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# Season 2 Episode 3 Changes Ahead: Intellectual Property Rights and the Future of the *Guidelines* —Transcript—

[“Skip to My Lou” by Neal Caine Trio plays.]

# Sponsorship

[00:00:00] **Bridget McDougall:** This episode of *Between the Lines with FGI* is brought to you by the American Society for Health Care Engineering: Optimizing health care facilities.

[Music ends.]

# Opening

[00:00:00] **Heather Livingston:** While it means that FGI is undergoing a lot of change at present, we still believe that the ultimate outcome is going to be improved health care facilities. There are exciting things that come with changing how we do things. It allows us to reinvent ourselves, and hopefully in this case, also make information more readily available, which ultimately will improve the safety of *all* of the people who occupy health care spaces.

[“Skip to My Lou” by Neal Caine Trio plays.]

# Intro

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Welcome to *Between the Lines with FGI*, a podcast brought to you by the Facility Guidelines Institute. In this podcast series, we invite you to listen in on casual conversations related to health and residential care design and construction. Coming to you from Washington State, home to the longest continual lava tube in the continental U.S., shout out to the Ape Cave in Cougar, Washington, is FGI’s very own John Williams, vice president of content and outreach and chair of the 2026 Health Guidelines Revision Committee. Think there’d be any cougars or apes in those caves, John, in the Ape Cave, in Cougar, Washington?

[00:00:00] **John Williams:** Absolutely. Cougars, probably, maybe, anyway. It’s, you know, it’s actually right below Mount St. Helens, out in the woods.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Really?

[00:00:00] **John:** Mm-hmm.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Have you been?

[00:00:00] **John:** Beautiful place. I have not been yet.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Be careful. There’s [sic] cougars in there.

[Sound of cougar growling.]

[00:00:00] **John:** And coming to you direct from St. Louis, Missouri, is Bridget McDougall, associate editor of FGI. Speaking of caves, Bridget, Missouri has been called the “Cave State” because of approximately 7,500 caves in the state. Wow.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** No seriously. That’s a lot of caves, and in one of them, or at least one of them, Jesse James and his gang hid out.

[00:00:00] **John:** Wow.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Back in the day.

[00:00:00] **John:** Alright, so what if we do some exploring, not of a cave, but of FGI.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Ooh, yeah, I see what you did there, I approve. Let’s do it.

[00:00:00] **John:** Alright! So, yeah, this promises to be a great episode. We’ve invited Heather Livingston, CEO of the Facility Guidelines Institute, to join us today to talk about some changes ahead, intellectual property changes and property rights, and really the future of the *Guidelines*.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** It’s a really timely topic because we’ve got some changes coming up as to how and where the next edition of the *Guidelines* will appear, and even a change to the name of the document itself. We’ve got a lot of ground to cover, so we’d like to jump right in.

[00:00:00] **John:** Let’s get ready to read between the lines with FGI. Ready to go?

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Absolutely!

[Music fades.]

# Guest Welcome

[00:00:00] **John Williams:** Welcome to Heather Livingston, CEO of FGI and our fearless leader. Thanks so much for being on today.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Welcome, Heather.

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Thanks, John and Bridget. I appreciate you guys having me on.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** So, as you know, Heather, everyone who’s been involved with *Guidelines* development has that origin story of coming to get to know the *Guidelines* and getting involved with it. What is your origin story?

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Yeah, I became aware of the document actually back in 1997. I had just moved to the DC area and was working at AIA national’s bookstore. They had just formed a partnership with Rizzoli Books, whom I had been working for in Williamsburg, and they opened up the AIA Rizzoli Bookstore. I became aware of this rather ugly yellow book, honestly. It was not a very pretty book, but very thin, and for some reason everybody was super interested in this. Now, if you don’t know anything about Rizzoli Bookstore, they are also a publisher of art and architecture books, and so they’re known for very pretty coffee table books, and so, coming from that, I’m looking at all these gorgeous monographs wondering, “Why does everybody want this ugly little book?” So [I] dug into it and just found it really fascinating.

