

Prison Visitation Policies: A Fifty State Survey

November 2012¹

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Part I. Methodology.....	3
Part II: Key Findings.....	6
Part III: Overnight Family Visits and Virtual Visitation	19
A. Overnight Family Visits	19
B. Virtual Visitation	24
Part IV: Next Steps for Potential Research Projects	32

¹ Chesa Boudin is a 2011 graduate of the Yale Law School. Trevor Stutz is a 2012 graduate of the Yale Law School. Aaron Littman is a member of the Yale Law School class of 2014. The authors thank the Liman Program at Yale Law School and Judith Resnik, Hope Metcalf, Fiona Doherty, Nina Rabin, and Sia Sanneh for their supervision. We thank the directors of the Departments of Corrections of all fifty states for their time and effort in providing us with information about their inmate visitation policies that was not available on the departments' websites. That assistance was facilitated by the Association of State Correctional Administrators and in particular by President Ashbel T. Wall, II, Director of the Rhode Island Department of Corrections, who provided constructive guidance throughout our research. We also express our appreciation to the Association's staff – particularly Co-Executive Director George Camp, and Senior Associate Wayne Choinski – who were instrumental in making the entire data collection process so successful. Finally, many generously read and commented on early drafts: Brett Dignam, David Fathi, Philip Genty, David Menschel, Chief Administrative Law Judge Brenda Murray, Myrna Raeder, and Michael Wald.

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum presents a summary of the findings from a survey of prison visitation policies in the fifty states and in the system run by the Federal Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”). We embarked on the project with two primary goals. First, we wanted to provide for relatively easy state-by-state comparisons across a group of common visitation-related categories. Second, we hoped to identify similarities and differences across states in the categories we tracked. In practice, these two goals tended to converge because many of the variations warranted their own categories in the spreadsheet we used to present the data. We also discovered some significant issues that did not lend themselves to neat or easy comparisons. Thus, in addition to the attached spreadsheet, this memo provides a summary of our key findings, analyses, and areas for further research.

The lives of prisoners and their families are deeply affected by visitation policies and, to date, there has been no comprehensive effort to compare these policies across all of the fifty states.² We believe the dataset presented here is the first of its kind to explore the contours of how prison administrators use their discretion in prescribing visitation policies. This comparative analysis has many uses, both in identifying best practices and in uncovering policies that warrant concern as a matter of law or policy.

² Fifty state surveys exist in related areas. *See, e.g.*, LEGAL ACTION CENTER, AFTER PRISON: ROADBLOCKS TO REENTRY (2004) (comparing barriers to reentry from prison); NAT’L INST. OF CORR., U.S. DEP’T OF JUSTICE, SERVICES FOR FAMILIES OF PRISON INMATES (2002) (surveying the services available for families of prisoners), available at <http://www.nicic.org/pubs/2002/017272.pdf>; BRENDA V. SMITH, FIFTY STATE SURVEY OF STATE CRIMINAL LAWS, PROHIBITING THE SEXUAL ABUSE OF INDIVIDUALS UNDER CUSTODIAL SUPERVISION (2008) (documenting policies preventing sexual abuse in prisons). Note, too, that in 2002 the Department of Justice and the National Institute of Corrections sent out a survey to the Department of Corrections for all fifty states with questions about initiatives related to families of inmates. *See* Jade S. Laughlin, Bruce A. Arrigo, Kristie R. Blevins & Charisse T. M. Coston, *Incarcerated Mothers and Child Visitation: A Law, Social Science, and Policy Perspective*, 19 CRIM. JUST. POL’Y REV. 215, 225-26 (2008).

Comparative analysis of visiting is particularly important given that the contours of prison visitation are determined almost exclusively by administrative discretion, unconstrained except at the margins by judicial interference. The Supreme Court and other federal courts have been largely deferential to prison administrators, granting them wide latitude generally, and in the realm of visitation regulations specifically.³

As a result, decisions made by corrections officials are among the primary determinants of whether and how inmates are able to maintain relationships with their parents, spouses, siblings, and children. Recent studies show that visitation is strongly correlated with decreased recidivism and improved penological outcomes.⁴ Visitors often represent the only contact inmates have with the world outside the prison walls, to which they will most likely return after serving out their sentences; the strength of the connections inmates maintain with their communities may depend substantially on visitation regulations promulgated by administrators. The nearly unrestrained discretion officials have in crafting and implementing prison visitation regulations makes clear how consequential these policy choices are, both to inmates' experiences of incarceration and to the success of the correctional enterprise.

This memo is organized as follows. Part I describes the methodology we employed and discusses the challenges and limitations of our research. Part II provides our key substantive findings, beginning with broad observations about the similarities and differences across the fifty states, and then discussing specific highlights of the data in several key areas. Part III provides a

³ See *Overton v. Bazzetta*, 539 U.S. 126 (2003) (holding unanimously that a ban on visits by minors and a restriction on visits for inmates with substance abuse violations violated neither the Fourteenth Amendment due process clause, the Eighth Amendment prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment, or the inmates' right to freedom of association under the First Amendment, on the grounds that both regulations were, as required under the four-part standard for evaluating challenges to conditions of confinement articulated in *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 89 (1987), "reasonably related to legitimate penological interests").

⁴ See, e.g., Grant Duwe & Valerie Clark, *Blessed be the social tie that binds: The effects of prison visitation on offender recidivism*, 20 CRIM. JUST. POL'Y REV. 1 (2011) (finding that visitation significantly decreased the risk of recidivism).

detailed description of two sub-policy areas within visitation regulations that raise particularly complex and specialized considerations: virtual visitation and overnight family (also called “conjugal” or “extended”) visitation. Finally, Part IV outlines possible next steps for research on this topic.

PART I. METHODOLOGY

A. Sources of Data

Three layers of rules govern prison visitation. The first two - administrative regulations (often general grants of rulemaking authority to correctional administrators) and policy directives (more detailed rules promulgated by those administrators) – apply to the state system as a whole. Facility-specific rules, which form the third layer, vary considerably, and are usually the most detailed, although they do not always cover the full scope of visitation policies.⁵

We began by reviewing the websites for the Department of Corrections (“DOC”) for each of the fifty states and the federal BOP. We found that some websites contained direct links to the various departmental policy directives, others only gave thumbnail sketches of their visitation policies, and others had little or no information available on topic. Some of these websites also included visitor “handbooks.”⁶

⁵ For the purposes of this memo a “regulation” or “administrative regulation” is the code promulgated pursuant to each state’s administrative law procedures. A “policy directive” is a list of policies promulgated and signed by the head of the DOC or his / her designee. Throughout this memo, we differentiate between policy directives and administrative regulations, although this distinction can at times be murky, since jurisdictions do not always use the same terminology when referring to the policies that guide their discretion. Often, the policy directives closely track the language in the regulation.

⁶ Visitor handbooks or rules on the website are primarily informational, and not binding. Where available, handbooks provide a range of information about visitation policies and procedures in plain English rather than legalese. Often the handbooks closely track the policy directives or the regulations. Handbooks are issued both statewide, for an entire prison system, and by individual facilities. We considered the statewide ones only.

We compiled copies of all the available policy directives, regulations, and any other materials directly related to visitation that were available online. Roughly half of the jurisdictions have administrative regulations available on Westlaw;⁷ the vast majority of jurisdictions have policy directives.

Where a directive was not available online, we contacted DOCs through the Association of State Corrections Administrators (ASCA), which counts as its members corrections directors from every state. ASCA sent its members a draft of this report, including a spreadsheet, and solicited feedback. We received valuable updates from more than half of the departments; most of the others responded to confirm that we had accurately represented their most recent policies. Through this process, we were able to obtain information about the visitation policies of all fifty state prison systems and the BOP.⁸

We chose to focus our review at the level of policy directives for several reasons.⁹ First, the directives articulate policy more comprehensively than institution-specific rules,¹⁰ and in much more detail than most regulations. They also contain the DOC's policy rationale for and philosophy of visitation. While we missed out on some variation between facilities within each of the jurisdictions, this approach allowed us to develop an understanding of visitation policies

⁷ See Prison Visitation Regulations Spreadsheet, Column F (attached). We also acquired some administrative regulations that were not available on Westlaw directly from the DOCs.

⁸ As of 2005, the last time comprehensive data was collected, there were 1,190 confinement (as opposed to community-based) correctional facilities operated under state authority (including private facilities), and 102 operated under federal authority. JAMES J. STEPHEN, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS, CENSUS OF STATE AND FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES, 2005, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS 10 tbl.2 (2008). This data set does not map perfectly onto ours, but the match is close, since it excludes facilities like city, county and regional jails, military facilities and immigration detention centers, which are not under the authority of state DOCs.

⁹ While we relied principally on policy directives, we included information from administrative regulations for states where information was different or more detailed. Although administrative regulations are generally less specific, some are quite detailed, and so we considered these. Five states (FL, IL, OR, UT, VT) rely exclusively on such regulations rather than policy directives.

¹⁰ Institution-specific rules proved too numerous, inaccessible, and subject to change for productive study, given our limited time and resources. We do reference institution-specific policies in the more detailed discussions of family and video visitation, *infra* Part III.

across the nation in a manageable way. Second, we focused on policy directives because they are most amenable to systemic assessment, and, if necessary, reform. Policy directives are issued by a single, common entity – the director of the state’s DOC. Each policy directive is issued and signed by the state director and governs all facilities, with some amount of discretion left up to each facility’s warden. Amending policy directives may be the most pragmatic approach to advancing policy goals, because it is likely easier to amend a policy directive than it is to change state-level regulations. Additionally, amendment or replacement of policy directives would likely have a broader and more lasting impact than changing practices at a single facility.

B. Methodological Limitations

This methodology yields data that are limited in several ways. First, our analysis does not provide a picture of how each of the numerous provisions is actually implemented, institution by institution. Disparities between policy and practice might occur for any number of reasons, including variation in the inmate populations housed within different facilities, locations of the facilities, physical infrastructure and staffing capacity, and attitudes towards visitation held by management and officers. Conducting case studies to see how policies work in practice would add valuable nuance to this study. On-the-ground research will, we hope, be the next stage of our project.

Second, this survey does not account for distinctions among particular prison populations. One key sub-group is female prisoners, who may be affected differently than male prisoners by visitation rules. Security classification also likely has a significant impact on how prisoners are permitted visitation. These key differences, which could be a rich area for future research, are rarely accounted for adequately by the categories we tracked in policy directives.

Third, in order to create data points for comparison, we organized our review into several categories. The policy directives and regulations, however, range from a few to dozens of pages and contain a disparate breadth and depth of information, and hence did not always fit neatly into the categories we used. Our review necessarily left much more to do.

Based on our initial review of the policy directives, we chose categories to target issues that came up frequently, for which there was a wide range of responses, or that presented important questions. We also chose to delve more deeply into two areas that both potentially provide greater access to and alter the experience of visitation: overnight family visitation and virtual visitation.

PART II: KEY FINDINGS

In this section, we offer observations about the similarities and differences the data revealed between and across jurisdictions. We then provide a more detailed summary of the key findings on several specific aspects of visitation policies. While most of the factual information in this section is also presented in the spreadsheet, the discussion that follows provides additional analysis and, in synthesizing the data, provides a context in which to place the policies of any particular state.

A. Overview of Key Findings

This Part reviews the main findings from our survey, organized thematically. It includes both summary statistics and illustrative examples.

Institutional Authority Over Visitation

Forty-six jurisdictions had DOC policy directives – policies promulgated by the head of the DOC. All of the five states that lacked policy directives (FL, IL, OR, UT, VT) followed an administrative regulation and or had written policies on the department website.

Number and Duration of Visits

Thirty jurisdictions promote or encourage visitation at the outset of their policy directives or regulations. (BOP, AK, AR, CA, CO, GA, HI, ID, IN, IA, LA, MD, MN, MO, MT, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OH, OK, OR, RI, SC, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WY). For example, in Alaska, “[t]he Department encourages prisoner visitation because strong family and community ties increase the likelihood of a prisoner’s success after release. Visitation is subject only to the limitations in this policy and as necessary to protect persons and maintain order and security in the institution.”¹¹ However, these states are not necessarily the ones in which visitation is most liberally permitted, and indeed some have policies that severely limit visitation.¹²

Twenty-eight jurisdictions have a floor for the minimum number of days or hours visitation must be made available (AK, AR, CA, CT, FL, GA, KS, KY, LA, MD, MA, MN, MS, MO, NM, NY, NC, ND, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VA, WI, WY). For example, in Georgia, “[a] minimum of SIX (6) hours shall be allotted each day for visitation periods on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays. Normally, there will be no restrictions placed on the length of visits during the facility’s established visitation periods.”¹³

¹¹ Alaska Dep’t Corr. Policy 810.02 VI.A.

¹² A number of other jurisdictions explained in communication with us that their correctional philosophy does recognize the value of visitation; we have included in this count only those states that articulate this in an official policy document.

¹³ Ga. Dep’t of Corr. Policy IIB01-0005.VI.C.1.

Several other states provide for ceilings to visitation hours. Oregon allows only one visit per day per visitor on weekends and holidays;¹⁴ Utah allows no more than two hours per visit per day. Overall, New York State's maximum security prisons provide perhaps the most welcoming visitation policy, allowing for up to six hour visits 365 days per year *and* overnight conjugal visits approximately every two months, while North Carolina is perhaps the most restrictive, establishing a ceiling of no more than one visit per week of up to two hours (plus legal and clergy visits).

Inmate Eligibility for Visits

Twenty-two jurisdictions specify that offenders at different security classifications will be subject to limits on visitation (AR, AZ, CA CT, DE, MA, MN, MS, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, OK, PA, SC, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA). In addition to security classification, several states indicate special provisions for sex offenders, limiting the ability of minors to visit. Many jurisdictions note that though the policy directives do not limit visitation based on inmate classifications, individual facilities will determine their own specific rules. In most states that differentiate based on security classification, higher security inmates are allowed fewer visiting opportunities.

In Oklahoma, for example, maximum security inmates are given up to four hours per week of visitation, while minimum security inmates get up to eight hours per week. Likewise, Mississippi's regulations state that Long-Term Administrative Segregation Status offenders are allowed only "[o]ne (1) hour non-contact visit on the 2nd Monday in the last month of each

¹⁴ Under this system, inmates are given a number of points per month to spend on visits. Weekend and holiday visits deduct two points per visitor per session (only one session per day is allowed for any given visitor), weekday visits deduct one point per visitor per session (two sessions per day are allowed for any given visitor), and visits with minor children do not deduct any points. Or. Admin. Rule 291-127-0250.

quarter with any approved visitor on their visitation list.”¹⁵ In contrast, New York is the only state that provides more visitation opportunities, and more flexible timing of visits, to inmates in higher security settings.¹⁶

In general, higher security inmates and those in segregation within the prison may face additional barriers to visitation, such as requirements of ‘no-contact’ visits. Georgia, however, has a specific provision to allow visitation to inmates in the most restrictive custody.¹⁷ Additionally, prisoners may be temporarily or permanently banned from visits for disciplinary violations. Michigan enforces a mandatory permanent ban on visiting in some circumstances,¹⁸ and new regulations in New York introduce harsher penalties for inmate misconduct, including a

¹⁵ Miss. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 31-03-01.

¹⁶ “At maximum security facilities, visiting is allowed every day of the year and at hours intended to encourage maximum visitation. At medium and minimum facilities, visiting is allowed on weekends and holidays only. At Work Release facilities, only inmates held in restriction status shall be allowed visitors.” N.Y. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 4403.III.A.

¹⁷ “K. Special Visitation Requirements: 1. Protective custody and administrative segregation inmates shall in general have the same rights to visitation as general population inmates unless this is not feasible. Non-feasibility must be documented. An example would include inmates with documented assaultive and destructive behavior.” Ga. Dep’t of Corr. Policy IIB01-0005.VI.K.1.

