

OPERATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT ON INTERNET USE POLICY
TO FULL BOARD OF GREENVILLE COUNTY LIBRARY

(Adopted by Operations Committee July 17, 2000)

(Adopted by Full Board July 17, 2000)

I. INTRODUCTION

During the past year, problems related to the Greenville County Library's Internet Use Policy have become apparent. Due to questions about those problems and the Board's full understanding of those problems, the Operations Committee requested the opportunity to review the current Internet Use Policy and look into the problems that have arisen under that policy. As part of its review, the Committee looked into incidents related to the Internet. The Committee interviewed Staff and patrons. The purpose for the Committee's review was to determine whether changes need to be made and, if so, what changes need to be made.

It is clear that dramatic changes to the Internet Use Policy need to be made. It is also clear that the Code of Conduct must be vigorously enforced and the Policy for Disruptive and Unattended Children must be reevaluated and vigorously enforced. Finally, it is clear that the Board must accept responsibility for a multitude of problems related to the Internet and must do everything within its power to earn the trust and support of the

community, which has been eroded in part because of problems related to the Internet.

II. CURRENT INTERNET USE POLICY: APPLICATION AND EVOLUTION

A. FROM INCEPTION TO JANUARY 2000

The current Internet Use Policy was approved by the Board of Trustees on June 22, 1998. Under that policy, patrons have faced few limitations. For example, the policy does not provide time limits or limits based on age. Although one provision provided that users could not “display obscene materials, child pornography, and/or other materials prohibited under applicable local, state, and federal laws”, that provision was not enforced for approximately one and one-half (1 1/2) years. That lack of enforcement was the result of instructions by former Executive Director, Phil Ritter, who is no longer at the Greenville County Library. Staff stated that they were told by the Executive Director not to interfere regardless of what patrons were displaying on their computer ¹screens. branch manager states that “Staff members were told by the Director to say nothing to a patron regardless of what we saw.... The system-wide

¹The Executive Director’s instructions were consistent with the American Library Association’s position on Internet use in public libraries.

procedure was to ignore whatever was on the computer [screen]." Another branch manager states that the Executive Director on at least two (2) occasions said: "We will not interfere with what people view." One Staff understands the policy was "not to interfere unless another patron complained about what was being displayed on a computer screen."

The "non-interference" policy, especially when combined with a lack of time limits and genuine support by the administration, resulted in an offensive and frustrating atmosphere for Staff and patrons. Some Internet patrons were rude and vulgar and boisterous, and Staff contend the administration provided little support or direction in dealing with these problem patrons. The Board knew nothing about the problems until December 1999. On December 19, 1999 and December 21, 1999, the Herald-Journal published unflattering articles about the atmosphere in Greenville County Library's Main building (hereinafter "Main"). The Executive Director denied the truth of the articles. Staff state that the Executive Director was less than forthright and that the Herald-Journal articles were entirely truthful. The articles should be reviewed and deemed reliable.

B. FROM JANUARY 2000 TO PRESENT

As a result of the Herald-Journal articles, the Board held a special meeting in January 2000. At that meeting, reports of Internet-related

incidents were provided to Board members, who were surprised at the seriousness of the incidents. From that point forward, the administration was asked to report Internet-related incidents to the Board. The Executive Director was subsequently separated from his employment for a variety of reasons, the majority of which had nothing to do with Internet-related problems.

In February 2000, the administration began implementing a "tap on the shoulder" policy, pursuant to which Staff members were told they could interrupt patrons and encourage them to move from "inappropriate" sites. Also, "privacy" desks were installed around the majority of Internet-accessible computers in Main. These measures continue to be in effect. Even with these measures, the current Internet Use Policy is a failure for a variety of reasons.