I worked for AIA for a couple of years and then worked freelance for about, I don’t know, five, six, seven years or so, and then Pamela Blumgart, former editor of the *Guidelines*, reached out to me in I guess it would have been 2010, and asked if I would be interested in working on the *Guidelines*. I asked her, you know, why she reached out to me, and she said, “Well, you know, I remember you at the bookstore, and I see that you’ve been doing some freelance, and you’ve got a good background in architecture and design,” and [laughs] she said quite frankly, “I’d like to retire someday.” [Laughs.] So she was looking for some people to come on board, and I absolutely leapt at it because I, too, found that ugly little yellow book thoroughly fascinating and wanted to contribute to it, and I’m so glad that I have because it’s truly been my life’s greatest work. I’ve really enjoyed every cycle on it and have tremendous respect for the Health Guidelines Revision Committee and what they try to do with this minimum standard document.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Heather, that’s high praise if Pamela Blumgart sniffed you out as a protégé. [Laughs.] You’ve got a great story about her, too, coming into the bookstore, I remember.

[00:00:00] **Heather:** [Laughs.] Yeah, that’s actually my first memory of Pamela. She came in and gave me a little bit of a dressing down because we had all of these pretty design books. She was OK with that, but then, you know, we started bringing in, like, some children’s books and some world music CDs and other things, and then just like straight landscaping, not landscape architecture books, and so she came in, and she just gave me the riot act, you know, “Why are you carrying these books in here? This is totally inappropriate!” And that’s my first recollection of Pamela. [Laughs.] She is very passionate. Just a lovely person.

[Slow, gentle, guitar music begins]

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Oh, man**,** I couldn’t agree more. And as many of you know, our dear Pamela passed just this past August, and we sure do miss her every day. If you go to the “News & Updates” page of our website, you’ll find a press release from August 21 in which we share some of Pamela’s history with FGI and her lasting impact on this work. We miss you, Pamela.

[Music fades]

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** We’ve touched on some of this in previous podcast episodes, but Heather, could you give folks a quick review of how long the *Guidelines* have been around and what the Health Guidelines Revision Committee is all about?

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Yeah, the *Guidelines*, they’ve actually been around for 77 years, coming up on 80 here, before too long. And it didn’t start off as volunteer-led organization, it started off as a government document from the Hill-Burton era. It was created in 1947, but it became fully volunteer-led really in 1984 when the federal government sunsetted its requirements for minimum standards for construction, renovation, and equipment of hospitals and medical facilities. And then when the grant program and the loan program that was behind the Hill-Burton Act expired, there was no need for the government to continue revising these documents, and that’s when it became retitled “*Guidelines*” and really became driven by other organizations outside the federal government and the Health Guidelines Revision Committee became what it is now.

It’s made completely of volunteers of architects, engineers, facility managers, owners, clinical folks, so infection preventionists, doctors, nurses, as well as state and some federal authorities having jurisdiction, and researchers as well. Evidence-based design is very important for us. It’s not always achievable, of course. You can’t have evidence for everything, but the HGRC recognizes the importance of it, and so they try to bring some researchers on in order to make sure that where possible we have evidence behind what the requirements are in the *Guidelines*.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** I’ve said this before, I’ll say it a million times again: I’ve never seen a more passionate and committed group of people than the people that are involved in revising these codes, and that’s members of our HCRC and then members of the public that get involved during the proposal and comment periods. It’s clear that what everybody’s thinking about, bottom line, is patient safety.

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Absolutely. That’s always the first priority, and they never lose sight of that.

[3-bass note musical interlude]

[00:00:00] **John:** Heather, how has this effort been accomplished over those couple of years? I know we started with the federal government who funded a lot of this work, but really how has that been sustained over the past couple of decades?