¹⁸ These two provisions in combinations seem to effectuate a permanent ban:

“Except as set forth in Paragraph AAA, the Director may restrict all of a prisoner’s visits if the prisoner is convicted or found guilty of any of the following:

1. A felony or misdemeanor that occurred during a visit.
2. A major misconduct violation that occurred during a visit or was associated with a visit.
3. Escape, attempted escape, or conspiracy to escape.
4. Two or more violations of the major misconduct charge of substance abuse for behavior that occurred on or after January 1, 2007, which do not arise from the same incident. This includes failure to submit to substance abuse testing.”

Mich. Dep’t. of Corr. Policy 5.03.140.XX.

“The Director may remove a restriction upon written request of the Warden or the restricted prisoner, subject to the following: 1. The restriction shall not be removed if it is based on a felony or misdemeanor that occurred during a visit or if it is based on an escape, attempted escape, or conspiracy to escape associated with a visit.”

Mich. Dep’t. of Corr. Policy 5.03.140.BBB.

six-month to year-long suspension of all visiting privileges for any drug-related charges, whether stemming from a visit or not.¹⁹

Approval of Visitors

Thirty-two jurisdictions limit the number of visitors an inmate may have on an approved visiting list;²⁰ Pennsylvania allows the longest visitor list (40) and South Dakota the shortest (two plus immediate family). In contrast, California affirmatively places no limit on the number of approved visitors: “Limitations shall not be placed on the number of visitors approved to visit an inmate.”²¹

Many states allow a visitor to be on only one inmate’s approved visitors list, unless a visitor has multiple immediate family members incarcerated. In Connecticut, “[n]o visitor, except an immediate family member, shall be on more than one (1) inmate’s visiting list at the same facility (i.e., to visit two or more inmates at the same facility, the visitor must be an immediate family member to all the inmates on whose list the visitor is on). This requirement may be waived at the discretion of the Unit Administrator.”²² In Maine, “[v]isitors shall not be approved to be placed on the approved visitor list of more than one prisoner within a facility, unless they are members of the immediate family (spouse, natural, foster or adoptive mother, father, son, daughter, grandfather or grandmother, grandchild, brother or sister, or stepmother,

¹⁹ N.Y. DEP’T OF CORR., VISITING PROGRAM GUIDELINES, *available at* http://www.doccs.ny.gov/PressRel/2012/Visiting_Program_Guidelines_20121001.pdf.

²⁰ AL: 8, AR: 20; AZ: 20, CO: 12 plus minor children, CT: 5-10 depending on security classification, FL: 15 plus children under twelve, GA: 12, IN: 10 family and 2 friends, IA: 4 plus immediate family, KS: 20 with restrictions on higher security classifications, KY: 3 plus immediate family, LA: 10, MD: 15, MI: 10 plus immediate family, MN: 24, MS: 10 plus children, MO: 20, NH: 20 plus immediate family, NM: 15, NC: 18, OH: 15, OK: 6 plus immediate family, OR: 20, RI: 9, SC: 15, TN: 8 plus immediate family, TX: 10, WI: 12 plus children, WY: 10 plus children.

²¹ Calif. Dep’t of Corr., Operations & Rehabilitation Manual 54020.18.

²² Conn. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 10.6.4.A.4.b.

stepfather, stepson, stepdaughter, stepgrandfather or stepgrandmother, stepgrandchild or stepbrother or stepsister) of more than one prisoner.”²³

States vary in their policies for adding and removing visitors to the “approved visitors” list. In some cases, such as North Carolina and Wisconsin, they provide opportunities to add or remove visitors from the list only every six months. Tennessee requires a visitor taken off one inmate’s list to wait a full year prior to appearing on another inmate’s list. Utah requires that all visitors reapply every year to stay on an inmate’s visitors list.

Exclusion of Visitors

Almost every jurisdiction excludes some categories of visitors, often former felons. Sometimes these restrictions bar former felons from *ever* visiting. Idaho denies anyone who has a felony conviction, or *arrest* within the last five years or a misdemeanor drug *arrest* within last two years. Michigan restricts from visiting “a prisoner or a former prisoner in any jurisdiction. However, a prisoner or former prisoner who is an immediate family member may be placed on the prisoner’s approved visitors list with prior approval of the Warden of the facility where the visit will occur.”²⁴ Hawaii, by contrast, specifically allows former felons to visit inmates, as do Massachusetts and Vermont.²⁵ New Jersey²⁶ and Nebraska are the only states that explicitly provide for inmate-to-inmate visitation in their written policies. States require various levels of background checks for visitors, ranging from nothing to a detailed criminal history check.

²³ Me. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 21.4.VI.B.7.

²⁴ Mich. Dep’t. of Corr. Policy 5.03.140.J.2.

²⁵ “No group of persons, such as parolees or ex-offenders may be excluded from visiting residents solely because of their status.” Vt. Admin. Code 12-8-22:966.

²⁶ “Visits shall be permitted between incarcerated relatives that are incarcerated in facilities under the jurisdiction of the New Jersey Department of Corrections. [Conditions and limitations follow.]” N.J. Admin. Code 10A: 18-6.6.

Many states do not allow victims to visit inmates. In Indiana, “[v]ictims generally shall not be allowed to visit offenders, unless the visit is for therapeutic reasons and a therapist has requested the visit and will be a part of the visit.”²⁷ Several jurisdictions have highly specific, and sometimes unique, rules excluding other categories of visitors. The BOP only allows visits from people inmates knew prior to their incarceration.²⁸ Oklahoma prohibits married inmates from receiving visits from friends of the opposite gender.²⁹ Washington is the only state to explicitly require, in its written policy directive, non-citizens who wish to visit to provide proof of their legal status in the US,³⁰ although Arkansas and Kentucky require visitors to include a social security number on the visiting information form.³¹ Utah prohibits visitors from speaking any language besides English.³²

Searches and Behavior of Visitors

Forty-one jurisdictions specify, with varying levels of detail, the search procedures for visitors (BOP, AL, AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MD, MA, MN, MS, MO, MT, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY). In some cases searches may extend to vehicles and to body cavities of visitors.

²⁷ Ind. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 02-01-102.IX.

²⁸ “The visiting privilege ordinarily will be extended to friends and associates having an established relationship with the inmate prior to confinement, unless such visits could reasonably create a threat to the security and good order of the institution. Exceptions to the prior relationship rule may be made, particularly for inmates without other visitors, when it is shown that the proposed visitor is reliable and poses no threat to the security or good order of the institution. Regardless of the institution’s security level, the inmate must have known the proposed visitor(s) prior to incarceration. The Warden must approve any exception to this requirement.” CFR § 540.44.c.

²⁹ “If the offender is married, no person of the opposite gender may be added as a ‘friend’ on the approved visiting list.” Okla. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 030118 add. 01.A.

³⁰ “Persons who are not United States (U.S.) citizens must provide proof of legal entry into the U.S. Aliens require documentation to visit. [List of acceptable documentation follows.]” Wash. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 450.300.IH.

³¹ Ark. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 11-49. Attach. 1; Ky. Corr. Policy 16.1.II.D.2(b).

³² The DOC website provides a list of rules for visitors including: “All visits will be conducted in English.” *Visiting Rules*, UTAH DEP’T OF CORR., http://corrections.utah.gov/visitation_facilities/visiting_rules.html (last visited Oct. 10, 2012).

Various additional methods of search are specified. For example, in Arizona, “[a]ll visitors and their possessions are subject to physical search by staff, electronic metal detection devices, barrier sniff screening (Narcotics Detection) by a Department Service Dog, and/or Ion Scanning. . . . All vehicles on Department property are subject to search.”³³

In some cases, the refusal to submit to a more intrusive search bars entrance to the facility, and can be a cause for sanctions. In Georgia, “[i]f a person refuses to be searched, an incident report will be completed and this could be cause for removal from the inmate’s approved visitor list.”³⁴ Pennsylvania, however, prohibits its correctional officers from conducting pat or strip searches of incoming visitors.

Several states also have noteworthy policies controlling what visitors can wear or bring with them into the prison. Tennessee’s visitor dress code specifically requires visitors to wear undergarments but prohibits “thong and water brassieres.”³⁵

Many policy directives limit displays of physical affection. In New Hampshire, “[p]hysical contact and displays of affection will be kept within bounds of decorum with hugging and kissing allowed only at start and end of visits for 15 seconds or less,”³⁶ and in Kentucky, “[a]n inmate in the regular visiting area shall be allowed brief physical contact (example: holding hands, kissing, and embracing). This contact shall be permitted within the bounds of good taste and only at the beginning and end of the visit.”³⁷

Children Visiting

³³ Ariz. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 911.03.1.1.1.

³⁴ Ga. Dep’t of Corr. Policy IIB01-0005.VI.J.7.

³⁵ Tenn. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 507.01.VI.M.1.b.

³⁶ N.H. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 7.09.IV.N.1.d.).

³⁷ Ky. Corr. Policy 16.1.II.H.1.

Some states have in place policy directives pertaining to minor visitors. Many provide for the termination of visits if children cannot be controlled.³⁸ New Hampshire prohibits all toys from the visiting room.³⁹ At the opposite end of the spectrum, some states, like Washington, provide for child-friendly visiting rooms, including toys, games and rule enforcement sensitive to children.⁴⁰ Maine has a specific provision to ensure that minors can visit.⁴¹

Extended Visits

Nearly all states offer some form of extended daytime visit, and some offer overnight family visits. These visits look different in each jurisdiction, however, as there is no consistent length of time allotted for an “extended” visit, and there is no consistent definition of “family” for the purposes of overnight visit eligibility – in some cases, this category includes only children (of a certain age) or only spouses (and sometimes domestic partners), while in others it includes all immediate family members and legal guardians.

Forty-seven jurisdictions provide for “Special Visitation,” which in most instances specifically includes visitors who have traveled a great distance to the prison (BOP, AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN,

³⁸ See, e.g., Tex. Dep’t of Crim. Just. Policy I-218.3.14.1.

³⁹ “Although children are allowed in the visiting room, no toys are allowed.” N.H. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 7.09.IV.I.3.

⁴⁰ “Visit rooms will provide toys and games suitable for interaction by family members of all ages[;] rule enforcement will be sensitive to visitors, particularly children.” Wash. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 450.300.I.A.1(a). Georgia’s women’s prison also has a separate visiting room for children, called the Children’s Center.

⁴¹ “Visits by Minors. Each facility shall ensure that minors (persons under 18 years of age, unless married or emancipated by court order) are permitted to visit prisoners, unless the minor is on the prisoner’s Prohibited Visitor List. A minor visitor must have an application completed on their behalf and must be accompanied at the visit by an immediate family member or legal guardian who is an adult (persons 18 years of age or older, married, or emancipated by court order). An adult who is not an immediate family member or legal guardian may also be allowed to bring in a minor visitor with the written permission of the parent(s) having legal custody or the legal guardian of the minor and with the prior approval of the Chief Administrative Officer, or designee. A professional visitor from the Department of Health and Human Services may also be allowed to bring in a minor visitor with the prior approval of the Chief Administrative Officer, or designee.” Me. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 21.4.VI.H.

MS, MO, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY). In Iowa, for example, “[t]he Warden/Superintendent or designee may permit special visits not otherwise provided for in this policy. These may include, but are not limited to, extended visits for close family members traveling extended distances, immediate visits for close relatives or friends about to leave the area, visits necessary to straighten out critical personal affairs, and other visits for similar reasons.”⁴² A number of states exempt visitors who have traveled long distances from early visit termination due to overcrowding.

Nine jurisdictions allow for overnight family visits (CA, CO, CT, MS, NB, NM, NY, SD, WA). California provides for “Family Visiting” in great detail. Connecticut offers “Extended Family Visit. A prolonged visit between an inmate and specified immediate family member(s), and/or a legal guardian, in a designated secure area separate from the inmate population.”⁴³ However, family visitation is not currently operational in any Connecticut facilities.⁴⁴ Only Mississippi refers to these visits as “conjugal” visits. Nebraska only allows for overnight visits in one women's facility, and only for children under age six.⁴⁵ According to communication with the Director of the DOC, Colorado also has overnight visits in its women’s prison, though its official policy directives do not mention this. Though not in its formal policy, South Dakota also provides for weekend-long visits for incarcerated mothers and their children, “intended to alleviate some of the familial stress associated with the mother’s incarceration, create a better

⁴² Iowa Dep’t of Corr. Policy 5.IV.J.2.

⁴³ Conn. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 10.6.5.E.

⁴⁴ This information has been confirmed with the director of ASCA and with family members of CT inmates.

⁴⁵ See *Nebraska Correctional Center for Women*, NEB. DEP’T OF CORR. SERVS., <http://www.corrections.nebraska.gov/nccw.html> (last visited Oct. 10, 2012).

understanding of the parent role, and provide the opportunity of the inmate mother to maintain some direct responsibility for the care of her children.”⁴⁶

Virtual Visits

At least eighteen jurisdictions have some form of virtual (video) visitation (AK, CO, FL, GA, ID, IN, LA, MN, MO, NJ, NM, NY, OH, OR, PA, VA, WA, WI). Indiana and Wisconsin allow video visitation where the inmate is not allowed other forms of visitation, on a temporary or permanent basis. New Mexico and Pennsylvania, by contrast, allow for video visitation as a supplement to, rather than a replacement for, other forms of visitation. Alaska, Colorado, Georgia, Louisiana, New Jersey, New York and Ohio reported that they also have programs, many of which are limited in scope and/or privately operated, but these programs do not appear in their policy directives or regulations.

The Alaska program is only for inmates at a contract facility in Colorado, and it is run by that contractor and the Tanana Chiefs Conference; the Colorado program likewise applies to only one facility; the Georgia program is being piloted by JPay in women’s facilities; the New York program is facilitated, in part, by the Osborne Association; the Ohio program operates in four facilities; and the Virginia program has recently expanded from one facility to ten and is now incorporated into its official state-level policy. Oregon explicitly permits video visitation in its policy documents but has decided to allow access to video interactive phones and cover the related policy directives as part of their administrative phone rule. Oregon will offer video interactive phone calls at all institutions after piloting the concept at the two located most

⁴⁶ South Dakota Dep’t. of Corr., South Dakota Women’s Prison, available at: <http://doc.sd.gov/adult/facilities/wp/mip.aspx>.

remotely from population centers. Florida, Idaho, Missouri and Washington also have limited programs that do not appear in their policy directive or regulations.⁴⁷

B. Similarities and Differences Across the Fifty States

Substantial consistency and significant commonalities exist across all the jurisdictions surveyed. All states have some provisions for prison visitation; all states screen visitors and place limitations on who can visit and when, and all states provide a substantial level of discretion to each prison's warden or superintendent in implementing the policy directives. Reading through the various policy directives, administrative regulations, and visitation codes makes clear that all DOCs treat visitation as a privilege, not a right. In most of the policies reviewed, DOCs note that inmates are not entitled to visits.⁴⁸

However, some jurisdictions generally restrict visitation, while other states specifically encourage and promote visitation as a core part of the rehabilitation process. While the various state policies exist on a continuum, these extremes symbolize divergent policy approaches to visitation and suggest key questions for further exploration: Do states that promote and encourage visitation have better or worse outcomes in terms of institutional security or recidivism rates? To what extent, if any, does the general attitude towards visitation articulated in policy directives correlate with actual visitation policy? Does it correlate with other related policies in the jurisdiction, such as family law provisions preserving or dissolving custodial relationships when parents or children are incarcerated?

⁴⁷ See PATRICK DOYLE, CAMILLE FORDY & AARON HAIGHT, VERMONT LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH SERVICE, PRISON VIDEO CONFERENCING 3 (2011), available at <http://www.uvm.edu/~vlrs/CriminalJusticeandCorrections/prison%20video%20conferencing.pdf>.

