article, or influence whether contrary evidence is preserved.

66. Sustainability and Continuity

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation may develop individual giving, organizational underwriting, grants, partnerships, reimbursement of legitimate expenses, and reasonable compensation for actual work when resources and governance support it. Sustainability does not change the evidence standard.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Preserving a serious archive requires infrastructure and people. The objective is not commercialization. The objective is continuity beyond what one founder or volunteer can personally sustain.

67. The Institution Must Outlive the Builder

FORMAL RULE. Policies, source provenance, database relationships, identity decisions, correction history, credentials/access practices, and institutional knowledge should be documented well enough that the archive can be handed to future responsible leadership without depending on one person's memory.

Part IX. Preservation, Architecture, and Discoverability

Preservation is incomplete if information cannot be found, connected, migrated, or recovered. This Part explains the three-site ecosystem, canonical ownership of information, stable URLs, metadata, born-digital preservation, discoverability, backups, and long-term access.

68. Three-Site Historical Ecosystem

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation's public archive operates as an interconnected three-site ecosystem with distinct canonical functions: KansasUltrarunningHistory.org as the umbrella historical archive and institutional methodology site; KansasUltraRaces.com as the race-centered historical record; and KansasUltraRunners.com as the people-centered historical record.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The sites are separate by function but should behave like one historical system through shared data relationships, navigation, reciprocal links, and consistent methodology.

69. One Canonical Home

FORMAL RULE. Each piece of structured information should have one canonical home. Other pages reference or cross-link that information rather than creating competing manually maintained versions.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A race's edition record should not exist as three independently edited copies. A person's canonical identity should not be separately invented on the race site and runner site. Cross-links should express the relationship rather than duplicate the underlying fact.

70. Permanent Historical URLs

FORMAL RULE. Published historical URLs should remain stable wherever practical. When information is reorganized, redirects or other continuity mechanisms should preserve discoverability and citation integrity rather than casually breaking historical references.

71. Metadata and Digital Preservation

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation preserves relevant original metadata on submitted digital material when available and records enough descriptive metadata to maintain historical context. Born-digital material, including old websites, results files, and databases, should be treated as preservation targets before they disappear.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. A file without context can become useless. File dates, captions, source URLs, original names, creator information, and related race/person/organization anchors can be as important as the visible content itself.

71.1 Born-Digital Sources

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation treats vulnerable born-digital material as historical evidence worth preserving when it falls within scope. Examples include defunct race websites, online result pages, downloadable files, database exports, archived social posts with genuine historical value, and other digital records likely to disappear.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Digital does not mean permanent. A web page can vanish faster than a paper result sheet. When the Foundation captures a born-digital source, it should preserve the source URL, capture or retrieval date, file format where relevant, and enough context to explain what was captured.

71.2 Original Metadata

When files contain useful original metadata, the Foundation should preserve it where practical rather than routinely stripping or rewriting it. File names, embedded dates, creator fields, image metadata, and source folder structure can provide leads even when they are not conclusive evidence by themselves.

72. Search, Research, and Machine Readability

FORMAL RULE. Discoverability is part of preservation. The Foundation uses descriptive titles, semantic structure, internal relationships, citations, crawlable content, structured data when the underlying facts justify it, and research-friendly organization so humans, search engines, and machine systems can understand the archive.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. This is not generic SEO filler. A stable, well-sourced page that clearly identifies a race, person, edition, organization, and source relationship is easier for a researcher to cite and for a machine to interpret correctly.

73. Backups, Exports, and Long-Term Access

FORMAL RULE. The Foundation should maintain reliable backups and, as the archive matures, research-friendly exports or other preservation mechanisms that reduce dependence on a single website, plugin, hosting environment, or database interface.

73.1 Preservation Beyond the Website Interface

The public website is one access layer, not the only copy of the historical record. Database backups, source-file backups, configuration documentation, and periodic exports reduce the risk that a hosting failure, plugin failure, account problem, redesign, or future platform change destroys the archive's accumulated work.

73.2 Future Research Access

As the Foundation matures, research-friendly exports may allow qualified analysis of race, edition, performance, person, and organization relationships without forcing every researcher to scrape public pages. Any future access model should preserve privacy, rights, and evidence-status distinctions rather than exporting a flattened dataset stripped of methodology.