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Mainly through our partnerships. When we first separated from the federal government, we had some support from the Department of Health and Human Services, and that lasted for a little while, but we also partnered with the American Institute of Architects, and what was then known at the time as the Committee on Architecture for Health, it’s now the Academy of Architecture for Health, but it’s a knowledge community of AIA. And so, they took over publishing the *Guidelines* documents for, I think it was probably four cycles or so. After that the American Society for Health Care Engineering partnered with us and the HGRC to publish it.

The Facility Guidelines [Institute] itself was created in 1998, but we didn’t become our own publisher of the documents until the 2018 edition. We always had a publishing partner, either ASHE or AIA, in between when the federal government quit updating it and when FGI took over as the stand-alone publisher.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** You mentioned that FGI itself was created in 1998, and really, we have Doug Erickson among others, Armund Burgun and Joe Sprague, to thank for that. Heather, tell us a little bit about what it’s been like for you stepping into Doug’s role as CEO of FGI after his retirement last year and after years of you as managing editor of the *Guidelines*.

[00:00:00] **Heather:** It’s certainly very different now. Doug and I worked very closely together for a very long time, and he was a great champion as well as a great mentor. He’s, incredibly knowledgeable, I mean, just encyclopedic knowledge of standards, uh, NFPA, ICC, as well as the *Guidelines*, so stepping into his shoes certainly been, uh, you know, it’s been a big role to fill, um, but, when I became CEO, John also stepped in as vice president of content and outreach. My role is more focused on leading FGI as an organization and helping it grow, and John brings that content and, uh, background that Doug had. So, uh, I guess it takes two people to create one Doug. [Laughs.]

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** That’s a fair, fair assessment. What do you think are some misconceptions about FGI and about the *Guidelines* that you can address? For example, one thing that I’ve heard is that “Well, the *Guidelines* just keeps getting bigger and bigger and bigger and adding more requirements.” We went from one document early on to now we’ve got three; one for hospitals, one for outpatient, one for residential, so what would you say to that?

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Right. Yeah, you know, the documents do get bigger. There’s, there’s no doubt about that. And yes, clearly, they’ve gone from one to three, but that has been actually driven by the community and their desire to make clearer requirements for the different facility types. They’re bigger also because over time we’ve added a lot of appendix information, and that information, as you know, is not enforceable, but it does provide an awful lot of information on how to use the *Guidelines*. So, I would say that that is why those things have happened because it’s been requested, you know, there are always new facility types, there are new room types, there are new technologies that are evolving, and in order for us to be able to keep pace with that, changes have to be made.

[3-bass note musical interlude]

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** FGI put out a press release recently talking about the 2026 edition and some of the changes to come and one of the things that was mentioned was about the appendix language and what’s going to be happening with that in the future. Would you like to speak about that?

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Yeah, it’s a big change, actually. For the 2026 edition, we have two really big things to announce. One is that the title is going to change. It’s no longer going to be the *Guidelines* documents, we’re now calling them the *FGI Facility Codes* for hospitals, outpatient settings, and residential health and support settings, and that’s being changed in recognition of the fact that these really are minimum standards. They’re not guidance documents. They’re not just, “should do,” they’re minimum standards, so the title is changing to reflect that. The other change that you brought about with the appendix is also a recognition of the fact that these are minimum, and we don’t want people to be confused about what needs to be applied. We get a number of questions, as you know, Bridget, because we have to answer a lot of the queries and requests for interpretations that come in, we get a lot of questions about things that are in the appendix even though we’ve tried to state very clearly up in the front matter of the book that the appendix is not meant to be enforceable, it still does get enforced. So, we are removing that from the minimum standard for the 2026 edition so that it will just be the code, nothing but the code.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** OK, so before everyone drops on the floor, right? [Laughs.] Because the whole idea about the *Guidelines* and all the guidance that’s in there and why the documents have gotten so big, as you mentioned, because of all of the guidance that’s in as appendix, where’s that going to go? Maybe John, do you want to address that? Because I know that you’re involved in that right now.