III. PROBLEMS WITH APPLICATION OF CURRENT POLICY

A. Pornography and/or obscenity

The percentage of Internet use directed toward pornography and/or obscenity is somewhat difficult to determine. On November 23, 1999, a patron reported: "A large number, perhaps fifty percent (50%), of the users on one afternoon were young men going to pornography sites." The December 19, 1999 Herald-Journal article reported: "Five of the Library's

nine Internet-accessible computers were being used to access pornographic web sites or sexually-oriented chat rooms from 11:00 a.m. to noon Thursday." One Staff estimates that twenty to twenty-five (20-25%) percent of patrons are using the Internet to access pornography and/or obscenity. On June 27, 2000, a history was randomly taken from Computer 24 in Main, and the history revealed that at least twenty (20%) percent of the sites visited were pornographic or obscene.² Regardless of the exact percentage, it is apparent that library equipment is being misused.

Displays of pornographic and/or obscene materials on computer screens is a problem far greater than previously realized. Beginning in February 2000, the Board began receiving verbal reports on the number of documented incidents wherein patrons were asked to move from "inappropriate" sites. In late May and early June 2000, Board members received actual incident reports and Internet log entries which documented some of these incidents. These materials, as well as Staff and patron interviews, reveal that the euphemism "inappropriate" fails to adequately convey the seriousness of the incidents that have occurred.

²The actual percentage of pornographic and/or obscene sites visited is likely higher. When pornographic and/or obscene sites are accessed via a search engine, no history is recorded.

Without specific reference to incident reports or Internet log entries, Staff indicate that they have seen the following material displayed on computer screens in Main:

- n Live video of people engaging in sex both heterosexual and homosexual.
- n Live video of people engaging in sex with animals, including a "girl dressed in leather with a strapped on [plastic penis] having sex with a dog" and "a man having sex with a chicken."
- n Live video of a woman spreading peanut butter on her vaginal area and a dog licking it off.
- n Live video of men having oral sex with boys.
- n Threesomes.
- n Live video of a male ejaculating into the face of a woman.
- n Prepubescent naked girls.
- n People urinating on each other
- n Live video of naked women masturbating.
- n Live video of naked men masturbating.
- n Still shots of naked women and men and the subjects identified above.

Within the last nine (9) months, more than 100 incidents have been documented in which patrons have viewed/displayed pornographic and/or

obscene material. According to Staff, the incident reports and Internet log entries describe merely a fraction of the incidents that have occurred. There are several reasons for that. First, the Internet log was not maintained until mid to late February 2000. Second, Staff cannot possibly identify every instance in which a patron displays pornographic and/or obscene material. Staff have other responsibilities that divert their attention from the Internet area. When Staff suspect that an incident is occurring and approach patrons, the patrons often "click" to different web sites. Third, some Staff simply are not willing in the first instance to "confront" patrons who are viewing pornographic or obscene material. One Staff estimates that less than half of Staff are willing to confront patrons for reasons ranging from feelings of intimidation to indifference. Fourth, some Staff state that they did not bother to write down a number of incidents because doing so seemed like an utter waste of time. Such a reaction is understandable, in light of the fact that the reports seem to have been made for the purpose of counting the number of incidents. Actual incident reports were not made available to the Board nor the existence of the Internet log known to the Board until late May 2000 and early June 2000. Staff had no reason to believe that documenting incidents would lead to any action. Fifth, once the "tap on the shoulder" policy was implemented in early

2000, Staff were told to write explicit descriptions of what they observed on computer screens. One Staff states that she did not care to write these explicit descriptions.

Though incomplete, the incident reports and Internet log entries document the seriousness of the problem with pornography and/or obscenity at the Library³. The problems with pornography and/or obscenity are addressed in the following broad categories, and excerpts from incident reports and Internet log entries are provided as examples of the problems. It is important to remember that examples are provided from only a portion of the incident reports and Internet log entries.