⁴⁸ The Supreme Court held in *Overton v. Bazetta*, 539 U.S. 126, 136-37 (2003), that bans on all visitation for two years following an inmate's second substance-abuse violation did not violate the Eighth Amendment, although it noted that "indefinite withdrawal of visitation or denial of procedural safeguards" might not also pass muster.

The differences between states' visitation policies are also revealing. First, limits on visitation are often justified in terms of security, which may lead one to expect consistent policies across jurisdictions. We do not know why similar security concerns yield widely variant statewide policies. Jurisdictions evaluate security in different ways in different contexts, so we need to learn more about policy in practice in order to understand this variation.

No clear regional, geographic, or political trends appear to explain variation in policies. One might expect that certain policies – for example, overnight family visits – would exist in a state or group of states with certain common characteristics. Instead, the states in each category we examined do not appear to have much in common. The eight states that allow for overnight family visits, for example, are not from any one or even two geographic regions, and it is unclear what else of significance California, Colorado, Connecticut, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, and Washington have in common.

Further, while the states often serve as laboratories of policy experimentation, one might expect some harmonization of best practices. If there has been such a harmonization or cross-pollination process, it is not apparent in several key areas. For example, North Carolina allows just one visit per week for a maximum of two hours, while New York allows its maximum-security offenders 365 days of visiting. While South Dakota allows only two people (plus family members) to be placed on an inmate's list of approved visitors, California allows inmates to list an unlimited number of visitors. It would be useful to know more about how these policies are developed and revised, both procedurally and substantively. What resources and which stakeholders are consulted when policy directives are drafted or updated? What prompts the issuance of new policies?

PART III: OVERNIGHT FAMILY VISITS AND VIRTUAL VISITATION

Two particular types of visitation stood out in our research as worthy of additional focus: overnight family visits and virtual visits. These forms of visitation are extremes – overnight family visits that allow for the most intimate of human contact, and virtual video visits that allow for secure visitation without contact and across great distances. Both kinds of visits are present in a minority of states. Overnight family visits have existed for approximately 100 years in at least one state, while virtual visitation only became technologically feasible in recent years. Yet both of these forms of visitation present opportunities and risks from the perspective of prison safety on the one hand, and the rights of inmates and their families on the other. In short, these cutting edge topics make for an excellent point of departure for the research that will hopefully flow from our dataset.

These subsections will describe the policies that currently exist, and then discuss some potential costs and benefits of each.

A. Overnight Family Visits

While most prisons limit visiting to specially designated rooms under close supervision by correctional officers, several states allow for overnight family visits. Specifically, the policy directives in six states (CA, CT, MS, NM, NY, WA)⁴⁹ allow for some sort of overnight family visit. Some other states, such as Colorado, Nebraska, and South Dakota, provide for extended family visitation in some facilities, even though this program is not mentioned explicitly in their policy directives or regulations. Others, such as Tennessee, allow for outdoor visits including cooking and picnicking in lower security classifications, or longer visits with family in

⁴⁹ See also Kacy E. Wiggum, *Defining Family in American Prisons*, 30 WOMEN'S RTS. L. REP. 357, 357 (2009).

supervised visitation rooms, but do not provide for overnight visiting. This section describes the range of policies in those few states that address the issue of overnight visiting in their policy directives, as well as the costs and benefits of these rare programs.

California's "Family Visitation" program is described in the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Code.⁵⁰ Participating correctional facilities allow for overnight visitation,⁵¹ and provide the inmates and their families with all the necessary accommodations, except for food, at no cost. Only those visitors meeting the statutory definition of "immediate family" are allowed to participate in the program.⁵² Inmates convicted of sex offenses or violent offenses involving minors are barred from participating in the program, as is a broader class of inmates with extremely long sentences (e.g. life without parole).

Connecticut's "Extended Family Visitation" program is described in the general visitation policy directive. The program is defined as "[a] prolonged visit between an inmate and specified immediate family member(s), and/or a legal guardian, in a designated secure area separate from the inmate population." All inmates wishing to participate in the program must be tested for tuberculosis and other unspecified contagious diseases. The policy directive does not provide many details but allows each facility offering the program to develop local rules.⁵³

Mississippi does not have a policy directive, but the DOC website briefly mentions "conjugal visitation" as being available only for married inmates. These visits are not referred to

⁵⁰ Title 15, § 3177

⁵¹ Note that the regulations do not stipulate the length of visits.

⁵² This definition includes domestic partners.

⁵³ Note that the CT DOC does not, in practice, currently have any facilities that allow for overnight visitation. *See supra* note 43.

either as a “program” or as having any relationship to “family.” This form of visitation has been in continual existence for nearly a hundred years.⁵⁴

New Mexico’s policy directive provides for “family visits” defined as “extended visit[s] between eligible inmates and their families where physical contact is allowed. Visits are conducted in the Family Visitation units,” and the DOC provides all of the necessary accommodations in mobile or modular homes. These visits are generally limited to spouses and children of inmates. The goal of the program is to “promote family stability, encourage participation in programming, and enhance the reintegration/rehabilitation process.”⁵⁵ The DOC charges a fee to defray all costs associated with the family visit.⁵⁶ Access to the program is limited by type of conviction, disciplinary status, and security classification. New Mexico has a detailed list of eligibility requirements that must be met prior to approval of a family visit and varying by the inmate’s sentence. For example, all inmates eligible for family visit must request, schedule, and receive a family visit counseling session with medical staff before the family visit is allowed to take place. Information about the inmates’ health may be communicated to his or her family prior to a family visit. In addition, inmates and their spouses are encouraged to use prophylactic devices when engaging in sexual activity, and condoms are available upon request.

⁵⁴ Christopher Hensley, Sandra Rutland & Phyllis Gray-Ray, *Inmate Attitudes Toward the Conjugal Visitation Program in Mississippi Prisons: An Exploratory Study*, 25 AM. J. CRIM. JUST. 137 (2000); COLUMBUS B. HOPPER, *SEX IN PRISON: THE MISSISSIPPI EXPERIMENT WITH CONJUGAL VISITING* (1969).

⁵⁵ Note that New Mexico has two directives on point: one is a general family visit program directive and the other is specific for female inmates. It appears from the language of the directives that there is a female specific program that is designed to allow children of female inmates to visit overnight though a program administered by a contractor. There is also a more general program – though it is unclear if this program is male only – that allows spouses, family, and children to visit overnight. While this gender distinction may accurately reflect the reality of who visits whom and which inmates are likely to be actively engaged in parenting from prison, the gender distinction also raises significant concerns. *Compare* N.M. Dep’t of Corr. Policy CD-100205 *with* N.M. Dep’t of Corr. Policy CD-100202.

⁵⁶ Fees range from \$10 to \$30.

The family visit program is highly structured and divided into three phases. Phase I consists of 6-hour family visits. Phase II consists of 12-hour family visits. Finally, Phase III consists of 24-hour family visits, but only those inmates who have successfully completed Phases I and II and are within one year of a projected release or discharge date may apply for Phase III visits.

New York's Family Reunion Program "is designed to provide approved inmates and their families the opportunity to meet for an extended period of time in privacy. The goal of the program is to preserve, enhance, and strengthen family ties that have been disrupted as a result of incarceration."⁵⁷ Only those inmates on good behavior and with active participation in prison programming will have access to the Family Reunion visits. Some prisoners may be denied the privilege of participating on the basis of their convictions or security statuses. Only immediate family members (including partners in same-sex marriages and civil unions) may visit, and they may only use the Family Reunion Program once they have "established a recent visiting pattern" in regular visiting rooms. The policy directive defines this as at least three regular visits over the preceding twelve months, although this requirement may be waived. The New York policy directive provides explanations of the program, including the application process, the punishment for violations (for example, testing positive for drug use), contagious disease testing and prevention, and the various forms used in administering the program.

Most of the state policy directives do not provide enough detail for a meaningful comparison of overnight family visitation programs. Without knowing how many individual prisons actually offer the overnight visitation programs within each state, and how many inmates are eligible, it is difficult even to compare the sizes of the programs. However, the relative rarity of these programs was, in itself, notable; we wondered why more overnight family visitation

⁵⁷ N.Y. Dep't of Corr. Policy 4500.

programs do not exist around the country. Family visitation programs could be costly, because they would require institutions to construct modular or mobile homes, and secure them within appropriate fencing or walls. Allowing inmates, some of whom may be violent offenders, to have unsupervised visits over extended periods of time may present certain risks, including the potential for physical violence and smuggling of contraband. Contagious diseases may be spread, and female inmates may become pregnant, increasing medical costs for the state.

On the other hand, those states that do have family visitation programs maintain them, and other states might consider making the investment, given their apparent positive impact on offender behavior. As far back as 1980, studies showed positive outcomes from participation in family visitation.⁵⁸ Participation in such programs could be a powerful incentive for good inmate behavior (if its revocation effectively disincentives inmate misconduct), and the strengthened family ties that result may ease the transition home upon release.⁵⁹ Allowing conjugal visitation may also decrease sexual violence within prisons.⁶⁰ Family members and children who visit and

⁵⁸ See, e.g., D. G. MACDONALD & D. KELLY, NAT'L INST. OF JUSTICE, FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF POST-RELEASE CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR OF PARTICIPANTS IN FAMILY REUNION PROGRAM 1 (1980) (finding that inmates who had participated in overnight visiting programs with their families were as much as 67 percent less likely to recidivate).

⁵⁹ Studies evaluating the impact of family connections on recidivism have consistently found a strong positive effect. See MINN. DEP'T OF CORR., THE EFFECTS OF PRISON VISITATION ON OFFENDER RECIDIVISM (2011) (noting that visits from former romantic partners were not, however, correlated with reduced recidivism), available at <http://www.doc.state.mn.us/publications/documents/11-11MNPrisonVisitationStudy.pdf>; see also NANCY G. LA VIGNE, CHRISTY VISHER & JENNIFER CASTRO, URBAN INSTITUTE, CHICAGO PRISONERS' EXPERIENCES RETURNING HOME 8-9 (2004), available at http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/311115_ChicagoPrisoners.pdf; MARTA NELSON, PERRY DEESS & CHARLOTTE ALLEN, VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE, THE FIRST MONTH OUT: POST- INCARCERATION EXPERIENCES IN NEW YORK CITY 8-13 (1999), available at http://www.vera.org/download?file=219/first_month_out.pdf; CHRISTY VISHER, VERA KACHNOWSKI, NANCY LA VIGNE & JEREMY TRAVIS, URBAN INSTITUTE, BALTIMORE PRISONERS' EXPERIENCES RETURNING HOME, available at http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310946_BaltimorePrisoners.pdf; William D. Bales & Daniel P. Mears, *Inmate Social Ties and the Transition to Society: Does Visitation Reduce Recidivism?*, 45 J. RES. CRIME & DELINQ. 287 (2008); Rebecca L. Naser & Christy Visher, *Family Members' Experiences with Incarceration and Reentry*, 7 W. CRIMINOLOGY REV. 20 (2006).

⁶⁰ See Stewart J. D'Alessio, Jamie Flexon & Lisa Stolzenberg, *The Effect of Conjugal Visitation on Sexual Violence in Prison*, AM. J. CRIM. JUST. (2012) (finding that after controlling for a variety of likely determinants of prison rape, the rate of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence was approximately four times lower – a statistically significant finding – in states with conjugal visitation programs than in those without), available at

are thus able to build and sustain more meaningful relationships with their incarcerated parent or family member may benefit tremendously. Indeed, more generally, the positive impact of visitation on visiting family and on inmates has been well documented.⁶¹ But to reap these benefits, DOCs must be willing to invest the resources to establish, maintain, and administer family visitation programs, and also to take on the liability that inevitably comes with extended, unsupervised visits.

Finally, political obstacles to developing family visitation programs in other states might include the difficulty of appropriating funds for prison programming, especially in times of widespread budget deficits. Overnight visitation programs may be particularly subject to attack as insufficiently punitive. Thus, before arguing for expansion into other jurisdictions, policy advocacy in this area may have to begin by justifying those programs that exist.

B. Virtual Visitation

Virtual visitation has been implemented in a limited number of states, either to enable visitation where long distance is a barrier or to enhance security where a contact visit presents safety concerns. Many inmates are incarcerated far away from friends and family; sheer distance

<http://www.prearesourcecenter.org/sites/default/files/library/theeffectofconjugalvisitation.pdf>; see also Rachel Wyatt, Note, *Male Rape in U.S. Prisons: Are Conjugal Visits the Answer?*, 37 CASE W. RES. J. INT'L L. 579 (2006).
⁶¹ See CHILDREN WITH PARENTS IN PRISON: CHILD WELFARE POLICY, PROGRAM, & PRACTICE ISSUES 13 (Cynthia Seymour & Creasia Finney Hairston eds., 2001); Denise Johnston, *Parent–Child Visitation in the Jail or Prison*, in CHILDREN OF INCARCERATED PARENTS (Katherine Gabel & Denise Johnston eds., 1995) 135; Joseph Murray & David P. Farrington, *The Effects of Parental Imprisonment on Children*, 37 CRIME & JUST. 133 (2008) (reviewing literature and citing studies); Christy Visher & Jeremy Travis, *Transitions from Prison to Community: Understanding Individual Pathways*, 29 ANN. REV. SOC. 89, 100 (2003); Note, *On Prisoners and Parenting: Preserving the Tie That Binds*, 87 YALE L.J. 1408 (1978) (arguing that facilitating child–parent bonds in the context of incarceration is in the interests of the children); see also STEVE CHRISTIAN, NAT'L CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES, CHILDREN OF INCARCERATED PARENTS 1, 13 (2009) (suggesting that visitation may be a crucial part of breaking intergenerational cycles of incarceration), available at http://www.cga.ct.gov/COC/PDFs/fatherhood/NCSL_ChildrenOfIncarceratedParents_0309.pdf.

serves as a major barrier to visitation.⁶² Some inmates are incarcerated out of state due to a lack of prison bed space or inadequate facilities for housing specific offenders, or because out-of-state facilities are more cost-effective than in-state facilities. Other inmates are housed within their home states, but still hundreds of miles from their homes (for example, New York City residents housed in upstate New York). From a security standpoint, in-person visitation presents a number of acknowledged concerns, among them the potential to exchange contraband or to engage in dangerous conduct.

These programs generally, although not always, charge inmates and their visitors money. DOCs may also pay to install and operate virtual visitation facilities, both in correctional institutions and in the centers where visitors come to use the system. In assessing the value of virtual visitation programs for inmates, visitors, and institutions, it will be important to compare the costs of these visits to each party to the costs of contact visits and phone calls.⁶³

In the last decade, several private vendors have developed technologies that facilitate virtual visits over web-based or closed-circuit cameras.⁶⁴ One company, JPay, has developed electronic kiosks installed in prison facilities that allow inmates to participate in video visits with

⁶² For example, sixty-two percent of parents in state correctional facilities and eighty-four percent of parents in federal facilities were incarcerated more than one hundred miles from their place of residence at arrest; only fifteen percent of parents in state facilities and about five percent of parents in the federal system were within fifty miles of their place of residence at arrest. SARAH SCHIRMER, ASHLEY NELLIS, & MARC MAUER, *THE SENTENCING PROJECT, INCARCERATED PARENTS AND THEIR CHILDREN: TRENDS 1991–2007*, at 8 (2009), available at http://www.sentencingproject.org/doc/publications/publications/inc_incarceratedparents.pdf. See also Susan D. Phillips, *Video Visits for Children Whose Parents Are Incarcerated: In Whose Best Interest?* (2012), available at http://www.sentencingproject.org/doc/publications/cc_video_visitation_white_paper.pdf.