[00:00:00] **John:** Yeah, it’s that classic split between the mandatory requirements, the “shalls” in the book, and the nonmandatory requirements, the guidance that exists, and that’s the “you should do this,” or “you should think about doing it this way.” So that’s, that’s a classic split that you see in code documents, whether you’re talking about NFPA, ICC, and certainly the *Guidelines* now. We want to make that split incredibly clear. Since they’re both in the same document now, we’re moving that appendix away like Heather said, and we’re moving it to another location. It isn’t going very far away. It’s going to be published in a different format. It will be an online format, and this will make up what, for the moment, we’re calling our handbook.

There will be a handbook for each of the three documents that we publish, and that handbook is going to have explanatory information like we’re used to in the appendix, but it’s also going to layer on some other types of information: sketches, drawings, maybe photos, narrative about how you would implement this or how you would have a conversation with a client about working through some of these concepts, and that’s really meant to draw not only that sharp distinction but be able to make the appendix better.

We’ve always pushed information into the appendix and editors like Pamela have sort of put a governing kind of lid on that appendix because we didn’t want to put too much into it. If we split it off into a handbook, we can make the handbook be really what it’s always wanted to be; a really rich and deep set of guidance material that is not only narrative, it includes all of the graphic elements that I think we’re really craving.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** My God, be free, appendix!

[00:00:00] **John:** Right.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Go to your pasture where you can, you can run free!

[00:00:00] **Heather:** We’re also going to be adding some tools that are meant to make using the *Guidelines* easier. Those are in development, and I don’t want to get too deeply into them right now, but we do have some tools that are planned to accompany it, just like you said, to make it all much more friendly and accessible and, and to really address things we’ve never had an opportunity to do before because of that editorial lid, you know, don’t put too much in, don’t go too far. We can now be a little bit more explanatory, and hopefully, that’s going to be for the betterment of everybody.

[3-bass note musical interlude]

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** I’d like for folks to understand a little bit more about who creates these codes, and then what are the, kind of the financial implications for the company. I think it’s important to realize it is that consensus-based process. This is not a get-rich proposition for FGI. [Laughs.]

[00:00:00] **John:** Right.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** This is not why it was formed or why we’re in it.

[00:00:00] **John:** So, the code development process is one that’s rooted in a lot of history. I think in the forties and the fifties when we started building a lot of health care facilities, we had some pretty spectacular examples of, uh, how not to build them. There were some injuries, a lot of fatalities, in the way that we were putting things together back then, and a lot of them were around how we were dealing with health and safety, fire safety, and the federal government recognized and realized if we’re going to invest this much money in this process, we need some reasonable assurance of safety, health and safety, as we’re building all of these new buildings, and that’s the bedrock of why these documents get put together.

It is a multidisciplinary consensus-based process where you have the experts in the field coming together and saying, “These are things that we believe need to be minimum standards for moving forward with this type of building.” And as the federal government published those for decades and decades. I think states, the design community, the engineering community looked at those as the core, sort of that safe harbor for understanding what due diligence looked like and where the industry was.

When the federal government stopped publishing these documents in the 80s, there was a lot of concern about where is going to be that common touch point, that common understanding of what a minimum standard was, and that’s why many people like Doug Erickson and Armand Burgun and Joe Sprague and many other folks, retrieved those from the federal government and said, “This is important. We need to continue to have this conversation as a community and continue to develop a common understanding of what minimum safety standards look like for health care facilities” because health care is evolving, the facilities are evolving, all the different building mechanisms are evolving, so it can’t just die on the vine, it needs to continue to grow, and you know, those set of volunteers continued to do that for decades and decades and that’s really kind of created a utopian world of developing standards where it’s really volunteer-led and industry-led.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** What’s the harm of having each state create their own standards?

[00:00:00] **John:** Well, it creates this complicated scenario if you work in multiple states, many architects work in multiple states, you have varying sets of rules that you have to comply with, and that gets really complicated. I remember when I was working in 28 states I had 28 different books of different approaches, different standards, different changes, and when you switch from state to state, it became very complicated to follow the unique rules of each state.