1. Patrons are inadvertently exposing other patrons, including children, to pornography and/or obscenity.

- A. While patrons are viewing pornography and/or obscenity

Examples:

- November 23, 1999–A patron wrote: “I am highly offended that open pornography is allowed to be viewed by

³The problem with pornography and/or obscenity in public libraries is clearly not limited to the Greenville County Library system. See “Dangerous Access, 2000 Edition: Uncovering Internet Pornography in America’s Libraries” by David Burt and available at <<http://www.frc.org>>.

minors—let alone anyone—in our public library. A number, perhaps fifty (50%) percent, of the users on one afternoon were young men going to pornography sites. What has this Library become? A “virtual brothel?” The patron who reported this incident was interviewed. He was an adult male. According to the patron, several minors were viewing pornography, and their screens were in open view of anyone who was within the area. He stated that he “grieved for little children walking around there.” The patron described the atmosphere as “negative” and a “sexually deviant atmosphere.” He further described the atmosphere as “repulsive.”

- December 1999—A patron wrote: “Please, please, please cut out the porno watchers on the Internet! My kids saw it! He was scary! Thanks!”
- The December 19, 1999 *Herald-Journal* article began: “The man at Computer Number 5 typed explicit instructions to the naked woman on his computer screen. Though her words were audible only through the man’s headphones, her physical response was visible to patrons of the Reference section....”
- February 26, 2000—“[Patron] said daughter between two guys looking at “something they should not have...” Patron who reported this incident was interviewed. She was an adult female. According to the patron, her ninth grade daughter was working on a poetry project at Main. The patron came to check on her daughter and was very disturbed by what she found. The ninth grade girl was the only female in the whole row. Adult male patrons were on either side of her. Both adult male patrons were viewing pornography. One of the adult males had an erection. The patron was extremely upset. The patron was agitated even when recalling the situation. She described the Internet area as an “unsafe environment” and a “primarily

male environment." She further described the environment as "degrading."

- March 30, 2000—"Minor patron complained that a person at Number 15 was looking at pornography..."
- April 1, 2000—"I saw [patron] looking at a site showing exposed breasts and genital areas of females. He was seated next to a young lady..."
- April 6, 2000—"Patron called to complain that he and his daughter were researching on Computer 22, and the patron on the computer to their left was looking at pornography. His twelve-year-old daughter viewed this and waited until they were in the car to inform him..."
- May 10, 2000—"Number 1...white male...mid-late twenties...multiple naked lady sites open—asked to move on to another site (young teen boy next to him [looking] over his shoulder). Said clicked on by accident—however 20-30 windows were open." Staff checked what sites the adult male had been viewing, and they were: "Wetcircle.com, Free Animal Sex TV, Animal Fever, Hotel Fetish, Just Beastiality, Free Beast, Sexy Pets, Beast Links, etc. One site was showing a woman and a man engaging in oral sex—very explicit."
- May 24, 2000—" [Patron] was looking at woman performing [oral sex]. There were young boys in the area—maybe nine or ten years old..."

B. After patrons have viewed pornography

and/or obscenity and have left their terminals

Examples:

- March 1, 2000–“Patron signed to use—at least thirty (30) windows up in browser left open to porn sites (naked women–body parts)...”
- March 28, 2000–“[Patron]...left open a page full of links to porn sites, e.g., “Ashley’s Naked Pics”, “Dutch P*****, Revealing Hardcore Sluts”, “Blow*** Battle of the Day.”
- April 10, 2000–“A little boy [patron] (eight years old) asked to use Computer 7. He came back over to the desk and told me that when he tried to close out the window that was open, a “Playboy picture” came up on the screen. I asked him to stay at the desk and I went to go over to close it out. There were many layers of web sites containing many pics of nude women...”
- April 15, 2000–“Computer No. 2 was left with “Cu**TV” and “Nastiest Site on the Web...”
- April 15, 2000–“A female patron came up to me and stated that a male patron who had been on Computer 7 prior to her had been viewing some inappropriate sites which contained nudity and a lot of teen-age girls nude. She stated that she was rather embarrassed trying to close them out because every time she tried to close it a new sex site came up.”
- April 27, 2000–“Patron complained that he was unable to use the computer... he signed up for. When I checked the computer, it was locked on to a site featuring a full-breasted nude female...”
- May 3, 2000–“A very young boy viewing “Beastiality” web site...The Bestiality web site was frozen and the more than twenty (20) Netscape windows which were all open to the Beastiality web site would not close.”