⁶³ Phone calls from prisons are often very expensive, as a result of additional security technologies and because facility operators receive revenues from the phone companies that operate these systems. See Todd Shields, *Prison Phones Prove Captive Market for Private Equity*, BLOOMBERG, Oct. 4, 2012, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-10-04/prison-phones-prove-captive-market-for-private-equity.html>.

⁶⁴ In addition to JPay, Primonics, Inc. has created a “TeleCorrections” system to “reduce the need for physical visits” to jail facilities. See Press Release, Primonics, Westchester County Department of Corrections Selects Primonics’ Televisit Corrections Solution (Mar. 6, 2009) (promoting its product as cost-saving for Westchester County, New York’s jail system), http://www.corrections.com/vendor/show_press/15701.

friends and family using a personal computer. JPay advertises the service as “reduc[ing] traffic at the facilities and sav[ing] friends and family the cost of traveling to and from the facilities. Video visitation also facilitates a reduction in inmate movement; thereby increasing security within the facility.”⁶⁵ Private industry will likely play a continued role in promoting this form of visitation. Private vendors stand to gain from expanding their market. Companies like JPay will profit from installing access points for inmates, charging visitors and inmates for using the service, and potentially even from including advertising on the video feeds.⁶⁶

The oldest continually running virtual visitation program in the country is in Pennsylvania.⁶⁷ In 2001, with a federal grant,⁶⁸ the Pennsylvania DOC and the nonprofit Pennsylvania Prison Society entered a partnership to provide inmates at a handful of state prisons the opportunity to visit with their families in Philadelphia via videoconferencing.⁶⁹ The goal of the program is to maintain family ties.⁷⁰ The initial program received positive feedback from

⁶⁵ Lisa Chunovic, *KDOC Contracts for Inmate Banking, Electronic Messaging, Video Visitations*, GOV. SECURITY NEWS, Sept. 23, 2009,

http://www.gsnmagazine.com/article/19246/kdoc_contracts_inmate_banking_electronic_messaging.

⁶⁶ *Jail Selling Ad Space on Video Visitation Monitors*, NBC2, Oct. 7, 2009 (“A few months ago, the Charlotte County Jail added video visitation for inmates in a separate building so inmates can have video contact with their friends, loved ones, and professionals. Visitors are no longer allowed to go into the main jail building for visitations. Officials with the Bureau of Corrections say the video terminals offer the opportunity to place advertisements that will be seen by both inmates and visitors and say the idea may be the first in the whole country.”), <http://www.nbc-2.com/Global/story.asp?S=11267954> (last accessed Oct. 10, 2012).

⁶⁷ Predating the 2001 program, video conferencing for incarcerated inmates had “been used for inmates to attend court hearings, reducing the costs and risks of transporting inmates to court. Video conferencing has [also] been discussed for possible use during inmate medial examinations.” Melissa Crabbe, *Virtual Visitation Program Uses Video Conferencing to Strengthen Prisoner Contacts with Families and Children*, 6 OFFENDER PROGRAMS REP. 35 (2002). In Michigan, the Department of Corrections provided video visitation at no cost from 1998 to 1999, while the state temporarily housed prisoners in Virginia.

⁶⁸ *Id.* (noting that the “program is funded through a 3-year Federal grant through the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency”).

⁶⁹ Katy Califa, *Prisoners as Parents: The Importance of Strong Parent-Child Relationships During Parental Incarceration* 21, Stanford U. Criminal Just. Center Working Paper (2006), available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=977050.

⁷⁰ It appears that the program, while it still exists in a very similar form, is as of November 2011 no longer operated in partnership with the Pennsylvania Prison Society, “due to a lack of funding.” See *Virtual Visitation*, PA. PRISON SOC’Y (“Family Virtual Visitation’s goal was to help inmates incarcerated far from home stay connected to their

inmates and corrections officials.⁷¹ Today, the program has expanded from four prisons to eight prisons in Pennsylvania, one in Michigan, and one in Virginia.⁷² The program allows families “real time” visits with the inmate. Families can schedule a 55-minute visit once a month in the Prison Society’s Philadelphia office, where the Society provides family friendly rooms.⁷³ Visits cost \$20, effectively pricing out many prisoners and their families. According to the DOC policy directive, families can also schedule visits in the Pittsburgh area.⁷⁴

As we noted, seven jurisdictions provide for some form of video visitation in their policy directives or regulations (IN, MN, NM, OR, PA, VA, WI), while another eleven (AK, CO, FL, GA, ID, LA, MO, NJ, NY, OH, WA) have also implemented programs that are not mentioned in the policy directives.⁷⁵ Indiana and Wisconsin allow video visitation where the inmate is not permitted other forms of visitation. Wisconsin’s regulations provide that among the limitations that can be placed on visitation, “no contact visits or visitation provided by technological means not requiring direct personal contact, such as video connections” can be applied.⁷⁶ Indiana’s

families. Some family members cannot travel the long distance to prison locations due to their age, the cost of transportation, or disabilities. The virtual visits provided an opportunity for families who might not otherwise have a chance to see their loved ones at all. We believe that creating stronger links between families is important for the stability of the inmate’s family and his/her successful reentry into the community. Increasing the frequency of family visits helped support family relationships and improves the inmate’s ability to adjust to life in prison.”), http://www.prisonsociety.org/progs/ifs_fvv.shtml (last visited Oct. 10, 2012).

⁷¹ Crabbe, *supra* note 65 (“Participating in the virtual visitation program has been viewed as an effective inmate management tool. Better behavior from inmates involved in the program has been identified, as well as inmates providing positive feedback, indicating program success. However, the program has not come about without encountering obstacles, such as whether to allow program participation by sex offenders, and future funding. Part of the success of the program is that few, if any negative incidents have taken place in the first year of operation.”).

⁷² *Supra* note 68, *Virtual Visitation*, PA. PRISON SOC’Y.

⁷³ *Id.*

⁷⁴ Pa. Dep’t of Corr. Policy DC-ADM 812 §1-K (“Virtual Visitation”).

⁷⁵ Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Washington’s programs are not addressed in detail because they do not appear in the states’ policy directives. Washington plans to pilot a JPay program at its women’s prison in the imminent future. Note, too, that Michigan has used video conferencing technology for more than a decade to save on inmate transportation costs for doctor visits, parole hearings and so forth, but not for visiting. Patrick Doyle et al., *Prison Video Conferencing*, *supra* note 45.

⁷⁶ Wis. Adm. Code DOC § 309.08(3). Wisconsin also intends to create a program for tele-visits, with terminals at community sites, for visitors who would have to travel long distances.

policy directive has merged the two concepts of video visitation and “non-contact” visitation, so that video visitation is offered as an alternative to contact visits only where contact visits are prohibited.⁷⁷ Offenders in segregation may also have access to video visitation where restricted to “non-contact” visits. Indiana defines video visitation as a “method of visitation which allows offenders to visit through electronic media”⁷⁸ and does not specify whether a visitor can conduct her visit from home or is required to appear at a specific location. One provision does indicate that visitors could video-conference from outside a facility through vendors, where available:

Offenders who are placed on non-contact visitation may have the option of regular non-contact visits, intra-facility video visitation or video visitation through a vendor, if these options are available at the facility. There shall be no cost for intra-facility video visitation; however, there may be a cost associated with video visitation provided by a vendor.⁷⁹

Pennsylvania’s policy directive provides the most comprehensive explanation of any virtual visitation program:

1. Virtual Visitation shall be available at the facilities listed in the Virtual Visiting Program Facilities . . . and limited to persons living in the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh areas.
2. The Virtual Visitation Program uses video conferencing technology as a means to:
 - a. enhance the parenting skills program;
 - b. allow an inmate to visit with immediate family members, caregivers of the inmate’s children, and other individuals on the inmate’s approved visiting list approved by the Facility Manager/designee with whom he/she would otherwise not be able to visit;
 - c. increase the frequency of visits for an inmate with the individuals listed on the inmate’s approved visiting list; and
 - d. permit the scheduling of visits at times that are best for the individuals

⁷⁷ “The Department recognizes that in some cases, the visitation privilege can be abused or used for inappropriate purposes and for this reason the Department shall establish visitation guidelines. These guidelines may include the imposition of restrictions ranging from non-contact visits, including video visits, to not allowing certain persons to visit.” Ind. Dep’t of Corr. Policy & Admin. Proc. 02-01-102 §II (“Policy Statement”).

⁷⁸ *Id.* §III (“Definitions”).

⁷⁹ *Id.* §XVIII (“Bodily Contact Between Offenders and Visitors”). Message boards indicate that the vendor option may only be available in a handful of facilities. See *Video Visits*, JPAY FORUM, <http://forum.jpays.com/showthread.php?57-video-visits> (last visited Oct. 10, 2012) (last posting Aug. 24, 2009).

listed on the inmate's approved visiting list.

3. The cost to the inmate or his/her family participating in this program shall be determined by the Department.

4. Inmate participation in the Virtual Visitation Program is voluntary and every inmate in general population status, regardless of his/her custody level, is eligible. An inmate housed in Administrative and Disciplinary Custody is not permitted to participate in the Virtual Visitation Program. . . .

6. The Department shall attempt to reserve at least 10 percent of the Virtual Visitation Program visiting slots per month for long-term offender inmates. A long-term offender inmate is defined as having a minimum sentence of 10 or more years and an inmate serving a life sentence.

7. Up to five persons will be permitted to visit if space permits. . . .⁸⁰

New Mexico and Oregon follow the Pennsylvania model of affirmative forms of virtual visitation. New Mexico distinguishes between video visitation and tele-visits. A video visit is a limitation—a “non-contact visit using video cameras to permit visits between an inmate and any visitor”⁸¹ which is used within the prison “when a resident is not allowed to visit face-to-face.”⁸² Tele-visits are “[p]rearranged televised visits coordinated through [partner organization] PBJ Family Services, Inc. and the facility between inmates and their child/children from the facility to a community site. The visits are designed to promote healthy family relationships by reunifying and connecting children with their incarcerated parents.”⁸³ Inmates must meet certain criteria to be eligible for tele-visits and the “child/children participating in the visit must be relatives or the inmate must have been in a parenting relationship prior to the incarceration.”⁸⁴ Once inmates have met the eligibility requirements, New Mexico provides a detailed step-by-

⁸⁰ Pa. Dep't of Corr. Policy DC-ADM 812 §1-K (“Virtual Visitation”).

⁸¹ N.M. Dep't of Corr. Policy CD-100200, at 4.

⁸² N.M. DEP'T OF CORR., GUIDE FOR FAMILIES AND FRIENDS OF JUSTICE INVOLVED NEW MEXICANS 16, *available at* http://www.corrections.state.nm.us/family/docs/Offender_Family_Guidebook.pdf.

⁸³ N.M. Dep't of Corr. Policy CD-100200, at 4.

⁸⁴ N.M. Dep't of Corr. Policy CD-100204.

step process for arranging a tele-visit.⁸⁵ In a parallel manner, Oregon determined that the limitations caused by inclusion of video visiting within the visiting rule could be avoided if the chance to have visual and audio contact were open to all inmates through video interactive phones.” The decision to allow video interactive phones maintains security limits within the visiting rule while allowing contact with friends and family who may visit by computer from home.⁸⁶

According to the Virginia DOC website, it appears that Virginia has followed Pennsylvania’s model of partnering with nonprofits and establishing off-site visiting centers for visitors to log into the system.⁸⁷ Virginia’s program is now included in its DOC policy for those “selected facilities” where it is available.⁸⁸

As with any technological innovation, and any correctional policy judgment, video visitation has potential trade-offs. Among the salutary benefits, video visits can enhance access to visits for far-flung relatives and friends, young children who may be unable to comply with

⁸⁵ *Id.*

1. The facility coordinator will communicate with the designated contact staff at Peanut Butter and Jelly (PB & J) Family Services, Inc., to inform of the approval and the regional area where the child/children are located. The Tele-visit Application Form (CD-100204.1) indicating approval will be faxed to PB & J informing that the visit was approved at the facility level.
2. PB & J will contact the family and provide assistance in preparing the child/children for the visit, through support and therapy as needed. PB & J will inform the designated prison coordinator that the family has agreed to the visit and services.
3. PB & J will schedule the visit at the community site, make arrangements for transportation, and coordinate the time and date with the prison sponsor.
4. PB & J will provide ongoing support and therapy for the child/children following each of the visits. PB & J will coach inmate parents before and after the visit if needed.
5. Following each visit, PB & J staff will document an evaluation of the televised visit.
6. Prior to the actual visit, PB & J will conduct a tele-visit orientation with the inmate parent. The session will explain the program and process.
7. PB & J staff will conduct a group session yearly with the parent inmate for feedback and evaluation. The Corrections Family Services Liaison will coordinate this session.

⁸⁶ Or. Admin. Rule 291-127-0210. This program becomes active November 01, 2012.

⁸⁷ *Video Visitation Program*, VA. DEP’T OF CORR., <http://www.vadoc.state.va.us/offenders/prison-life/videoVisitation.shtm> (last accessed Oct. 10, 2012) (effective date Jan. 30, 2010).

⁸⁸ Va. Op. Proc. 851.1.IV.O.

prison visiting rules, and elderly and disabled visitors. Video visits can save the cost and time of travel for visitors, as well as reduce costs for prison facilities.⁸⁹ The possibility for the exchange of contraband is eliminated, and prisons reduce the movement of persons through their facilities. Visitors would not be subjected to intense processing and search procedures. Visitors, especially children, could choose to avoid the potential trauma and intimidation of entering a prison.⁹⁰

The flip side, however, is that video visitation could be used as an alternative or replacement for in-person visits. If video visitation is cheaper, easier, and safer, then prisons may begin to prefer this form of visitation, reducing or eliminating the availability of contact visits, and placing less of a priority on locating inmates in facilities near their families.⁹¹ Virtual visits that replace contact visits, even if potentially more frequent and less costly for visitors, might not serve as effectively to strengthen or maintain family ties and thereby reduce recidivism. Additionally, the loss of non-contact visits (which might be viewed as equivalent to telephone call privileges) may not provide as strong a disincentive to disciplinary infractions in the prison, thereby decreasing rather than increasing security in correctional facilities.⁹²

⁸⁹ Primonics, Inc. claimed the technology would save Westchester County \$300,000 by increasing the efficiency of visits. See Press Release, Primonics, *supra* note 62 (“County officers like bail expeditors and probation officers don’t have to visit the jail. It saves on the cost of transportation and of correction officers to take the prisoners in and out of the housing locations.”).

⁹⁰ As the Indiana Directive notes, “Facilities shall take into consideration the impact that visits with parents or grandparents in a correctional facility may have on young children, especially preschool age children.” Ind. Dep’t of Corr. Policy 02-01-102.IV.

⁹¹ This concern was raised by the *Washington Post*, in response to the decision to replace in-person visits at the D.C. jail with (free) virtual visits. Editorial, *Virtual Visits for Inmates?*, WASH. POST, July 26, 2012 (“While there may be benefits to video visitation, there are also significant drawbacks. In-person visits provide the obvious benefit of strengthening family ties in times that can threaten those bonds, and they do much to preserve inmates’ morale.”), http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/virtual-visits-for-inmates/2012/07/26/gJQAultJCX_story.html; see also Adeshina Emmanuel, *In-Person Visits Fade as Jails Set Up Video Units for Inmates and Families*, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 7, 2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/07/us/some-criticize-jails-as-they-move-to-video-visits.html>.

⁹² This point and the preceding one are necessarily speculative; because virtual visitation in prisons is a relatively new phenomenon, there has been no research evaluating its impact on family relationships and on inmate behavior – or assessing whether it in fact increases visitation rates, by how much, and for whom.