One of the things that I think the design community, as well as the regulatory community, really appreciates is having kind of a common understanding of a level playing field. If you design a facility in one state, you know, you move a couple of miles across the facility line, you should not have to design a completely different-looking facility because the standards are different. There are unique geographical differences from state to state, like Washington has a lot of volcanoes and tsunamis, and Kansas has tornadoes, so there’s [sic] unique risks and threats to buildings in different locations, but generally, the approach should be similar.

[00:00:00] **Heather:** And perhaps years ago, it might not have been as important because you had smaller firms and smaller health care organizations, but now with the consolidation that we have, it’s not uncommon for both design firms and for the health care organization to stretch across multiple states. There’s always going to be a little bit of variation, like John said, among the states, but primarily, it’s going to be the same from state to state, and that just makes the process much more transparent and easier and, honestly, a lot less expensive for the states because they don’t have to foot the bill of creating and updating standards. The reality is they wouldn’t be updated very often if states had to assume the cost of doing it.

[00:00:00] **John:** Exactly. If a state were to do this, it would be unique to that state, they would have to assemble their own set of experts who may be very local, and then, put together a set of standards, and then open public meetings, and if you can imagine running through, similar to a HGRC committee process, 50 times across the country instead of just once, the level of effort is exponential.

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Well, and John, as a longtime HGRC member, you also know that thousands of volunteer hours go into every single edition. Imagine multiplying that by 50.

[00:00:00] **John:** Exactly.

[00:00:00] **Heather:** It just wouldn’t be done.

[3-bass note musical interlude]

[00:00:00] **John:** When we talk about it, we’re really describing this classic community-supported standards-making process in a truly utopian world. But that’s not truly the case anymore due to some recent developments related to intellectual property. Can you tell us more about that and how that’s driving some of the changes related to what we do?

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Yeah, well, first, let me let me be clear that we’re not getting rid of our classic community-supported standards process. That will remain the same. But, yes, the changes that people are seeing in the draft of the 2026 *FGI Facility Code* are due to some developments in intellectual property, as you said. Primarily, we’re seeing an issue in the courts where intellectual property rights of standards development organizations are no longer being enforced. There are some organizations out there that are taking content of the standards development organizations and they’re using it to basically upsell their own products in a lot of cases.

For a long time, we have been able to rely on the copyright of our documents to protect the work of the Health Guidelines Revision Committee. As I mentioned before, thousands of volunteer hours go into creating every single edition of the three books. We’ve always tried to be incredibly fair in the pricing of our documents and we’ve maybe, maybe to a fault focused on being the best public stewards that we could and focusing on one thing, we haven’t gone out and created a ton of education, we don’t have a membership program, we’ve really focused on creating the best health care standards that we could. Unfortunately, that is changing now, and maybe it’s going to eventually be for the best of FGI. With every challenge comes an opportunity, and so we’re looking at this as an opportunity. But what’s happening is that because of the proliferation of codes that are being put on other sites without licensing agreements with standards development organizations, we’ve become very concerned that we cannot assure the accuracy of the content on these other sites. And so that is actually the primary reason why when we release the 2026 *FGI Facility Codes*, we will have a free version.

That doesn’t mean that all versions are going to be free, but it’s not going to be the limited use, read-only version that people have come to expect over the years. It is so important that architects and owners and everybody who needs these documents has access to the code, and that they know that they’re getting complete and accurate information, that we have decided, the FGI Board of Directors and fully supported by the HGRC, have decided that it’s time to make the code free.

You can still buy a paperback version of the code because some people really like the feel of having a book. It’s just what we’re comfortable with and then there’s a licensed version with some added tools. And then, as John mentioned earlier, we’re going to have a handbook and that’s where the new appendix and all these other tools are going to live. So there’s still going to be tiers just like you’re used to, but if all you need is a basic code, it will now be free.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** And that’s beginning with the 2026 edition [of the *FGI Facility Code* documents], correct?

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Yes, that’s beginning with the 2026 edition. It’s not going to be backwards looking, so, you know, 2018 edition [of the *Guidelines*], the 2022 edition [of the *Guidelines*], we’re not changing the way those have been packaged and sold. It’s just from this point forward.

