

Red Tape Review Rule Report (Due: September 1, 2026)

Department Name:	Iowa Department of Corrections	Date:	6/15/2026	Total Rule Count:	20
IAC #:	201	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	20	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	904.103(5) and 904.108(1) "k"
Contact Name:	Jen Rathje	Email:	jen.rathje1@iowa.gov	Phone:	515-802-0898

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

To establish uniform operational, safety, and security standards across correctional institutions. This provides necessary public transparency regarding core public-facing systems such as facility visitation, correspondence, fiduciary transactions, and victim notification.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Yes. The Department successfully maintains uniform, safe, and secure facility operations across all institutions.

What are the costs incurred by the public to comply with the rule?

There are no mandatory costs incurred by the general public under this chapter. Any costs associated with accessing institutional services, such as voluntary travel for in-person visits, standard postage for mail, etc., are entirely discretionary and dependent upon an individual's choice to interact with an incarcerated individuals under the supervision of the DOC.

What are the costs to the agency or any other agency to implement/enforce the rule?

There are no additional costs beyond existing operational expenditures.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Yes. This is necessary given the requirement for safe institutional operations and public transparency.

Are there less restrictive alternatives to accomplish the benefit? ☐ YES ☒ NO

If YES, please list alternative(s) and provide analysis of less restrictive alternatives from other states, if applicable. If NO, please explain.

Iowa Code requires rules. Establishing baseline regulatory thresholds is necessary to maintain facility security, public safety and public transparency.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language? [list chapter/rule number(s) that fall under any of the above categories]

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

Yes. The Department proposes removing language that is unnecessarily restrictive, duplicates state statutes, that is obsolete, or that does not align with current processes. This applies to rules 20.1 through 20.15, and 20.17.

RULES PROPOSED FOR REPEAL (list rule number[s]):

20.16, 20.18, 20.19 – Remove historical placeholders, reserved lines, and previously rescinded text to clean up chapter numbering.
20.20 – Repeal in entirety. Rule is obsolete due to federal regulatory changes.

RULES PROPOSED FOR RE-PROMULGATION (list rule number[s] or include rule text if available):

Current chapter will be rescinded and will adopt new rule chapter in lieu thereof.

****For rules being re-promulgated with changes, you may attach a document with suggested changes.***

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	4
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	6,316
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	174

ARE THERE ANY STATUTORY CHANGES YOU WOULD RECOMMEND INCLUDING CODIFYING ANY RULES?

None