- May 6, 2000–“I took a boy over to use Computer 4 and I had to close out a window that had been left open. Beneath it was a very explicit web site featuring full female nudity.”
- May 7, 2000–“Number 7 system...was left open to porn sites–about 10+ windows open when next person went to use...”
- May 8, 2000–“Number 4...open to multiple porn sites when mother and child sat down.”
- May 16, 2000–“While closing down Computers 1 and 8...there were pornographic advertisements left up featuring nude women.”

2. In some instances, adult patrons have intentionally exposed children to pornography and/or obscenity.

- November 10, 1999–Staff reported that an adult male patron was looking at pornography and “two young boys, about the ages of 10 to 14, sat down next to him. The boys did not log onto their assigned computers but chose to view pornography on Number 3.” The Staff who reported this incident was interviewed. According to Staff, the adult male patron said to the boys, “Check this out, isn’t this cool?” The adult male patron was looking at live sex sites, including Threesomes, sado-masochism, and corpses of sexually assaulted and mutilated women. The two boys viewed these sites with the adult male patron for approximately thirty (30) minutes.
- November 30, 1999–Staff reported that an adult male patron grabbed a young boy and forced him to look at his computer screen, upon which was displayed pornographic material. The Staff who reported this incident was interviewed. According to Staff, the adult male patron was about twenty-eight (28) years old. A six or seven-year-old

boy was walking with his sister near the adult male patron, who said "Goodbye" to the adult male patron. The adult male patron grabbed the young boy by the arm and said, "Hey buddy, take a look at this." He pulled the boy over and held him by the arm in front of the screen and forced the little boy to look at the pornography. The little boy immediately turned his head away. Upon being rebuked by the Staff, the adult male patron said, "Ten years from now he'll be begging for it."

- February 24, 2000—An adult male patron was viewing pornographic sites with three thirteen-year-old girls. "I observed this as I walked to the area. I heard [patron] saying "sex with snakes" and observed the word "F***ing" in large red letters on the screen..."
- March 16, 2000—"...I was seating a father and young son nearby and so asked [patron] to move from that [porn] site immediately. He completely disregarded my request and as I walked by he smirked at me."

3. Without regard to whether other patrons are being exposed, some patrons are viewing materials that clearly fit within the scope of federal and state obscenity laws and the "Miller Test".

In *Miller v. California*, 413 U.S. 15, 24-25 (1973), the United States Supreme Court provided "a few plain examples" of material that may be deemed to be obscene. Those examples included "ultimate sexual acts, normal or perverted, actual or simulated,...masturbation, excretory

functions, and lewd exhibition of the genitals." The reports by Staff provided previously, as well as documented incident reports and Internet log entries, support the conclusion that patrons are regularly viewing and displaying material that meets the Miller Test and is covered by federal and state obscenity laws.

Examples:

- February 18, 2000—"I saw [patron] on Computer Number 11 on the screen was a woman...she was inserting a finger into her vagina..."
- March 30, 2000—"...As I walked past [patron] on Computer 14, I observed a woman lying on her back. A man was above her and his penis was in her mouth...."
- May 19, 2000—"...I saw the patron on Computer 18 looking at a site depicting nude males engaged in various sexual acts and masturbation...."