[00:00:00] **John:** It gets to an interesting question about who owns the law and who owns those technical documents that are associated with law? I mean, it’s impossible to own math or to own science. Those are fuzzy concepts, right? But you take the concepts in there, the science and the math behind why we put a building together, and then you start to interpret it and create technical standards and things like that, there’s costs associated with that. And Heather, you mentioned the tens of thousands of hours that the committee puts into doing this. There’s [sic] also tens of thousands of staff hours that are engaged in, putting these documents together, laying them out, creating a, either a paperback or a web portal and all the maintenance that goes along with that. So, who pays for that development of the technical interpretations and standards associated with those foundational concepts? It’s a fascinating question, and I don’t think we’ve heard the last of it. I think the courts are still going through and trying to determine who pays for these standards that we all get the public health and safety benefit from?

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Right. No, you’re not wrong about that, John. I mean, the standards development organizations assume the cost of developing those with the expectation that they will be able to recoup those costs through sales. This new paradigm really threatens all of that.

[00:00:00] **John:** You know, it potentially sets up a scenario where states will go back to developing their own individual standards, and that threatens that concept of a unified code that gives you the predictability of knowing what to expect from an AHJ and what to expect, you know, from working in several states. Not only that, it confuses this concept of the safe harbor of knowing that generally your peers who work in the same industry would agree with the design that you’ve put together. It becomes a much more confusing patchwork of information.

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Well, there’s no doubt that because of the court cases that have been going through, FGI and probably other organizations, like NFPA and ICC, although I can’t speak for them, but I imagine that they, like we, are rethinking how they’re going to recoup the cost of development because we all believe very much, as well as our committee, in the importance of what we do for the reasons that you just stated.

One thing that we have discovered as we’ve gone through this process, as we’ve learned more and more about who owns the law, and we really do see value in making it freely available to others because everybody needs to understand what the law is, we do agree with that, but there are still are development costs, and that is not a fact that we can afford to ignore. There’s a piece of legislation that’s before Congress now that actually would protect the copyrights of standard development organizations. It would still allow for this free access. That is one of the stipulations of what’s been called the Pro Codes Act, is that standards development organizations would be able to protect their copyright as long as they do provide a version that is freely available to the public.

There’s a nonprofit called the Electronic Frontier Foundation, and there are others actually lobbying against standards development organizations’ ability to protect their copyrights; they’re trying to shoot down the Pro Codes Act, and it’s really because of a false narrative. They’re making claims that the Pro Codes Act would mean that the read-only version is what would continue to be available, that it would be very limited, but the courts have routinely said that no, that’s not good enough. That’s why some of these organizations have been able to take the content of standards development organizations and put it on their sites because they didn’t believe that the very limited read-only access was sufficient. The Pro Codes Act would enshrine that right, but because it would protect the copyright protections of standards development organizations, they don’t want to see it go through. We very much want to see it go through because it does assure that only organizations that have a licensing agreement are able to put our content on their site.

What that means is that then, you know, that if an organization has FGI codes on its site, then FGI was part of that process, and you know that they’re accurate. Right now, only products that are available directly through FGI itself are endorsed by FGI, so if you find our codes elsewhere, we cannot say with any amount of certainty that they’re accurate or that they’re complete, that they have a[n] errata updated in there, for example, so it’s kind of a buyer beware situation. But with the Pro Codes Act, that would assure that there’s a licensing agreement in place and that the codes are correct and complete.

[00:00:00] **John:** So, it sounds like we’re in favor of good, transparent, open access to the data that people need to make good decisions around how to put buildings together, and at the same time, we believe that we need to continue to develop these standards and keep them updated and fresh with how health care is changing and how building technology is changing and that takes resources too, so we’re trying to find that sweet spot, that balance point, that lets us do both; have that good and transparent access while supporting continuation of the development process.

