

A SAMPLING OF WHAT LIBRARIES IN COLORADO  
ARE DOING ABOUT FILTERING, MAY 2004

36 libraries responded to an email survey that asked the following questions:

1. If you DO filter now, do you filter all your public computers, or just children's. What kind of filter?
2. If you DON'T filter yet, are you considering it?
3. If you ARE considering it, is it because of CIPA, the new State Law, or...?
4. If you ARE considering it, do you know yet what kind of approach you are going to take?

SUMMARY RESULTS:

Today – YES filter 10      NO filter 26

Soon – YES filter 25      NO filter 11

The tally: "Filter" in this tally means filtering across the board, on all computers.

- 10 libraries already filter, 26 do not.
- Of the 26 who do not filter, 3 filter just for children.
- Of the 26 who do not filter, 15 are considering filtering, and 11 are not (or haven't decided yet).
- IF the 15 libraries who are considering filtering choose to implement it, which is highly probable for most, 25 of the libraries will filter, and 11 will not.
- Reasons for considering filtering:
  - 4 – CIPA and State Law
  - 5 – Just the State Law
  - 3 – Just CIPA
  - 2 – Did not say
  - 1 – Matches present policy of "no porn."

YES – LIBRARIES THAT CURRENTLY FILTER

1. Englewood – uses a "smart card" that allows patron or parent of patron to choose type of internet access
2. Ft. Collins – also uses a "smart card"
3. Cortez – 4 filtered computers, 6 unfiltered. Minors must have written permission on file to use unfiltered computers.
4. Littleton – filters all but 2 computers, which can be used by adults only. These 2 computers are outfitted with privacy screens.

5. Westminster – filters via PC Management System that allows an adult cardholder to automatically disable the filter.
6. Manitou Springs – uses Cyberpatrol on all
7. Broomfield – filters via PC Management System; filter is set for porn only.
8. Security – uses WebSense on all
9. Las Animas – filters all
10. Aurora – filters all computers. Adults can request a password to disable the filter.

#### NO, BUT CONSIDERING FILTERS

1. Gunnison Co.
2. Park Co.
3. Rio Grande
4. Douglas Co currently filters only for children. Because of the State law, they are considering either a blacklist approach or a combination of a blacklist and image blocker. This would allow “text only” access to blocked sites.
5. Red Feather Lakes currently filters only for children.
6. Denver, because of CIPA, is currently considering a proposal to filter via a PC Management System that allows an adult cardholder to automatically disable the filter.
7. Boulder
8. Durango currently filters only for children.
9. Salida is considering GELF (blacklist) approach because it matches current policy that no sexually explicit imagery may be displayed.
10. Stratton
11. Delta Co. is considering a web-based filtering software that blocks content (as opposed to white or black lists) and is easy to temporarily disable.
12. East Morgan Co. is considering the GELF (black list) Jamie has developed.
13. Pikes Peak Library District
14. Jefferson Co currently offers filters to adults as a choice. For children, search engines use a filtered version, which can be turned off. Because of State law, they are considering filtering via their PC Management System that allows an adult cardholder to automatically disable the filter.
15. Arapahoe, because of CIPA, is considering a “blacklist” filter for adults that would be left on at all times, and a more comprehensive filter for children.

#### NOT CONSIDERING FILTERS, OR UNDECIDED

1. Grand Co., 2. Estes, 3. Elbert Co., 4. Garfield Co., 5. Mesa Co., 6. Kiowa Co.  
7. Louisville, 8. Nederland, 9. Lafayette, 10. Basalt, 11. Montrose