Virtual visitation in prisons is still an emergent concept. Advocates in Illinois have pushed for virtual visits;⁹³ Florida has experimented with it;⁹⁴ and Congress inserted it into a 2004 House bill, though it did not pass.⁹⁵ More generally, virtual visitation is a new concept in family law, where there is a relatively sparse literature analyzing virtual visitation in child custody disputes.⁹⁶ Undoubtedly, the technology will spread.

As virtual visitation expands, any jurisdiction seeking to implement such a program will have to consider several important factors: (1) how and where inmates will access the interface – in the yard, in a private booth, in a shared visiting room; (2) where visitors will access their interface – at the prison itself, at a partner organization, from their homes; (3) the degree to which video visits will be used to supplement or replace in-person visits; and (4) all of the related rules that accompany other forms of visitation—the degree of monitoring for the visits, eligibility to participate, sanctions for breaking the rules, the frequency and duration of visits, etc. These decisions will likely determine the contours of virtual visitation in a state or institution – how much it is used, by whom, and to what effect.

PART IV: FURTHER RESEARCH

Our fifty-one jurisdiction survey was a significant undertaking, but much work remains to be done. This final Part considers four categories of next steps: (1) further analysis of the

⁹³ Jeffrey M. Leving, *Illinois Virtual Visitation for Incarcerated Fathers*, FATHERS' RIGHTS, Apr. 1, 2009, <http://dadsrights.com/index.php/illinois-virtual-visitation-for-incarcerated-fathers/>.

⁹⁴ Califa, *supra* note 67, at 22.

⁹⁵ *Id.* at 23 n.3. The 2004 Re-Entry Enhancement Act, H.R. 5075, 108th Congress § 101(a)(17) (2004) was proposed, but not passed, by Congress. The bill generally supported enhanced visitation opportunities, including “developing programs and activities that support parent-child relationships, such as . . . (B) using videoconferencing to allow virtual visitation when incarcerated persons are more than 100 miles from their families”). The proposed Act also promoted family visits of the sort discussed in our previous sub-part.

⁹⁶ See, e.g., Charles P. Kindregan, Jr., *Family Interests in Competition: Relocation and Visitation*, 36 SUFFOLK U. L. REV. 31 (2003); Anne LeVasseur, Note, *Virtual Visitation: How Will Courts Respond to a New and Emerging Issue*, 17 QUINNIPIAC PROB. L.J. 362 (2004).

information already available to us; (2) relating the data we have gathered to existing indicators of correctional success or failure; (3) gathering of additional information to add depth and breadth to our survey; and (4) presentation of these findings in accessible formats.

First, the areas detailed *supra* in Part III – extended family visitation and virtual visitation – as well as other topics in the accompanying spreadsheet, such as grievance procedures and limitations on numbers of visitors or hours of visitation, warrant more detailed treatment. As an example, additional research might track language in regulations referring to children (or to gender, marital status, or any number of other variables) and analyze the ways in which children (or males/females, or married/unmarried persons) are specially privileged or burdened in the context of prison visitation. Another analysis might scrutinize the various ways that visitation policies define “family,” where family members are granted special privileges. For example, which states recognize civil unions as equivalent to marriages for the purposes of visitation? Further analysis might likewise focus on the category of “special visits” by attorneys, clergy, and child welfare officials bringing children in their charge to see a parent. These arrangements tend to be subject to their own particular rules, and many of states have detailed provisions on point. With the wealth of information in our spreadsheet and database, there are numerous other topics that could be worth pursuing.

Second, it could be valuable to combine the data we have gathered about visitation policies with data about correctional outcomes, such as recidivism rates and institutional security, to learn about correlations between certain visitation policies and better or worse correctional outcomes. These correlations could then in turn prompt research to better understand

whether and how overall rates of visitation and specific features of visitation systems contributed to or detracted from the correctional mission of security and rehabilitation.⁹⁷

Third, gathering more information could substantially enhance the value of our data for scholars, policymakers, and practitioners. Specifically, as we discussed, it would be useful to get more information on how visitation policies operate at the level of individual institutions. The administrator of each facility has substantial discretion to implement policies, and hence there is an inevitable gap between policies on paper and in practice. Similarly, it would be useful to look into the legislative or regulatory process used in each jurisdiction to develop the regulations or policy directives currently on the books. In addition, other studies could adopt a broader scope by looking at visitation policies in detention facilities not covered by this data set, including jails and immigration detention centers.

Fourth, it would be valuable to present the information we have gathered in a format that is accessible not only those who make and study visitation regulations, but also to those whose interpersonal relationships are so profoundly affected by them: inmates and their families and friends. Ensuring that prisoners and prison visitors can easily access clear and comprehensive information about the rules governing their visits would allow them to maximize contact with loved ones and avoid frustration, and promote institutional security through compliance. Discretion will always be a necessary feature of visitation management, but making visitation policies and their implementation in practice more transparent might even create opportunities for those who participate in the visitation process to work with correctional administrators to improve it.

In conducting the first fifty state survey of prison visitation regulations, we have likely raised more questions than we answered. This report offers a sense of the policy landscape, and

⁹⁷ See, e.g., MINN. DEP'T OF CORR., *supra* note 57.

through further work on our part and the part of other researchers, we aim to better understand the ways these policies work in practice and impact specific groups of inmates and their families and friends. We hope, too, that this research will offer correctional administrators the tools to consider their own and other states' approaches and develop best practices.

Accessing Visiting Policies Online			Written Visiting Policies			Tone of Policies		Basic Limitations			
Department of Corrections (DOC) Website	Any Policies on DOC Website?	Visiting Policies on DOC Website?	URL for Policies on Website	Has a Visiting Regulation Available on Website?	Has a Policy Directive from DOC?	Has a Visitor's Handbook or Plain English Instructions?	Date of most recent source document	Promotes / Encourages visitation in policy documents?	Limits number of visitors on approved list?	Sets a floor for minimum visitation hours/days?	
Alabama	Yes	No	http://www.doc.state.al.us/adminrags.asp	No	Yes	Information about sending Packages and Mail, not Visiting	2009	"It is the policy of the AD/OC to afford inmates the privilege of participating in the visitation program in accordance with this regulation."	Yes 8. Can change list only every six months. Ala. Admn. Reg. 303, "Visitation," at VB (2006) Specifies gender/relationship status of allowed visitors. <i>Id.</i> at VB.6.	No Visitors can only be on one inmate's visitation list unless family. <i>Id.</i> at VB.12.	Ala. Admn. Reg. 303, "Visitation," at VJ.1 (2006)
Alaska	Yes	Yes	http://www.doc.state.ak.us/corrections/commis/hs/statutes/hsf/policies&procedures: http://www.corrections.gov/policies/psppoll/ices/hsf	Yes	Yes	Information about sending Packages and Mail, not Visiting	2010	"The Department encourages prisoner visitation because strong family and community ties increase the likelihood of a prisoner's success after release. Visitation is subject only to the limitations in this policy and as necessary to protect persons and maintain order and security in the institution."	No	Alaska Dept' Corr. Policy 810.02 VII A.	Alaska Dept' Corr. Policy 810.02 VII B.1 (e).
Arizona	Yes	Yes	http://www.arizona.gov/corrections/policies/90000911.pdf	No	Yes	Information about sending Packages and Mail, not Visiting	2012	"The Department encourages prisoner visitation because strong family and community ties increase the likelihood of a prisoner's success after release. Visitation is subject only to the limitations in this policy and as necessary to protect persons and maintain order and security in the institution."	Yes 20	Ariz. Dept of Corr. Policy 911.01.1.1.1.	No

		Special Visiting Provision		Specific Procedures		Specific Rules		
	Contains provision for long-distance visitors ("Special visitors"?)	Contains provision for overnight visiting (referred to as family reunion / extended / conjugal visiting)?	Contains provisions for video visitation?	Contains provisions for grievance procedures for when visitation is suspended?	Specifies search procedures for visitors?	Limits visitors based on security classifications?	Has child-specific rules?	Note for reader
Alabama	Yes Once per six months for out of state family. Ala. Admin. Reg. 303. "Visitation," at V.B.13.(2006).	No	No But does exist only for inmates at contract facility in Hudson, Colo. Service offered by contractor and by Inmate Chief's Conference. See http://www.correct.state.ak.us/corrections/institutions/images/HudsonVideoVisitation.pdf	Yes Write the warden. Ala. Admin. Reg. 303. "Visitation," at V.N.9.(2006).	Yes Ala. Admin. Reg. 303. "Visitation," at VI.1.(2006).	No	Yes Children defined as "Anyone under 19/moreteen years of age." Ala. Admin. Reg. 303. "Visitation," at III.B.(2006). "Visitors who bring minor children to visit will be expected to control the behavior of the children so that they do not interrupt other visitors."	
Alaska	Yes "The Superintendent may authorize extended visits for situations such as families traveling long distances or for professionals requiring extended hours of contact."	No	No But does exist only for inmates at contract facility in Hudson, Colo. Service offered by contractor and by Inmate Chief's Conference. See http://www.correct.state.ak.us/corrections/institutions/images/HudsonVideoVisitation.pdf	Yes "A prisoner may file a grievance concerning the denial or restriction of visitation directly to the Director of Institutions through the facility Grievance Coordinator. See policy #808.03. Prisoner Grievances." Alaska Dept' Corr. Policy: 810.02 VII.D.4.	Yes Alaska Dept' Corr. Policy: 810.02 VII.E.5.	No	Yes "Maximum Custody Inmates - Maximum custody inmates shall be allowed to visit a maximum of one 2-hour block per week. Visitation shall be by appointment only. All maximum custody inmates shall be for one block, and is always non-contact, regardless of what phase the inmate is in." Alaska Dept' Corr. Policy: 810.02 VIII.	
Arizona	Yes Ariz. Dept of Corr. Policy 911.05.	No	No	Yes "The visitor may submit a written statement to the Warden or unit Deputy Warden for review within five work days of the incident." "After reviewing all available information, the Warden or Deputy Warden shall determine appropriate action based on the specific circumstance and/or types of contraband detected." "Visitor appeals relating to visitation suspensions shall be addressed to, reviewed by, and decided by the Warden and not a designee. The Warden shall forward the appeal to the appropriate Regional Operations Director for review. The Regional Operations Director's decision is final." "Inmate visitation suspensions may be addressed through the inmate disciplinary system. Inmate appeals involving visitation suspensions may be addressed through the inmate disciplinary system appeals process." Ariz. Dept of Corr. Policy 911.06.	Yes "All visitors and their possessions are subject to physical search by staff, electronic metal detection devices, barrier staff screening (Sarcofucs Detection) by a Department Service Dog, and/or Ion Scanning." "All vehicles on Department property are subject to search. The owner/user shall be present during the search." Ariz. Dept of Corr. Policy 911.03.	No	No Greater privileges for lower custody & various "phases." Ariz. Dept of Corr. Policy 911.08.	

Accessing Visiting Policies Online				Written Visiting Policies			Tone of Policies		Basic Limitations	
Department of Corrections (DOC) Website	Any Policies on DOC Website?	Visiting Policy on DOC Website?	URL for Policies on Website	Has a Visiting Regulation Available on Website?	Has a Policy Directive from DOC?	Has a Visitor's Handbook or Plain English Instructions?	Date of most recent source document	Promotes / Encourages visitation in policy documents?	Limits number of visitors on approved list?	Sets a floor for minimum visitation hours/days?
http://www.adc.arkansas.gov/	Yes	Yes	http://adc.arkansas.gov/resources/Documents/adc_r.pdf/AR865.pdf/004.00.2.865	Ark. Admin. Code 004.00.2.865	Yes	Yes	2011	Notes that visitation "is essential to maintaining good morale, sustaining family life and ensuring relationship in the community upon release." Yes Ark. Dept of Corr Policy 11-49 II	Ark. Dept of Corr Policy 11-49 III A.9 20 Yes If a visitor is removed from list, must wait 6 months to be placed on any other inmate visitor list	Ark. Dept of Corr Policy 11-49 III C. Saturdays and Sundays from Noon until 4 p.m., depending on security level!
http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/	Yes	Yes	http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/R-regulations/index.html	CA Code of Reg Title 15, Art. 7, Visiting	Operations Manual, Ch 5, Art. 42, Visiting	Yes	2011	"The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) encourage inmates to develop and maintain healthy family and community relationships. " It is a privilege for inmates to have personal contact visits while confined in CDCR institutions and facilities. Visiting in CDCR institutions and facilities shall be conducted in as accommodating a manner as possible in keeping with the need to maintain order, the safety of persons, the security of the institution/facility, and the requirements of prison activities and operations." Op. Man. 54020.1 Yes	Affirmative ban on limiting the number of visitors. Op. Man. 54020.18 No	"Each institution/facility shall establish a schedule that provides a minimum of 12 visiting hours per week." Op. Man. 54020.7 Yes
http://www.doc.state.co.us/	Yes	Yes	http://www.doc.state.co.us/visitations/visiting-policies	No (but see 8 Colo. Code Reg. 1303)	Yes	No	2009	"[P]romotes the furtherance of family and other supporting relationships important to offender stability while incarcerated, as well as upon release, while foremost maintaining the security and integrity of the facility." Colo. Admin. Reg. 300.01.1 & II. <i>But see id.</i> at IV.A.1. Yes	Colo. Admin. Reg. 300.01.1V.B.1 12, minor children must be named on the visitor application but do not count towards this cap. No	No

Accessing Visiting Policies Online				Written Visiting Policies			Tone of Policies		Basic Limitations	
Department of Corrections (DOC) Website	Any Policies on DOC Website?	Visiting Policies on DOC Website?	URL for Policies on Website	Has a Visiting Regulation Available on Website?	Has a Policy Directive from DOC?	Has a Visitor's Handbook or Plain English Instructions?	Date of most recent source document	Promotes / Encourages visitation in policy documents?	Limits number of visitors on approved list?	Sets a floor for minimum visitation hours/days?
Connecticut http://www.ct.gov/doc/site/default.asp	Yes	Yes	http://www.ct.gov/doc/cwp/view.asp?Q=1492&QID=450576&docNav=18	No <i>but see</i> Conn. Agencies Regs. Title 18.	Yes	Yes	2009	No	Conn. Dept of Corr. Policy 10.6.4.B.	Comm. Dept of Corr. Policy 10.6.6.B. At least one (1) evening visit weekly; 2. Weekend visits; and, 3. Visits of at least one (1) hour in duration. Inmates shall normally be allowed a minimum of two regular visits each week.
Delaware http://www.delaware.gov/doc	Yes	No	http://doc.delaware.gov/information/DOC_Policy_Manual.shtml	No	Yes	Yes	2001	No	No	Del. Dept. of Corr. Pol. 5.2, at I.V.A. G(2001). Visits are by appointment only. Visiting hours range from one 45 minute visit per month to 1.5 hours per week.
Florida http://www.doc.state.fl.us/	Yes	Yes	http://www.doc.state.fl.us/secretary/legal/ch33/index.html	No <i>but see</i> Fla. Admin. Code Title 33, Chptr. 33-5.	No	No	2010	No	Fla. Admin. Code 33-601.7(6)(3) (2005).	Yes Visits allowed between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. each Saturday and Sunday. Fla. Admin. Code Ann. r.33-601.722 (2005).
Georgia http://www.docor.state.ga.us/famil/famInfoFriends.html	Yes	Yes	http://www.docor.state.ga.us/famil/famInfoFriends.html	Yes (Georgia Admin. Code, Title 125, Chptr. 125-3-4, Visitation)	Yes	Yes	2006	Yes "Provide visiting programs that are conducive to the establishment and maintenance of positive relationships with family and Significant Others. Visitation is a privilege for inmates and should not be considered a right."	Ga. Dept of Corr. Policy II801-0005.VI.D.1. Ga. Dept of Corr. Policy II801-0005.VI.D.1.	Ga. Dept of Corr. Policy II801-0005.VI.C.1. A minimum of 6 hours shall be allowed each day for visitation periods on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.