Part X. Policy Administration

A methodology that cannot change transparently becomes brittle; one that changes invisibly becomes untrustworthy. This Part explains the authority of the Manual, how material policy revisions are recorded, and how new edge cases are handled without creating unwritten exceptions.

74. Manual Authority and Applicability

FORMAL RULE. This Manual is the Foundation's primary published methodology for the historical and editorial subjects it covers. Shorter summaries, form instructions, FAQ answers, and page-level notes should be consistent with it.

75. Policy Revision

FORMAL RULE. Policy may be revised when experience, new evidence, technical realities, legal guidance, or review demonstrates that a rule should change. Material policy changes are made prospectively through a documented methodology revision rather than through one-off exceptions for favored or persistent submitters.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. The Foundation can change a bad rule. It should not secretly bend a good rule for one person.

76. Methodology Change Log

FORMAL RULE. Material revisions to scope, eligibility, evidence standards, submission requirements, identity rules, governance roles, or other core methodology should be recorded with an effective date and a concise explanation of the change.

76.1 What Counts as a Material Methodology Change

Examples include changing the ultra-distance threshold; changing the treatment of virtual efforts, relays, unofficial finishes, FKTs, or timed events; changing the burden of proof for result submissions; changing identity-merge rules; changing public attribution requirements; changing the authority of advisors or curators; or changing how conflicting evidence is displayed. Copyediting, typo correction, and non-substantive clarification do not require the same level of change notice.

77. Interpretation and Edge Cases

FORMAL RULE. When an edge case is not expressly resolved by this Manual, the Foundation applies the closest existing principles, documents the reasoning, avoids inventing unsupported facts, and, when the case reveals a recurring policy gap, updates the Manual rather than relying indefinitely on unwritten precedent.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION. Not every future event format or archival problem can be predicted. The objective is disciplined interpretation, not improvisation disguised as policy.

Appendices

The appendices condense recurring standards into quick-reference tables, examples, checklists, and workflow models. They summarize the Manual for practical use but do not replace the controlling rules in the main text.

Appendix A. Definitions Quick Reference

Term	Working Definition
Ultramarathon distance	Any verified distance greater than the standard marathon distance of 42.195 kilometers (26 miles 385 yards). “26.2 miles” may be used in casual explanatory language, but it is not the controlling mathematical threshold.
Race	A continuing event identity that may have one or many editions over time.
Edition	A specific occurrence of a race on a particular date or within a specific year.
Performance	A person’s recorded participation/result within an edition or qualifying historical race context.
Qualifying performance	A verified performance that satisfies the Foundation’s distance, format, status, geographic, and evidence rules for inclusion in the authoritative verified-results database.
Official result	A result treated as official by the authoritative event or results source.
Unofficial result	A result expressly labeled unofficial, non-finish, post-cutoff, early-start, altered-course, or otherwise outside the event’s official finish rules by an authoritative source.
Person	A historical individual represented in the Foundation’s relational record, whether or not the person is a runner.
Runner	A person with one or more running-related performances or runner history in the Foundation’s scope.
Historical role	A documented relationship such as founder, race director, owner, organizer, timer, official, photographer, volunteer, club leader, or other historically relevant role.

Term	Working Definition
Organization	A club, company, nonprofit, informal organizing body, sanctioning/support entity, or other institution with a documented relationship to Kansas ultrarunning history.
Source	The document, publication, record, photograph, database, correspondence, testimony, or other evidence from which a historical claim is derived.
Provenance	What is known about where evidence came from, who created or held it, what form it is in, how it was obtained, and how it relates to later use in the archive.
Firsthand recollection	A named account from a person describing events they personally experienced or witnessed.
Historical media	Curated photographs, video, audio, scanned ephemera, promotional material, and related documentary media selected for historical value and context.
Verification	The process of determining whether evidence is sufficiently competent, authentic, specific, and relevant to support the claim being made.