4. Some patrons are viewing child pornography.

Several Staff report seeing adult male patrons access child pornography. One adult male patron so regularly accesses child pornography that he is known by the nickname "The PetSmart guy". He wears his work uniform and hat to the Library. The PetSmart guy comes to the library regularly and views pornography and/or obscenity involving prepubescent females. The situation with the PetSmart guy underscores the fact that the Internet log entries do not adequately document the number of incidents

involving pornography and/or obscenity. Despite the fact that several Staff interviewed knew the PetSmart guy by sight and nickname and concurred that he regularly views child pornography, only a few incidents are documented.

- April 10, 2000–"[Patron] looking at nude pictures of young girls."
- June 13, 2000–"[Patron] on No. 8 looking at teen site which included topless young girls...."

Main has even had a convicted sex offender on the premises. This adult male patron was identified as a "regular" in the December 19, 1999 Herald-Journal article. Staff confirm that the convicted sex offender was a "regular." Apparently, he no longer visits Main.

5. Children are viewing pornography and/or obscenity.

Examples:

- One branch manager reported: "I watched a thirteen-year-old female using the screen name "Sexy P****" type in a line in a chat room asking if anyone would like to have sex with her?"
- April 15, 2000–"A minor [patron] was looking at a pornographic site showing a woman with her hand on her pubic area..."
- April 17, 2000–"[Patron] "14-year-old minor" on Number 24 was observed viewing a site featuring full frontal male nudity and masturbation..."

- May 1, 2000–“[Patron] was on Number 11 looking at web sites featuring nudity and intercourse...([Patron] is a special education student at Greenville Middle School).”
- May 3, 2000– “Very young boy viewing Beastiality web site...The Beastiality web site was frozen and the more than 20 Netscape windows which were all open to the Beastiality web site would not close.”
- May 19, 2000–“Parent flagged me down...her son had been using Computer 1...she said that she walked up on him and that he had been viewing “explicit pornography”...”
- May 28, 2000–“A report of [patron] on Computer 1 looking at obscene material...It was a video of obscene material. [Patron] was surrounded by four male minors looking and watching.”
- June 5, 2000–“Young black female looking at various X-rated sites, e.g. www.f***ingdogs.com, www.sh**.com, www.mommas.com, www.spiceboys.com....”

6. Inappropriate Patron Activity

Examples:

- November 29, 1999–“I saw [patron] sitting at Computer 14. Sitting on both sides of [patron] were two young ladies. The reason why I noticed them was because of the manner that they were sitting and because I thought the girls looked so young. The young lady who was sitting on [patron’s] left side was facing him with her feet on his chair. What did not look appropriate to me was that her legs were open and he was more or less between her legs. The young lady who was sitting on his right side was sitting with her legs facing the computers but the [patron] had his right arm between her legs.”

- One branch manager states that a young man was viewing pornography and later got up from his terminal and kissed a female patron. The young man did not know the female patron. The branch manager also states that a female patron complained that she was being “stalked” in the branch by a young man whom the branch manager states was viewing pornography.
- June 2, 2000–“Patron...complained that patron...was looking at pornography and listening to pornographic sounds...”
- One branch manager states: “We’ve had some grunting and groaning.”

B. No Time Limits

Staff who were interviewed and reports from focus groups reveal that the lack of time limits is a major problem to Staff and to other patrons. “Regulars” who know how to work the system keep the Internet-accessible computers occupied. The lack of time limits encourages patrons who may have nothing else going on in their lives to spend all day on the Internet. The December 19, 1999 Herald-Journal article reported that the “regulars...reappear daily”. The convicted sex offender stated: “I stay here most of the day.”

Enforcing time limits is sometimes a problem for Staff. Some of the patrons who use the Internet have been compared to “junkies”. Those

patrons are difficult when politely asked to limit their time or leave at the end of the day. A software solution to enforcing time limits would be helpful and appreciated by Staff.

C. Chat Rooms

Virtually all Staff interviewed expressed the view that chat rooms cause many problems. Chat rooms take up an inordinate amount of time for useless activity and often lead to the display of pornographic and/or obscene images.