	Special Visiting Provision	Specific Procedures	Specific Rules	Notes for reader				
	Contains provision for long-distance visitors ("special visitors")?	Contains provision for overnight visiting (referred to as family reunion / extended / conjugal visiting)?	Contains provisions for video visitation?	Contains provisions for grievance procedures for when visitation is suspended?	Specifies search procedures for visitors?	Limits visitors based on security classifications?	Has child-specific rules?	
	Yes	Extended Family Visit A prolonged visit between an inmate and specified immediate family member(s), and/or a legal guardian, in a designated secure area separate from the inmate population.	No	See Conn. Dept of Corr. Policy 10.6.4.A.6	Yes Criminal background check may be required. Del. Dept. of Corr. Pol. 8.48, at VI.B (2011). Various clothing requirements (e.g. no tight clothing) specified.	Yes Limits the number based on level of facility.	Yes Scattered references.	
Connecticut	Comm. Dept of Corr. Policy 10.6.5.A. For out-of-state one-time visitors. Yes	Comm. Dept of Corr. Policy 10.6.5.E. Not currently offering conjugal visits in any state facilities.	No	See Conn. Dept of Corr. Policy 10.6.4.A.6	Comm. Dept of Corr. Policy 10.6.6.G. Yes	Comm. Dept of Corr. Policy 10.6.6.K. Yes	Yes	
Delaware	Yes For visitors living more than 100 miles away. Del. Dept of Corr. Pol. 5.2, at IV.Q (2001)	No	No	No	Del. Dept of Corr. Pol. 5.2, at IV.E, T (2001). Yes	Del. Dept of Corr. Pol. 5.2, at IV.C, D, F (2001). Yes	Del. Dept. of Corr. Pol. 5.2, at IV.C, D, F (2001). Yes	
Florida	May allow additional visiting hours based on such factors as great travel distance or infrequency of visits. Yes See also Fla. Admin. Code Ann. r.33-601.736 (2005).	No	But does exist. See Patrick Doyle, et al., Prison Video Conferencing, Vermont Legislative Research Service 3, May 15, 2011	Fla. Admin. Code Ann. r.33-601.732(5) (2005).	Yes Fla. Admin. Code Ann. r.33-601.726, (2005).	No	Visit Subject to termination if child misbehaves. Fla. Admin. Code Ann. r.33-601.727 (2005).	
Georgia	Yes See Ga. Dept of Corr. Policy IIB01-0005 VI.C.5.	Family programming exists through the Children's Center in the women's prison, but no overnight visitation occurs.	No	No	Yes See Ga. Dept of Corr. Policy IIB01-0005 VI.J.	No	Visitors are responsible for keeping children under their control. Ga. Dept of Corr. Policy IIB01-0005 VI.O.6.	

Accessing Visiting Policies Online				Written Visiting Policies			Tone of Policies		Basic Limitations	
Department of Corrections (DOC) Website	Any Policies on DOC Website?	Visiting Policies on DOC Website?	URL for Policies on Website	Has a Visiting Regulation Available on Website?	Has a Policy Directive from DOC?	Has a Visitor's Handbook or Plain English Instructions?	Date of most recent source document	Promotes / Encourages visitation in policy documents?	Limits number of visitors on approved list?	Sets a floor for minimum visitation hours/days?
	Yes	Yes	http://hawaii.gov/psd/policies-and-procedures/P4P3-COR-3-P-%2013b6%20-%2020/Contents-3-COR/COR%20P-%2013b6%20-%2020/Contents%20-%202009.html?search=Rules, Title 23, Subtitle 2, Chpt 100	Yes Code of Hawaii Rules, Title 23, Subtitle 2, Chpt 100	Yes	No	2010	Yes Haw. Dept of Pub Safety Policy COR 1.5.04.3.0 Privilege not a right, but "visitation is integral to the correctional and rehabilitative process of inmates."	No	No
	Yes	Yes	http://www.cor.idaho.gov/psd/policies.htm	Yes Idaho Admin. Code, Chpt 01.604	Yes	Yes	2009	Yes "The Idaho Department of Correction (IDOC) encourages visitation between offenders and their friends and family. Visitation is important for offenders to maintain relationships and contact with the outside world."	No	No
	Yes	Yes	http://www.idoc.state.il.us/subsections/visitation/visdefault.shtml	Yes Ill. Admin. Code, Title 20, Part 525.20	No	No	2003	No Yes "Encourage offender communication and contact with family and friends. . . . [T]he majority of offenders will be released into the community and that the offender's eventual reintegration will be more effective if a visitation program permits the maintenance of social relationships. In addition to traditional forms of visitation (contact and non-contact), alternative methods of visitation may be made available to help facilitate persons unable to travel to facilities."	No	"Each correctional facility shall establish regular visiting hours." Ill. Admin. Code tit. 20, § 525.20(a), "Visiting Privileges."
	Yes	Yes	http://www.in.gov/idoce/	No	Yes	Yes	2009	Yes Ind. Dept of Corr. Policy 02-01-102. II. "It is the policy of the IDOC to allow offenders, including violator program offenders, visiting privileges to maintain and strengthen relationships with family members and friends."	Yes 4 plus family and children	No
	Yes	Yes	http://www.doc.state.iowa.us/visitinghours.asp	Yes Iowa Admin. Code, Agency 201, Chpt 20.3(904)	Yes	No	2010	Yes Iowa Dept of Corr Policy 3 at II.	Yes 4 plus family and children	No

	Special Visiting Provision	Specific Procedures	Specific Rules	Notes for Reader				
	Contains provision for long-distance visitors ("Special visitors")?	Contains provision for overnight visiting (referred to as family reunion / extended / conjugal visiting)?	Contains provisions for video visitation?	Contains provisions for grievance procedures for when visitation is suspended?	Specifies search procedures for visitors?	Limits visitors based on security classifications?	Has child-specific rules?	Notes for Reader
Hawaii	Where not on the same island. Haw. Dept of Pub. Safety Policy COR 15.04.3.2. Yes	No	No	No	See Haw. Dept of Pub. Safety Policy COR 15.04.3.9	No	Yes See Haw. Dept of Pub. Safety Policy COR 15.04.3.8	
Idaho	Normally limited to immediate family members who have traveled a distance and time does not permit normal processing of the visiting application. Idaho Dept of Corr. Policy 604.02.01.001.22. No	No	No	If denied, and the offender is immediate family, recopies in 90 days or files an appeal. If denied, and the offender is not immediate family, recopies one (1) year. Decision cannot be appealed. Yes	See Idaho Dept of Corr. Policy 604.02.01.001, at Table 151. Yes	No	Yes See Idaho Dept of Corr. Policy 604.02.01.001.6.	
Illinois	Ill. Admin. Code tit. 20, § 525.20(a)(2), "Visiting Privileges." Yes	No	No	No	Visitors shall be subject to search in accordance with Ill. Admin. Code tit. 20, § 501.220. Yes	No	Ill. Admin. Code tit. 20, § 525.20(b)(2) Yes Depending on age, children must be accompanied by an approved visitor and have the written consent of a parent or guardian, unless waiver granted. There is also an agency administrative directive, and each facility has an institutional directive.	
Indiana	Ind Dept of Corr. Policy 02-01-102.XIV. Yes	No	Only as punishment where inmate not allowed non-contact or contact visits. Yes	See Ind Dept of Corr. Policy 02-01-102.XVI. Yes	Ind Dept of Corr. Policy 02-01-102.XIII. Includes possibility of frisk search, metal detectors and ion scanning equipment, and trained K-9s. Yes	No	Restrictions on visits with minors. Ind. Dept of Corr. Policy 02-01-102.XX. Yes	
Iowa	Iowa Dept of Corr. Policy 3 at IV.J. Yes	No	No	Iowa Dept of Corr. Policy 3 at IVD. Applicant can appeal denial of visit or restriction within 45 days. Yes	No	No	No	

Accessing Visiting Policies Online				Written Visiting Policies			Tone of Policies		Basic Limitations	
Department of Corrections (DOC) Website	Any Policies on DOC Website?	Visiting Policy on DOC Website?	URL for Policies on Website	Has a Visiting Regulation Available on Website?	Has a Policy Directive from DOC?	Has a Visitor's Handbook or Plain English Instructions?	Date of most recent source document	Promotes / Encourages visitation in policy documents?	Limits number of visitors on approved list?	Sets a floor for minimum visitation hours/days?
Kansas	Yes	Yes	http://www.doc.kansas.gov/doc-policies/imp/73-search.htm#MPP104	Yes Kansas Admin. Regulations, 44-7-	Yes	Yes	2009	No	Kan. Dept of Corr. Policy 10-113.	Minimum of four (4) hours per week of visiting for all inmates in the general population.
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	http://www.corrections.ky.gov/communications/20Jan%20Police%20directs/Pages/default.aspx	Yes Kentucky Admin. Regulations, Title 501, Chpt 3.140	Yes	No	2012	No	Ky. Corr. Policy 16.1.H.D	Minimum of eight (8) hours per month.
Louisiana	No	No	http://www.doc.louisiana.gov	Yes La. Admin Code Title 22, Sec 316	Yes	Yes	2009	Yes "The department recognizes the importance of visitation in the maintenance of an offender's family ties; visitation is an integral component of institutional management. ... Visiting can improve public safety and encourage offender accountability. Authorized visitation is permitted by the department to facilitate an offender's institutional adjustment in accordance with the department's goals and mission."	Yes 10 L.A. Dept Pub. Saf. & Corr. Policy C-02-008.7.C.	Yes Two visits per month per visitor Two hour visit is "optimum."

	Special Visiting Provision			Specific Procedures		Specific Rules		
	Contains provision for long-distance visitors ("special visitors")?	Contains provision for overnight visiting (referred to as family reunion / extended / conjugal visiting)?	Contains provisions for video visitation?	Contains provisions for grievance procedures for when visitation is suspended?	Specifies search procedures for visitors?	Limits visitors based on security classifications?	Has child-specific rules?	Notes for reader
	Yes 1. Requests for a single visit prior to background verification and approval of subsequent visits; 2. When the visitor has traveled a distance of 150 miles (one way) or more, or (ACI 3-4442) 3. When the special visit is in the best interest of the inmate's rehabilitative needs or other correctional goals.				Yes			
Kansas	Yes Factors include: Distance the visitor travels; Frequency of visits for a particular inmate; Health problems of an inmate or visitor; or A visit for business purposes if a decision is needed that substantially affects the assets or prospects of a business or property.	No	No	No	Yes Kan. Dept of Corr. Policy 10-113.VIII.B.	No	No	Defines "immediate family" broadly to include "those who may reared the inmate in place of parents" and "a child to whom the inmate, although not a natural parent, acted as a parent." Ky. Cor. Policy 16.11.
Kentucky	Yes Ky. Cor. Policy 16.11.C.3	No	No	No The Warden or designee shall notify the visitor in writing that he has been removed from all applicable visiting lists, the reason why and that the removal will be reviewed after a specified amount of time. The visitor shall also be notified in writing that he may appeal the Warden's decision to the Secretary by sending a letter within 15 days of the date of the notice. If the visitor exercises this appeal right, the Secretary or designee shall review the appeal and investigate, as appropriate, within 30 days of notice. If necessary, a hearing shall be scheduled and the visitor shall be notified of the time, date and location of the hearing.	No	No	Yes L.A. Dept Pub. Saf. & Corr. Policy C-02-008.12.1(1)-(4) L.A. Dept Pub. Saf. & Corr. Policy C-02-008 Attachment	
Louisiana	Yes L.A. Dept Pub. Saf. & Corr. Policy C-02-008.7.N	No	Though Louisiana reported a program that does not appear in its directive explicitly, but is included under special visitation.	Yes See La. Admin Code, tit 22, pt. L, § 303; L.A. Dept Pub. Saf. & Corr. Policy C-02-008 Attachment	No	Yes L.A. Dept Pub. Saf. & Corr. Policy C-02-008 Attachment	Minors must be accompanied by parents or legal guardians in all times. Adults are responsible for behavior of children.	

	Special Visiting Provision	Specific Procedures	Specific Rules	Notes for reader				
	Contains provision for long-distance visitors ("special visitors")?	Contains provision for overnight visiting (referred to as family reunion / extended / conjugal visiting)?	Contains provisions for video visitation?	Contains provisions for grievance procedures for when visitation is suspended?	Specifies search procedures for visitors?	Limits visitors based on security classifications?	Has child-specific rules?	
	Yes	No	No	Any suspension of the prisoner's visiting privileges may be imposed only by the Chief Administrative Officer and only with the approval of the Commissioner of Corrections. The suspension may last only as long as necessary to resolve the risk to safety, security, or orderly management. A suspension of the prisoner's visiting privileges shall not be imposed in any case in which a restriction of visiting privileges, such as a requirement of non-contact visitation, would be sufficient to address the risk.	The prisoner shall be notified in writing of a suspension or restriction of visiting privileges, whether imposed on the prisoner or the visitor. A prisoner may use the grievance process to grieve a decision to terminate a visit or to deny, suspend or restrict visiting privileges. A visitor may contest a denial, suspension or restriction of visiting privileges by writing to the Chief Administrative Officer, or designee, within seven (7) business days of written notification.	No	Each facility shall ensure that minors are permitted to visit prisoners. . . .	Yes
Maine	In extenuating circumstances, e.g., visit from out of state. Me. Dept of Corr. Policy 21.4.VI.A.9.	No	No	Me. Dept of Corr. Policy 21.4.VI.G.	No	No	Me. Dept of Corr. Policy 21.4.VI.H.	
	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Each facility shall ensure that minors are permitted to visit prisoners. . . .	
	Where travel one way is greater than 200 miles, etc. Md. Div. of Corr. Policy 195.0001.05.T.	No	No	Md. Div. of Corr. Policy 195.0001.05.W.X.	Code of Md. Reg. 12.02.16.06 Visitor Searches. See also Md. Div. of Corr. Policy 195.0001.051.J. K. V.	No	If space is available may provide facilities for children visitors. Md. Div. of Corr. Policy 195.0001.05.E.7.	
Maryland	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
	Special accommodations, which vary by facility, are available for visitors travelling long distances.	No	No	Visitor's may contest restrictions in a letter within 15 days 103 CMR 483.16(6)	Yes See 103 CMR 483.14	Depends on the particular institution.	Requires consent forms for visiting minors unaccompanied by parents. There are specific clothing exclusions and allowable items for children and infants, and each visiting room has a children's area.	
Massachusetts	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Depends on the particular institution.	Requires consent forms for visiting minors unaccompanied by parents. There are specific clothing exclusions and allowable items for children and infants, and each visiting room has a children's area.	
	Termination of visits due to overcrowding does not apply to visitors who have traveled over 400 miles round trip.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Depends on the particular institution.	Requires consent forms for visiting minors unaccompanied by parents. There are specific clothing exclusions and allowable items for children and infants, and each visiting room has a children's area.	
Michigan	Mich. Dept of Corr. Policy 5.03.140.II.H	No	No	See Mich. Dept. of Corr. Policy 5.03.140. (scattered provisions including I., II., XX)	No	No	No	