Appendix B. Evidence Types and Appropriate Uses

Evidence Type	Often Strong For	Common Limitations
Official results/timer records	Official status, time, recorded distance, order, participation	May contain errors; limited context; does not prove every course detail
Race documents	Intended date, format, course, rules, organizers	May describe plans rather than race-day reality
Newspaper/magazine coverage	Contemporary reporting, quotes, names, context, sometimes results	Selective coverage and reporting error possible
Photographs/video	Visible presence, signage, environment, people, physical context	Does not automatically prove finish, exact date, or unseen facts
Organization records/correspondence	Ownership, decisions, roles, relationships	Authenticity, completeness, and context must be evaluated

Evidence Type	Often Strong For	Common Limitations
Firsthand recollection	Experience, motivation, undocumented context, research leads	Memory fallibility; attribution required; not independent proof
Secondary databases	Discovery, cross-checking, source leads	Imported errors, normalization, missing provenance/status
GPS/self-report	Research lead or editorial context	Insufficient by itself for authoritative race-result inclusion

Appendix C. Claim-Status Reference

Status	Meaning
Confirmed	Supported by evidence competent and sufficient for the specific claim.
Reported	Stated by a credible identified source but not independently verified to the level required for “Confirmed.”
Recalled	Based primarily on a named firsthand memory or oral-history account.
Disputed	Materially conflicting evidence or accounts remain unresolved, or the Foundation has reached a better-supported conclusion while preserving a significant contrary account.
Unconfirmed	A claim has been found in a source or submission but lacks sufficient support for confirmation.
Unknown	The Foundation has not located evidence sufficient to answer the question.

Appendix D. Eligibility Examples

Example	Verified-Database Treatment	Reason
Official 50K finish in Kansas	Eligible if sufficiently verified	Exceeds 42.195 km and may satisfy all other rules
Official 42.195 km result	Excluded	Does not exceed marathon distance
Official 42.196 km result	Potentially eligible	Exceeds the exact threshold
Six-hour result of 40 km	Excluded	Timed-event result does not

Example	Verified-Database Treatment	Reason
		exceed threshold
Six-hour result of 52 km	Potentially eligible	Individual recorded distance exceeds threshold
Relay leg	Excluded	Team/relay format
Virtual 50K	Excluded	Virtual/remote/self-timed format
FKT effort	Excluded	Outside verified race-result database
Authoritatively unofficial 100-mile completion	Excluded from official finish totals	Unofficial status controls database treatment
Historically significant excluded effort	May be documented editorially	Historical significance and database eligibility are separate

Appendix E. Submission Examples

The following examples summarize common submission outcomes. They do not replace the detailed rules in Part VI.

“I ran this in 1996. Please add it.”: Not sufficient for a verified result without competent independent evidence.

Official timer PDF with race/date/name/result: Reviewable and potentially sufficient, subject to status, distance, identity, and scope.

Garmin/Strava activity: Not sufficient by itself for authoritative race-result inclusion.

Newspaper clipping with publication/date and relevant result: Potentially strong contemporary evidence; evaluate what the article is competent to establish.

Old race flyer or program: Useful for event history, advertised format, date, organizers, and context; does not necessarily prove the race occurred exactly as advertised.

Unidentified photo with no context: May be held as a lead, but publication value is limited until people/date/event/provenance can be established.

Real-name submission with request for no public credit: Permitted. Foundation retains submitter identity internally.

Fully anonymous web-form submission: Not accepted under the ordinary submission policy.

Documented FKT or personal route effort with GPS and other supporting material: May be considered for an article when substantially relevant to Kansas ultrarunning history; publication does not create verified-result status.

Kansas resident submits an otherwise unrelated adventure account: Ordinarily outside editorial scope unless the subject has a meaningful Kansas ultrarunning historical connection.

A similar article was previously published: Does not create an entitlement to publication; each submission is evaluated on its own relevance, documentation, context, originality, and archival value.

Appendix F. Provenance Checklist

- What is the item or source?
- Who created it, if known?
- When was it created or published, if known?
- Who currently holds the original, if known?
- Who submitted the copy to the Foundation?
- Is the submitted item an original, scan, photograph, photocopy, transcription, web capture, export, or other format?
- If transcribed, who transcribed it and was it checked against the original?
- What race, edition, person, organization, date, or historical subject does it relate to?
- What rights or reproduction information is known?
- What material uncertainty remains about authenticity, date, identity, completeness, or context?