- One branch manager stated: "We must clearly do something about chat rooms. I saw an eight-year-old male in a chat room where someone had asked how he was "equipped". I watched a thirteen-year-old female using the screen name "Sexy P****" type in a line in a chat room asking if anyone would like to have sex with her....You would not believe some of the things that we see. Unescorted children in chat rooms doing who knows what; a mother who brings in her children and sits for hours in chat rooms, then leaves her children at the library with another family member who is also in a chat room. Five to eight year old children should not be in the library for five to six hours a day....These people are like junkies--totally out of control and they use thousands of dollars worth of County equipment to accomplish nothing."
- One Staff who attended a focus group stated: "Block chat rooms--pictures pop up on them--so it is not simply words. Chat rooms have no intellectual value."
- Another Staff stated: "I am opposed to chat rooms--they are the predator's best friend."

D. Groups of People/Clusters

Staff state that patrons sometimes cluster around computer terminals. The "clustering" is disruptive to other patrons and encourages unruly activity.

- August 2, 1999—"I was told that this group of six boys was using two computers. They moved my desk, used my chair, and moved other furniture as well. A patron using another computer asked the boys to settle down and be quiet. One of the boys called him a "C***sucker"...This matter with the group of children must be resolved."
- March 13, 2000—"Three Hispanic men clustered around Computer 4 looking at pictures of nude women—lots of boobs! I asked them to move to another web site and they just smiled. As soon as I walked away, they went back to "clustering" so I went back telling them "No clustering" and asked them to get their own computers...."
- One branch manager reported that a number of young teenagers listen to rap music as a group and act unruly and loud. They arrange themselves sometimes around one terminal. These children are the primary problem at this particular branch.
- May 28, 2000—"A report of [patron] on Computer 1 looking at obscene material...It was a video of obscene material. [Patron] was surrounded by four male minors looking and watching."

E. Lack of Consequences for Violators/Lack of Support by Administration

Staff interviewed state that administration failed to support the original Internet Use Policy and gave staff no backup. A number of patrons regularly viewed pornographic and/or obscene material and disregarded Staff instructions and harassed Staff. Yet these patrons continued to maintain their Library privileges and never experienced any real consequences for their behavior. Some of the problem rests with the policy itself, but clearly the former Executive Director provided no leadership to Staff and allowed the environment to deteriorate with no communication of this fact to the Board. Training programs provided the following comments:

- "I really think [the training session] was a waste of time. I don't think the administration has enough compassion for our situation."
- "...No one has the authority to do anything..."
- "We don't need future sessions; we need to put into our conduct policy."
- "...We eagerly await the arrival of the new Internet policy. I hope the new policy will be more assertive."
- "...The people in charge at the Main branch don't care about our difficulties. They are in denial."

F. Effect on Staff

The combination of a lack of time limits, exposure to pornography and/or obscenity, lack of administrative support, and requiring Staff to “tap on the shoulder” and monitor the Internet area has contributed to a high level of frustration and burnout for Staff. In short, the current Internet Use Policy requires too high a level of Staff involvement and puts Staff in uncomfortable positions.

Staff is weary of having to deal with unruly and rude patrons. Many Staff state that some Internet patrons are entirely different from traditional library patrons, e.g., more demanding and aggressive and less responsive.

The effect of pornography and/or obscenity on Staff is a serious issue. While we must encourage the availability of information consistent with the Library’s selection criteria, we clearly have a moral and legal obligation to provide a positive and non-hostile environment for Staff. Under the current policy, that has simply not occurred. One male Staff notes that “female Staff...are intimidated by this activity.” One female Staff reports “I felt dirty coming home at the end of the day.” Another female Staff states: “I take a very dim view of working in a place where this stuff is abundant.” One Staff states that Staff “feel uncomfortable asking patrons to move or seeing the material themselves—what are we requiring of them?”