	Special Visiting Provision	Specific Procedures	Specific Rules	Notes for reader				
	Contains provision for long-distance visitors ("special visitors")?	Contains provision for overnight visiting (referred to as family reunion / extended / conjugal visiting)?	Contains provisions for video visitation?	Contains provisions for grievance procedures for when visitation is suspended?	Specifies search procedures for visitors?	Limits visitors based on security classifications?	Has child-specific rules?	Notes for reader
	Yes May request an extension of visiting time when there are special circumstances or the visitor has driven more than 100 miles to visit.	No	Yes Denial of visiting privileges may be appealed in writing within 15 days of an official written decision to the warden or designee, who will render a decision within 5 days from the receipt of the appeal.	Yes Levels 5 and 4: 16 hours per month Level 3: 24 hours per month Levels 2 and 1: 36 hours per month	Yes Minors can visit only if accompanied by a parent or guardian or another adult they authorize. There are additional restrictions on visitation within inmates who have abused children in the past.	Offenders who have immediate family incarcerated at the same facility will be allowed to visit each other two (2) times per year (January and July).		
Minnesota	Min. Dept of Corr. Policy 302.100 A.1. G.	No	Min. Dept of Corr. Policy 302.100OPH.	Min. Dept of Corr. Policy 302.100 F.	Min. Dept of Corr. Policy 302.100 D.	Min. Dept of Corr. Policy 302.100 A.1.	Min. Dept of Corr. Policy 302.100 B.2.	
Mississippi	Miss. Dept of Corr. Policy 31-03-01 at 506	Yes Congregal visit/extended family visit, but not available for inmates married to other inmates after 1999. Ten dollar per night fee. Maximum of 5 nights every three months. Spouses of inmates with STD's may be prohibited.	No	No	Miss. Dept of Corr. Policy 31-03-01 at 99-100, 634-82, 745-47, 773	See Miss. Dept of Corr. Policy 31-03-01 at 453-505	Miss. Dept of Corr. Policy 31-03-01 at 261-263, 288.	Miss. Dept of Corr. Policy 31-03-01 at 597-598.
Missouri	Yes "Food visits" as an incentive for good behavior Mo. Dept of Corr. Policy IS13-3.1.III.K.3. Various kinds of special visits (military leave, long distance travel, terminal illness, etc.) Mo. Dept of Corr. Policy IS13-3.1.III.S.	No	No But does exist. See Patrick Doyle, et al. Prison Video Conferencing, Vermont Legislative Research Service 3, May 15, 2011	No A visitor may appeal visiting restrictions or suspension of visiting privileges to the appropriate deputy division director in Central Office. May also reapply after one year. Yes Mo. Dept of Corr. Policy IS13-3.1.III.L.11. See also Mo. Dept of Corr. Policy IS13-3.1.III.R (termination of visiting privileges - visitation)	Yes "Trace technology" searches." Mo. Dept of Corr. Policy IS12-3.1.III.N.	No	Yes Play areas for children will be provided. Mo. Dept of Corr. Policy IS13-3.1.III.D.3. Children's birthday celebrations within one month of actual birthday (12 and under) Mo. Dept of Corr. Policy IS13-3.1.III.K.4.	

Accessing Visiting Policies Online				Written Visiting Policies			Tone of Policies		Basic Limitations	
Department of Corrections (DOC) Website	Any Policies on DOC Website?	Visiting Policies on DOC Website?	URL for Policies on Website	Has a Visiting Regulation Available on Website?	Has a Policy Directive from DOC?	Has a Visitor's Handbook or Plain English Instructions?	Date of most recent source document	Promotes / Encourages visitation in policy documents?	Limits number of visitors on approved list?	Sets a floor for minimum visitation hours/days?
Montana http://www.cor.mt.gov/default.cfm?cx=lmncpx	Yes	Yes	http://www.cor.mt.gov/Resource/Policy/default.cfm?cx=lmncpx	No (But see: Admin. Rules of Mont., 20.9.622 (for juvenile facilities))	Yes	Yes	2011	Mont. Dept of Corr. Policy 3.3.8.1. Encourages family ties and supportive relationships important to the stability of offenders while incarcerated and upon release. Yes	No	No
Nebraska http://www.corrections.nebraska.gov/	Yes	Yes	http://www.corrections.nebraska.gov/policies/maintenancevisitation.html	Yes Neb. Admin. Code, Title 68, Chp. 4 No (But see: Nev. Admin. Code, Ch. 211 on jails)	Yes	No	2010	No	No	No
Nevada http://www.do.cnv.gov/	Yes	Yes	http://www.docnvd.com/visitation.html	No (But see: Nev. Admin. Code, Ch. 211 on jails)	Yes	No	2011	No	But see Nev. Dept. of Corr. Admin. Reg. 719.7.	No
New Hampshire http://www.nh.gov/nhdc/	Yes	Yes	http://www.nh.gov/nhdc/ocumens/7-09.pdf	Yes N.H. Code Admin. R. Cor 305	Yes	No	2009	N.H. Dept of Corr. Policy 7.09.1. To foster relationships with family and community volunteers that will improve the opportunities for inmates to successfully reintegrate into the community. Yes	N.H. Dept of Corr. Policy 7.09.1M.10. No visitor can visit more than one inmate unless family.	No But see N.H. Dept of Corr. Policy 7.09. (Hours of each unit listed)
New Jersey http://www.state.nj.us/corrections/pages/find.cx.shtml	No	No	http://www.njchp.org/njchp/visitation.html	Yes N.J. Admin. Code 10A:41-18	Yes	No	-	N.J. Dept of Corr. Policy 10A.007.000. "It is the mission of the Department of Corrections' inmate visit programs to encourage inmates to maintain the closest ties possible with family, friends and other members of the community, including clergy, and any other persons as determined by the Department, who may have a constructive influence on the inmate." Yes	No	No

	Special Visiting Provision	Specific Procedures	Specific Rules	Notes for Reader				
	Contains provision for long-distance visitors ("Special visitors")?	Contains provision for overnight visiting (referred to as family reunion / extended / conjugal visiting)?	Contains provisions for video visitation?	Contains provisions for grievance procedures for when visitation is suspended?	Specifies search procedures for visitors?	Limits visitors based on security classifications?	Has child-specific rules?	
	Yes Long distance, deathbed, clergy, etc.			No	Yes Mont. Dept of Corr. Policy 3.3.8.IV.C.2. Facilities issue specific rules related to children.	Yes Children must be accompanied by parent, guardian, or other approved adult.		
Montana	Mont. Dept of Corr. Policy 3.3.8.IV.K.	No	No	<i>But</i> See Mont. Dept of Corr. Policy 3.3.8.IV.D.	Mont. Dept of Corr. Policy 3.3.8.IV.G. <i>See also</i> Mont. Dept of Corr. Policy 3.1.1.7.	No	Mont. Dept of Corr. Policy 3.3.8.IV.B.1.F.	
	Yes Long distance, health emergency, clergy, legal, etc.	Only in one women's facility for children under age 6		No	No	Yes Must control children, but cannot use corporal punishment.		
Nebraska	Neb. Dept of Corr. Policy 205.02.IV.	See http://www.corrections.nebraska.gov/new.html	No	No	<i>But</i> see Neb. Dept of Corr. Policy 205.02.VII.A (dress code)	No	Neb. Dept of Corr. Policy 205.02.VI.A.	
Nevada	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	
	Yes		Yes	No	Yes N.H. Dept of Corr. Policy 7.09.J.6.; N.H. Code Admin. R. Corr. 305.02(m).	Yes Although not described in policy documents, limitations on frequency and duration of visits exist for inmates in the Management Control Unit, those with zero tolerance offenses, and those custody inmates.	N.H. Dept of Corr. Policy 7.09.I.3.	
New Hampshire	N.H. Dept of Corr. Policy 7.09.IV.K.	No	No	No	N.H. Dept of Corr. Policy 7.09.IV.C.	Yes	N.H. Dept of Corr. Policy 7.09.I.3.	
	Yes		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N.J. Admin. Code 10A:18-6.8.	
New Jersey	Yes	No	See video visitation description: http://www.state.nj.us/corrections/pages/VideoConference.html	But inmates whose contact visit privileges are revoked may petition after 1 year for reinstatement.	Yes N.J. Admin. Code 10A:18-6.14.		N.J. Admin. Code 10A:18-6.8.	

	Accessing Visiting Policies Online				Written Visiting Policies			Tone of Policies		Basic Limitations	
	Department of Corrections (DOC) Website	Any Policies on DOC Website?	Visiting Policy on DOC Website?	URL for Policies on Website	Has a Visiting Regulation Available on Website?	Has a Policy Directive from DOC?	Has a Visitor's Handbook or Plain English Instructions?	Date of most recent source document	Promotes / Encourages visitation in policy documents?	Limits number of visitors on approved list?	Sets a floor for minimum visitation hours/days?
Ohio	www.doc.ohio.gov/	Yes	Yes	No	Yes (Baldwin's) Ohio Admin Code 5120-9-15	Yes	No	2009	Ohio Dept of Corr. Policy 76-VIS-01.11. The visiting program is designed to enhance contact with family and other support persons that will enable the offenders to successfully re-enter society at the conclusion of their incarceration.	Ohio Dept of Corr. Policy 76-VIS-01. V1.C.1.	Ohio Admin. Code 5120-9-15(0).
North Dakota	www.nd.gov/doc/	No	No	No	No (Bart sec, North Dakota Admin. Code, Title 94)	Yes	No	2010	No	Bart sec N.D. Dept of Corr. Policy 6G-4.3 B.	N.D. Dept of Corr. Policy 6G-4.3 C.2.
North Carolina	www.doc.state.nc.us/	Yes	Yes	http://www.doc.state.nc.us/publications/index.html	No	Yes (unsigned rules)	Yes	2006 (2010 for handbook)	No	N.C. Dept of Corr. Policy 956 at 1.	N.C. Dept of Corr. Policy 956 at 2.
New Mexico	http://www.corrections.state.nm.us/	Yes	Yes	http://www.corrections.state.nm.us/policies/current/CD-1002000English.pdf	No	Yes	Yes	2010	N.M. Dept of Corr. Policy CD-100200 at Policy B. Shall provide a visiting program designed to enhance the inmates' opportunities to establish or maintain family and personal relationships.	N.M. Dept of Corr. Policy CD-100200 at Policy C.1.	N.M. Dept of Corr. Policy CD-100200 at Policy 1. <i>Guide for Families and Friends Involved New Mexicans</i> , N.M. Dept of Corr. at 18 (no date).
New York	www.doc.state.ny.us/	No	Yes	http://www.doc.state.ny.us/RulesRegs/index.html	Yes N.Y. Code of Rules and Regulations, Title 7, Chpt IV	Yes	Yes	1991	To provide inmates with an opportunity to maintain relationships with friends and relatives in order to promote better community adjustment upon release.	No	N.Y. Dept of Corr. Policy 4403.111.
									Yes	Yes	Varies by security classification.
									Yes	Yes	No more than 1 visit per week of up to two hours (plus legal/clergy visits)

Accessing Visiting Policies Online		Written Visiting Policies		Tone of Policies		Basic Limitations				
Department of Corrections (DOC) Website	Any Policies on DOC Website?	Visiting Policies on DOC Website?	URL for Policies on Website	Has a Visiting Regulation Available on Website?	Has a Policy Directive from DOC?	Has a Visitor's Handbook or Plain English Instructions?	Date of most recent source document	Promotes / Encourages visitation in policy documents?	Limits number of visitors on approved list?	Sets a floor for minimum visitation hours/days?
Oklahoma http://www.doc.state.ok.us/	Yes	Yes	http://www.doc.state.ok.us/official/170_Dept_of_Corrections/	No (but see Okla. Admin. Code, Title 170, Dept. of Corrections)	Yes	Yes	2011	Okla. Dept. of Corr. Policy 030118.	Okla. Dept. of Corr. Policy 030118 I.A.11.D. 6 plus family, but family is narrowly defined. Children do not count. Parents count as one visitor. Varies by facility.	Okla. Dept. of Corr. Policy 030118 I.B. C, D. Celling is set per security classification.
Oregon http://www.oregon.gov/DOCS/index.shtml	Yes	Yes	http://www.oregon.gov/DOCS/PUBSER/rules_policies/rules_alpha.shtml	Yes BSEIR rules_policies/rules_alpha_291-127	No	Yes In partnership with family advocacy group.	2011	Or. Admin. R. 291-127-0200(2). The Department encourages productive relationships between families and inmates and sees inmate visitation as a positive means to strengthen ties and increase the likelihood of success upon release.	Or. Admin. R. 291-127-0240(6)(A). 20, exclusive of children under age 13. Prisoners may add or remove visitors from the list at any time.	See Or. Admin. R. 291-127-0250. Complicated point system for allocating visiting room space on a monthly basis.
Pennsylvania http://www.corrections.pa.us/poportal/server.pl?community/department_of_corrections/604	Yes	Yes	http://www.corrections.pa.us/portal/server.pl/community/department_of_corrections/policies/612850	Yes Title 37, Chpt 93.3 & 95.233	Yes	No	2009	No R.I. Dept. of Corr. Policy 24-03-3. II. It is the policy of the Rhode Island Department of Corrections (RIDOC) to encourage inmates, in a manner consistent with sound security practices, to have regular social visits with relatives and other individuals in order to maintain close family ties and other positive relationships.	Pa. Dept. of Corr. Policy DC-ADM 812 § 1 at E.1. 40 37 Pa. Code § 93.30(b)(3)-(4).	Pa. Dept. of Corr. Policy DC-ADM 812 § 1 at B.3. Up to every day of year, with possible morning, afternoon, and evening visiting hours. At least one hour per visit and at least one visit per week.
Rhode Island http://www.docri.gov/index.php	Yes	Yes	http://www.docri.gov/friends/index.php	Yes R.I. Admin. Code, Title 17-1-6	Yes	No	2007	R.I. Dept. of Corr. Policy 24-03-3. II. It is the policy of the Rhode Island Department of Corrections (RIDOC) to encourage inmates, in a manner consistent with sound security practices, to have regular social visits with relatives and other individuals in order to maintain close family ties and other positive relationships.	R.I. Dept. of Corr. Policy 24-03-3.III.D.3. 9	R.I. Dept. of Corr. Policy 24-03-3.III.B. 3 visiting periods per week, minimum, 1.5 hour minimum per visiting period. Discretion of warden.

	Special Visiting Provision	Specific Procedures	Specific Rules	Notes for reader				
	Contains provision for long-distance visitors ("special visitors"?)	Contains provision for overnight visiting (referred to as family reunion / extended / conjugal visiting)?	Contains provisions for grievance procedures for when visitation is suspended?	Specifies search procedures for visitors?	Limits visitors based on security classifications?	Has child-specific rules?	Notes for reader	
Oklahoma	Yes Okla Dept of Corr Policy 030118.III.D	No	No	Okla. Dept of Corr. Policy 030118.D, Okla. Dept of Corr. Policy 030118D.	Yes The higher security status the lower the number of hours for visits per week (max is just 4 hours/week plus holidays; min is 8).	No Local rules govern children.	Okla. Dept of Corr. Policy 030118.III.A.5. Okla. Dept of Corr. Policy 01.A.	Okla. Dept of Corr. Policy 030118. Add-01.A.
Oregon	Yes Or. Admn. R. 291-127-0280.	No	Yes Robust policy provisions in place to allow video visitation both by prisoners on "basic" visitation and those for whom it is more convenient, but does not appear to exist in practice yet. Or. Admn. R. 291-127-0210(29).	Yes Dress code; no blue denim; must wear underwear. Or. Admn. R. 291-127-0290.	No	Some facilities have special programming for infants and children, including extended visits, and visiting rooms designed for children and families.		
Pennsylvania	Yes Pa. Dept of Corr. Policy DC-ADM 812 § 2 at B; 37 Pa. Code § 93.30(D).	No	Yes "Virtual visitation" Pa. Dept of Corr. Policy DC-ADM 812 § 2 at K.	Yes prohibits pat/frisk searches. In some cases metal detector alarm will result in a no contact visit. Electronic drug detection can be used on individuals and their vehicles Pa. Dept of Corr. Policy DC-ADM 812 § 3.	Yes Pa. Dept of Corr. Policy DC-ADM 812 § 1 at B.3.	Yes Pa. Dept of Corr. Policy DC-ADM 812 § 1 at D.3.		
Rhode Island	Yes R.I. Dept of Corr. Policy 24.03-3.III.G.	No	Yes R.I. Dept of Corr. Policy 24.03-3.III.F.10.	Yes Narcotics equipment, metal detector, hand or wand frisk. Visual inspection of open mouth. R.I. Dept of Corr. Policy 24.03-3.III.F. Dress code R.I. Dept of Corr. Policy 24.03-3.III.F.10.	No	Yes Failure to control children will lead to termination of visit. Children are not to run or play loudly. R.I. Dept of Corr. Policy 24.03-3.III.B.11(s).		