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Absolutely, and I would say that FGI has always believed that it would be beneficial to be able to provide the content of our codes for free, but you have to recoup your costs so that you can keep the thing going, right? We’ve always said that sales of the *Guidelines* fund the next edition, and that’s absolutely been true. So we’ve turned our model on its head by creating a handbook and putting out a free version, and we hope that we’re successful. We believe that this needs to continue for a very long time to assure that people have safe health care spaces at hospitals, outpatient facilities, residential care facilities. All of that is assured by continuation of revision of the codes to keep up with technology and practice and adoption.

[3-bass note musical interlude]

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** What can people do to learn more about the Pro Codes Act?

[00:00:00] **Heather:** If you’re interested in learning more about the Pro Codes Act, you can find lots of information online, both for and against, but we recommend that you get curious about it, and then if you’re in support of it, reach out to your elected officials because there are a lot of folks who are trying to make it go away, but in order for standards development organizations to be able to provide this content in an ongoing basis and for you to have free access to it, it really does need to go through.

[00:00:00] **John:** I think another thing to be curious about, too, is the impact of intellectual property challenges in all sorts of creative endeavors or technological endeavors, whether that be a . . . a painting, a book, a narrative, a technical document, an architectural design, an engineered design, get further curious about how that can be protected.

There is kind of a corollary between where we are now and the advent of the internet where streaming platforms were available so you could get copyright-protected music or videos or books and while the technology outpaced the laws of the land at that point, laws eventually caught up with that.

[00:00:00] **Heather:** The laws eventually caught up, and we have every expectation that that’s going to be the case with the intellectual property challenges that are going through, you know, largely because of AI technologies right now.

[“Skip to My Lou” by Neal Caine Trio plays.]

[00:00:00] **John:** All of this is for the public good whether it’s design of a hospital, a residential care facility, a piece of art, or a piece of narrative prose that inspires people, it’s all about bettering society, and you know, who contributes to developing those things that benefit us all.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Well, thanks, Heather, so much, for joining us today.

[00:00:00] **Heather:** Thanks, Bridget. Thanks, John. It was a great conversation. I really enjoyed talking with both of you, and [I] appreciate the opportunity to talk about some of the exciting changes that are going on at FGI.

[Music continues.]

# Outro

[00:00:00] **John:** Thanks for joining us for another episode of Between the Lines with FGI. Do you have an idea for an episode or a question that maybe you'd like us to explore? You can get in touch with us by sending us an email at podcast@fgiguidelines.org.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** And if you’re interested in sponsoring one or a series of episodes, you can also contact us at that same address; podcast@fgiguidelines.org.

[00:00:00] **John:** And we'll give you a shout out at the beginning and mention you on our social media.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Yes, we will.

[00:00:00] **John:** Again, many thanks to Neal Caine and the Neal Caine trio for the use of his song “Skip to My Lou” from the album of the same name.

[long pause]

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Oh my God. Sorry, there! Where’d I go? [Laughs.] You threw me the baton and I was like—*Clink!*—just dropped on the floor.

[00:00:00] **John:** There you go!

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** I’m sorry. I was thinking about being in caves, actually, and listening, uh how great the acoustics would be, listening to that album in a cave. That’s what I was doing.

[00:00:00] **John:** Wouldn’t it be amazing?

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** It would be incredible. Incredible!

[00:00:00] **John:** You know, it’d be like, you know, uh, listen to a pin drop in a cave and then the whole Neal Caine trio coming in. I wonder if the Neal Caine trio would ever do a concert in a cave.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** There is a cave concert venue. Andrew Bird just did a show there.

[00:00:00] **John:** No way.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Yeah.Do you think bats like jazz?

[00:00:00] **John:** Of all the animals, bats are the jazziest, for sure.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** I agree. I agree. Because you know why? They sure can swing. Cause they’re upside down, swinging.

[00:00:00] **John:** Oh, they swing.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** Yeah.

[00:00:00] **John:** OK. Yeah.

[00:00:00] **Bridget:** No? Too far-fetched?

[00:00:00] **John:** No. No. If I have to ask why... [Laughs.]

[Music fades.]