In addition to being exposed to pornography, Staff have been the subject of unwanted attention on several occasions.

- November 10, 1999–A female Staff observed a man viewing pornography, which included naked and mutilated female bodies. As female Staff were leaving for the evening, the male patron was waiting outside the doorway and made a remark to the female Staff. The combination of what the man was viewing and the way he made his remark was very disturbing to the female Staff.
- December 11, 1999–A female Staff received a sexually oriented and aggressive email from a patron. She was upset by receiving the email but also disturbed by the way the matter was handled by administration, who referred her to the Greenville City Police.
- Female Staff state that they are occasionally called over to a terminal by male patrons who claim to be “stuck” in a pornographic site. These male patrons appear to be seeking some sort of reaction from female Staff.

V. DISCUSSION

The majority of the problems identified above can be addressed without any real consideration of legal issues. A limitation on the flow of material into the Library via the Internet is more thorny. But the Board cannot allow the continued existence of an offensive and frustrating atmosphere for Staff and patrons and the resulting deterioration of the Library’s reputation and standing in the community.

Concern about intellectual freedom must be tempered by a countervailing concern about the effects of viewing and displaying pornography and/or obscenity in a public place. These effects include the exposure of children and other unwilling patrons to pornography and/or obscenity, both inadvertent and intentional; the viewing and display of child pornography; inappropriate activity; rude and vulgar and boisterous activity and the creation of a sexually hostile and extremely frustrating atmosphere for Staff and patrons. Much of the material described in the incident reports and Internet log entries does not enjoy constitutional protection. Moreover, material which is not otherwise obscene may, when displayed to minors, violate state and federal law.

The "tap on the shoulder" policy and the use of "privacy" desks have not solved the problem. The majority of reported incidents have occurred since these measures were implemented. Children and other unwilling patrons and Staff are still being exposed to pornography and/or obscenity. Even absent the problem of exposing children and other unwilling patrons and Staff, the Library has a responsibility and obligation to not provide obscene material and child pornography or, in the context of minors, material that is harmful to minors.

Not only has the "tap on the shoulder" policy not solved the problem but also it is no less a form of "censorship" than a software solution, although it is certainly more awkward and inconsistent. Staff are essentially asked to harass patrons away from material provided by the Library. Some Staff may apply different standards of judgment than others. Some Staff don't tap on the shoulder at all. So some patrons may be allowed to access certain material in peace while others are tapped on the shoulder and asked to move to different sites.

Much of the material available on the Internet would fail to meet the Library's selection criteria in the first instance. The Library should not be put in the position of having to accept everything that is available on the Internet, especially considering that much of the material is useless, disruptive, and illegal. The Library must offer material through the Internet which is consistent with its purpose and in a manner that is suitable to the public atmosphere that exists in its buildings.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Vigorously enforce all policies, including Internet Use Policy, Code of Conduct Policy, and Disruptive and Unattended Children Policy.
2. Require Library cards for Internet patrons.

3. Apply two hour daily time limits with one hour increments. Eventually these time limits should be enforced by the employment of software.
4. Place public terminals in full view of Staff.
5. Employ State-of-the-art software or network control mechanisms on public terminals designated to limit or restrict information or images which may be deemed to be obscene, child pornography, and material harmful to minors as that term is used in federal (47 U.S.C. §231 (e)(6)) and similar state laws. Otherwise allow Selection Librarian to use state-of-the-art software or control mechanisms to apply selection criteria to Internet to the extent possible.
6. In Main, make available terminals near Reference desk which do not employ state-of-the-art software or network control mechanisms. In branches, make available at least one terminal near Staff desk which does not employ state-of-the-art software or network control mechanisms.
7. Eliminate Chat Rooms.
8. Make clear to the community that the Board accepts responsibility for the conditions that have resulted under the current Internet Use Policy and will ensure that the Library environment is pleasant and safe in the future.