Accessing Visiting Policies Online			Written Visiting Policies			Tone of Policies		Basic Limitations		
Department of Corrections (DOC) Website	Any Policies on DOC Website?	Visiting Policies on DOC Website?	URL for Policies on Website	Has a Visiting Regulation available on Website?	Has a Policy Directive from DOC?	Has a Visitor's Handbook or Plain English Instructions?	Date of most recent source document	Promotes / Encourages visitation in policy documents?	Limits number of visitors on approved list?	Sets a floor for minimum visitation hours/days?
South Carolina http://www.doc.sc.gov/	Yes	Yes	http://www.doc.sc.gov/family/visitation.jsp	No (but see S.C. Code of Regulations, Chpt. 33)	Yes	Yes	2006	S.C. Dept of Corr. Policy OP-22.09. Practice is to enable and encourage inmates, consistent with security and classification requirements, to visit with family members and friends. Yes	Yes 15. must have no criminal record. Changes to list only once per 120 days.	Yes Only on Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and holidays. One visit per day. No more than 8 visits per month.
South Dakota http://doc.sd.gov/	No	No	No	Admin. Rules of So. Dak., 17:50/02	Yes	Yes	2007	No	Yes 2. plus family. Must clear background check first.	No Discretion of facility
Tennessee http://www.state.tn.us/corrections/	Yes	Yes	No	No (but see Rules & Regs. Of State of Tennessee, Chpt. 0420)	Yes	By facility	2010	No	Yes 8 plus family. One year wait between being on one list and being put on another.	Yes Weekends, and holidays, plus one weeknight per week, plus more at discretion. Cannot visit both at evening and on weekend.
Texas http://www.doc.state.tx.us/	Yes	Yes	http://www.doc.state.tx.us/documents/OffenderRulesandRegulationsforVisitation_English.pdf	No (but see Tex. Admin. Code, Title 37)	Yes	Yes	2008	Yes Tex. Dept of Crim. Just. Policy 1-218.	Yes 10. Ex-offenders require written permission from the supervising agency, based on which Warden makes a decision to grant or deny visit. Changes to list allowed every 6 months.	Yes Weekends from 8am to 5pm. One visit per weekend with up to two adult visitors for a maximum of two hours at a time.

	Special Visiting Provision	Specific Procedures	Specific Rules	Notes for reader				
	Contains provision for long-distance visitors ("special visitors"?)	Contains provision for overnight visiting (referred to as family reunion / extended / conjugal visiting)?	Contains provisions for video visitation?	Contains provisions for grievance procedures for when visitation is suspended?	Specifies search procedures for visitors?	Limits visitors based on security classifications?	Has child-specific rules?	
South Carolina	Yes Must be immediate family and on the visiting list. S.C. Dept of Corr. Policy OP-22.09.5.12.	No	No	S.C. Dept of Corr. Policy OP-22.09.17.2	S.C. Dept of Corr. Policy OP-22.09.8.9. Search procedures. S.C. Dept of Corr. Policy OP-22.09.7.1. Dress code. Yes	S.C. Dept of Corr. Policy OP-22.09.2.3	Only immediate family allowed to visit. S.C. Dept of Corr. Policy OP-22.09.5.1. Visit subject to termination if children are disturbing other visitors. S.C. Dept of Corr. Policy OP-22.09.7.7.	
South Dakota	Yes S.D. Dept of Corr. Policy 1.5.D.1.IV at "Special Visits." 1.5.D.1.IV at "Special Visits." p.mmp.aspx	No But see Women mother's weekend-long program: http://doc.sd.gov/adult/facilities/vp.mmp.aspx	No	No	S.D. Dept of Corr. Policy 1.5.D.1.IV at "Searches." S.D. Admin. R. 17-5002.08. But subject to search	No, but two classes of visiting room.	No	Scattered provisions. Special family visitation program (pg 7). Tem. Dept of Corr. Policy 507.01.VI.E.4(b). "The IDOC recognizes the value of family bonding in regards to the development of children (especially toddlers and infants). Visitation rules of each facility should therefore make reasonable allowances for some physical contact between parents and toddlers and infants."
Tennessee	Yes For children, those from over 200 miles away; attorneys, crisis intervention, etc. Tem. Dept of Corr. Policy 507.01.VI.E.4.	No	No	Tem. Dept of Corr. Policy 507.01.VI.G.4. Review of visitation suspension every 6 months. Yes	Yes Dress code: no hoods, no water bottles. Tem. Dept of Corr. Policy 507.01.VI.M. See also policy #306.06.	Tem. Dept of Corr. Policy 507.01.VI.K. Minimum security inmates get most choice of areas for visitation. Max security are limited to more secure areas for visiting.	Tem. Dept of Corr. Policy 507.01.VI.G.2(b). Visits may be terminated if kids misbehave.	
Texas	Over 300 miles away for immediate family members. Special visits include clergy; prospective employers; health emergency, etc. Tex. Dept of Crim. Just. Policy 1-218.6.0	No	No	Tex. Dept of Crim. Just. Policy 1-218.3.12, 13, 17. May appeal within 14 days of suspension. If denied, may appeal again 6 months later.	Search of person and vehicle. Tex. Dept of Crim. Just. Policy 1-218.3.6. Visitor rules and dress code. Pants must be worn "at or above the waist." Yes	Tex. Dept of Crim. Just. Policy 1-218.1.5.	Yes Visit will be terminated if children disturb other visitors. Tex. Dept of Crim. Just. Policy 1-218.3.14.1.	

Accessing Visiting Policies Online				Written Visiting Policies			Tone of Policies		Basic Limitations	
Department of Corrections (DOC) Website	Any Policies on DOC Website?	Visiting Policy on DOC Website?	URL for Policies on Website	Has a Visiting Regulation Available on Website?	Has a Policy Directive from DOC?	Has a Visitor's Handbook or Plain English Instructions?	Date of most recent source document	Promotes / Encourages visitation in policy documents?	Limits number of visitors on approved list?	Sets a floor for minimum visitation hours/days?
Utah	No	Yes	http://corrections.utah.gov/visitinfo/facilities/visiting.html	Yes	No	Yes	2011	Utah Dept of Corr. Inmate Orientation Booklet 4, available at http://corrections.utah.gov/visitinfo/facilities/documents/friendsandfamilymanual2012.pdf . Yes "Visitation serves an important role in preserving the relationship between inmates and their families and friends." No	But all approved visitors must submit a renewal form annually.	Yes No more than 2 hours per visit per day
Vermont	Yes	No	http://www.doc.state.vt.us/about/offices/policies/home	No	No	No	2010	VI. Admin. Code 12-8-22-966. Yes "The DOC encourages visiting by the family, friends, clergy and other community representatives when visits do not pose a threat to others or violate any state or federal law." No	No	Yes Discretion of each warden. VI. Admin. Code 12-8-22-966
Virginia	No	No	http://www.vadoc.org/	No	Yes	Yes	2012	Va. Op. Proc. §51.11 Yes "The DOC encourages visiting by the family, friends, clergy and other community representatives when visits do not pose a threat to others or violate any state or federal law." No	No	Va. Op. Proc. §51.11 V.G. Yes "Newly received offenders" no visitation for 60 days. Then generally Saturday, Sunday and all state holidays. Though inmates given "one hour" on "designated days" within that range if visits exceed capacity.
Washington	Yes	Yes	http://www.doc.wa.gov/	No	Yes	Yes	2011	Recognizes the vital role families play in the re-entry process and will support offenders in maintaining ties with family, friends, and the community by setting reasonable criteria for personal visits. Recognizes the need to engage community stakeholders, partners, and offender families in the re-entry process. Yes No	Wash. Dept of Corr. Policy 450.300 at Policy 11. Wash. Dept of Corr. Policy 450.300 IV.A.D. No	No
West Virginia	No	No	http://www.wvdoc.com/wvdoc	No	Yes	No	2010	No No But all visitors must apply and are subject to background check. May only appear on one inmate's list unless family. W. Va. Div. of Corr. Policy 505.03 V.C. D. (2010). Yes	W. Va. Div. of Corr. Policy 505.03 V.C. D. (2010). Yes 12, not counting children. Can only change list every 6 months. Must clear a background check. W. Va. Dept of Corr. Policy 309.06.01.II.B.2, III.D. W. Admin. Code DCC § 309.08(D)(a).	No Yes At least 9 hours per week.
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	https://dcs.legis.wisconsin.gov/	Yes	Yes	Yes	2010	No Yes Wise Admin. Code DCC § 309.09(3). Wise Admin. Code DCC § 309.09(3).	Wise Admin. Code DCC § 309.09(3). Wise Admin. Code DCC § 309.09(3).	Wise Admin. Code DCC § 309.09(3). Wise Admin. Code DCC § 309.09(3).

	Special Visiting Provision	Specific Procedures	Specific Rules	Note for reader				
	Contains provision for long-distance visitors ("special visitors"?)	Contains provision for overnight visiting (referred to as family reunion / extended / conjugal visiting)?	Contains provisions for video visitation?	Contains provisions for grievance procedures for when visitation is suspended?	Specifies search procedures for visitors?	Limits visitors based on security classifications?	Has child-specific rules?	Note for reader
Utah	No Not in policy but prisons regularly make accommodations for long distance, etc.	No	No	See also Utah Dept of Corr Inmate Orientation Booklet 5, available at http://corrections.utah.gov/visitation_facilities/docs/inmate%20friendandfamilymanual2012.pdf .	Longer property vehicle search. Attrite "must be conservative to enhance a family atmosphere." Female visitors must wear a bra and undergarments.	Level I and Level II inmates shall not exceed one and one-half hours per visit. High level security visits are all "barrier" The Inmate's Privilege Matrix Level shall determine the number of visits allowed per week/month.	Visitors with babies may bring two diapers, one bottle, but no sippy cups allowed. Children under ten may wear shorts and sleeveless shirts.	All visits must be conducted in English. Unless otherwise noted, all information comes from rules posted on Utah Dept of Corr Website.
Vermont	No Yes Includes, but not limited to: clergy, attorneys, former or prospective employers, sponsors, parole advisors, and immediate family on "infrequent" visits or "extreme travel distance."	No	No	No	Reference is made to a specific procedure, though that procedure is not published online. Va Op Proc: 851.11VA.6 See http://www.vadoc.virginia.gov/offenders/prison-visitations/	Yes The total number of hours an offender may visit per month will be in accordance with Operating Procedure 440.4" which is not published online.	No Allows unaccompanied visitation with a notarized statement.	Includes standards, such as "Offenders receive approved visitors except where there is substantial evidence that the visitor poses a threat to the safety of the offender or the security of the program."
Virginia	Va Op Proc: 851.11VE. Yes	No	No	Va Op Proc: 851.11VA.5.	Va Op Proc: 851.11VA.1 Specific search procedures included.	Va Op Proc: 851.11VAG.7. Yes	Va Op Proc: 851.11VAF.3. Yes	Va Op Proc: 851.11VA.2.
Washington	Wash Dept of Corr Policy 450.300.II.A. Yes From over 300 miles away, clergy, attorneys, health crisis.	Wash Dept of Corr Policy 5901.100. Yes	Though Washington is piloting a program in its women's facilities soon. See Patrick Doyle, et al., Prison Video Conferencing, Vermont Legislative Research Service 3, May 15, 2011.	Wash Dept of Corr Policy 450.300.XIII. Yes	Wash Dept of Corr Policy 450.300.XV and 420.340. Came searches, pat searches, electronic searches.	Wash Dept of Corr Policy 520.255. Inmates in Intensive Management Unit are limited to no contact visits with immediate family members.	Wash Dept of Corr Policy 450.300.IA.1(a), I.A.2, V. Child friendly space; "visit rooms will provide toys and games suitable for interaction by family members of all ages"; "rate enforcement will be sensitive to visitors, particularly children."	
West Virginia	W Va Div. of Corr Policy 505.00.VF.(2006). Yes	No	No	No	Must present two forms of ID.	No	No	
Wisconsin	Wis Dept of Corr Policy 309.06.01.V. Wis Admin. Code DOC § 309.10. Yes	No	Where inmate is restricted from normal visits. Wis Admin. Code DOC § 309.08(3).	Wis Admin. Code DOC § 309.12(d); Wis Dept of Corr Policy 309.06.01.III.G. Yes	Dress code. May be required to remove bra if it has an underwire. Wis Dept of Corr Policy 309.06.01.VIII. Yes	No	Scattered provisions. Breastfeeding allowed during visitation. Wis Dept of Corr Policy 309.06.01.IX.E.	

Accessing Visiting Policies Online				Written Visiting Policies			Tone of Policies		Basic Limitations	
Department of Corrections (DOC) Website	Any Policies on DOC Website?	Visiting Policies on DOC Website?	URL for Policies on Website	Has a Visiting Regulation Available on Website?	Has a Policy Directive from DOC?	Has a Visitor's Plain English Instructions?	Date of most recent source document	Promotes / Encourages visitation in policy documents?	Limits number of visitors on approved list?	Sets a floor for minimum visitation hours/days?
http://www.doc.wy.gov/	Yes	Yes	http://www.doc.wy.gov/policies/index.html	Yes (But see, Wyoming Rules & Regulations (listing Department))	Yes	Yes	2012	Yes <p>It is the policy of the Wyoming Department of Corrections (WDOC) to provide an opportunity for inmates to visit on-site with approved individuals in an orderly and safe environment. Visiting is an integral component of facility management, inmate habilitation and community safety. Visiting can improve public safety and encourage responsible familial relationships by holding inmates accountable and reducing the risk of future criminal behavior.</p>	No <p>10, not counting children. Can only change list every 6 months. Those over age 16 must pass background check.</p>	No <p>At least 3 days per week. At least 16 hours of visitation per institution per week required, with access to at least 2 visiting periods per week for each general population inmate.</p>
http://www.bop.gov/policy/index.jsp	Yes	Yes	http://www.bop.gov/policy/index.jsp	Yes (540.40 et. seq.)	Yes	No	2006	Yes	No	No

	Special Visiting Provision			Specific Procedures		Specific Rules		Notes for reader
	Contains provision for long-distance visitors ("Special visitors")?	Contains provision for overnight visiting (referred to as family reunion / extended / conjugal visiting)?	Contains provisions for video visitation?	Contains provisions for grievance procedures for when visitation is suspended?	Specifies search procedures for visitors?	Limits visitors based on security classifications?	Has child-specific rules?	
	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes The number of hours and visits allowed is determined by inmate status.	Yes	
Wyoming	Wyo. Dept of Corr Policy 5.400 IV.M. Yes	No	No	Wyo. Dept of Corr Policy 5.400 IV.Q.	Wyo. Dept of Corr Form 534: Visiting Rules. Yes	Wyo. Dept of Corr Form 535: Summary of Inmate Visiting Eligibility by Status. No	Scattered provisions. Yes	
Federal BOP	Business, consular, clergy, community groups, prospective employer, etc. 28 C.F.R. § 540.45	No	No	No	Background check may be performed. Search required, but details vary by facility. 28 C.F.R. § 540.51.	No	Under sixteen must be accompanied by and adult. 28 C.F.R. § 540.51(b).	