Appendix G. Correction and Version-History Model

For a material correction, the internal record should preserve at least:

- Date of correction
- Record/entity affected
- Previous value or historical conclusion when material
- Corrected value or conclusion
- Reason for change
- New evidence/source supporting the change
- Reviewer/curator where applicable
- Whether the public page requires a visible correction note
- Related identity, provenance, or status changes

Appendix H. Governance and Role Matrix

Role	Primary Function	Can Advise/Contribute?	Authoritative Power
Board of Directors	Corporate/fiduciary governance	Yes	Corporate authority under governing documents; not exempt from published evidence standards
Historical Advisory Council	Perspective, challenge, historical judgment, source leads	Yes	Advisory only; no routine governing or editorial veto authority
Curator	Research, verification assistance, organization, contextualization	Yes	Trusted historical participation; no unilateral rewrite authority
Contributor	Supplies evidence, recollections, corrections, media, leads	Yes	No direct editing or publication authority
Donor/Sponsor/ Partner	Supports preservation work	May contribute evidence like anyone else	No purchased historical or editorial influence

Appendix I. Submission Form Blueprint

A public form may be implemented as one Foundation-wide Submissions & Corrections workflow with conditional fields. The following is a methodology blueprint, not a requirement that every field appear to every submitter.

- Required for all ordinary submissions: real name, usable contact method, submission category, subject/related entity, description of what is being submitted or requested, and acknowledgment of the applicable submission standards.
- Results / Corrections: runner/person, race, edition/date, distance/format, requested change, source identity, source date/publication or timer detail, evidence upload/link/citation, and explanation of how the evidence supports the requested action.
- Race & Organization History: race/organization/person involved, relationship or historical fact, applicable dates/period, source or firsthand basis, supporting files/links, and known uncertainty.
- Articles / Photos / Historical Media: article subject or media item, date or approximate date, location, Kansas relevance, people depicted/discussed, creator/photographer if known, provenance, related entities, supporting evidence or source links where applicable, rights/publication information if known, and contextual description.
- Physical material: a conditional option allowing the submitter to state that important physical material cannot reasonably be submitted digitally, followed by a description and instruction not to send the material until the Foundation makes arrangements.
- Public attribution preference: public credit permitted, or identity retained internally without public contributor credit. Fully anonymous ordinary submissions are not accepted.
- Optional note field for unusual circumstances that do not fit the structured fields.

Appendix J. Internal Submission Status Fields

A small nonprofit does not need an elaborate archival-management platform to begin. It does need enough internal structure that submissions do not become untraceable email-like conversations. Useful fields include:

- Submission ID and received date
- Category
- Submitter identity and contact
- Public attribution preference
- Related race/person/organization/edition
- Submission status
- Evidence status / claim status
- Provenance status
- Qualification or exclusion reason where applicable
- Rights / public-display status
- Reviewer or curator when assigned
- Disposition date and reason

- Public page or record changed
- Correction/version-history reference
- Follow-up needed, if any
- Physical-material arrangement status, when applicable

Appendix K. General Inquiry Acknowledgment Model

Recommended substance for the automatic acknowledgment:

“This automated message confirms that the Kansas Ultrarunning Historical Foundation received your inquiry. Receipt is not a promise of individual follow-up, acceptance, correction, or publication. The Foundation reviews submissions and inquiries according to relevance, completeness, evidence, published methodology, and available capacity. Please review the Foundation Manual / Methodology and FAQ before expecting a response; many common questions are answered there. Incomplete, unsupported, noncompliant, already-addressed, or out-of-scope inquiries may receive no individual response. If a genuine historical or institutional issue remains and follow-up would materially assist the archive, the Foundation may contact you.”

Appendix L. Physical Historical Material Procedure

1. Submitter describes the physical material through the appropriate Foundation form. Do not mail or deliver unsolicited originals.
2. Foundation determines whether the material appears within scope and whether digital submission by the holder is practical.
3. If Foundation handling is useful, the parties agree in advance on the method of transfer and whether the material is being loaned for scanning, temporarily held, returned, or separately donated.
4. Foundation records the identity of the holder, the condition/form of the material, and any known provenance at intake.
5. Scans or photographs should preserve identifying marks, captions, backs of photographs, envelopes, annotations, and other context when historically relevant.
6. Return or retention is handled according to the prior arrangement. No implication of ownership transfer arises merely because the Foundation scanned or researched the item.

Closing Statement

The Kansas Ultrarunning Historical Foundation is building a record meant to be used, questioned, corrected, expanded, and preserved. The archive will never be strengthened by pretending uncertainty does not exist or by making its standards negotiable when a difficult case appears. It will be strengthened by applying the same rules consistently, preserving the provenance behind its conclusions, distinguishing memory from proof without devaluing either, and leaving a clear trail for the people who inherit the work.

Preserve the record. Show the evidence. Leave the archive stronger than we found it.