

Medical Psilocybin Program Propagation Committee Meeting Minutes

Location: Hybrid (Virtual + Albuquerque, NM)

Date: March 11, 2026

Time: 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM

Minute Taker: Adrian Estrada, DOH

**This meeting was recorded. For specific details pertaining to the meeting, please refer to the recording located on the Medical Psilocybin Advisory Board Website: [Psilocybin Advisory Board](#)*

Agenda items

1. Opening Statements

Dominick opened the meeting and reminded attendees that cameras were turned off to reduce bandwidth issues and avoid inappropriate backgrounds.

Chair Chris led a moment of silence in recognition of current events.

2. Introductions

Participants introduced themselves prior to engagement and voting, as required.

3. Program Updates

Dominick provided an update on rule development.

- Draft rules are still being finalized with minor revisions underway.
- Once submitted to the New Mexico Register, a minimum 30-day public comment period will begin.
- A rule hearing is tentatively scheduled for April 24, 2026, in Santa Fe.
- Additional revisions may occur following public comment before final implementation.

4. Permit Application Rules Review

General Requirements

Chair Chris reviewed draft permit application requirements for producers and laboratories.

Discussion focused on:

- Clarification of Secretary of State registration requirements
- Alignment between state requirements and local government processes
- Verification of inspection requirements (fire, electrical, HVAC)
- Coordination between state and local jurisdictions

DOH clarified that many inspection requirements are typically included within certificate of occupancy processes and that electronic systems will streamline submissions.

Producer Requirements

Applicants must provide food safety training certification.

Discussion clarified:

- Requirement applies to all operators, including sole proprietors
- Multiple acceptable certifications exist depending on jurisdiction

Laboratory Requirements

Two pathways were outlined:

- Existing cannabis laboratories expanding into psilocybin testing
- New laboratories meeting national accreditation standards

This approach is intended to balance accessibility and compliance.

Operational Changes

Applicants must notify the department of substantial changes, including:

- Structural modifications
- Equipment changes affecting production

Clarification provided:

- Only changes that significantly impact production processes require approval
- Minor additions do not require notification

5. General Permittee Requirements

Requirements reviewed included:

- Compliance with all applicable laws
- Prohibition of dual ownership across permit types
- Non-transferability of permits
- Disclosure of financial interests

Discussion

Significant discussion focused on the prohibition of vertical integration.

Stakeholders raised concerns regarding:

- Business viability
- Rural access limitations
- Market constraints

DOH stated the restriction is intended to:

- Prevent conflicts of interest
- Ensure product safety
- Avoid issues observed in other industries

It was noted that policy may evolve as the program develops.

6. Producer Operational Requirements

Producers must:

- Operate only within permitted premises
- Maintain sanitary conditions
- Secure all products
- Track products through the traceability system
- Sell only to approved entities

Clarifications included:

- No cap on number of permits
- Producers may sell to other producers and practitioners
- Certain materials (e.g., cultures) may be shared between producers

7. Key Questions and Discussion

Topics raised included:

- **Integration Coaches:**
Likely will not require permits, pending determination by the education committee
- **Permit Transfers:**
Permits cannot be transferred, but businesses may be sold and new owners must apply
- **Local Compliance:**
Local zoning and permitting requirements must be met prior to state approval
- **Product Standards:**
Dosage and formal standards are still under review by the dosage committee
- **Rural Access Concerns:**
Stakeholders noted potential barriers due to ownership restrictions

8. Open Discussion

Participants discussed:

- Profitability challenges for producers
- Lack of vertical integration
- Market structure and pricing concerns
- Need for clearer definitions and regulatory language

DOH acknowledged feedback and stated all comments will be reviewed with legal and policy teams.

9. Next Meeting

March 18, 2026

3:00 PM to 5:00 PM

Hybrid, Sante Fe New Mexico

Attendance

Chair

Chris Peskuski

DOH Staff

Adrian Estrada, DOH

Raymond Gallegos, DOH

Jorge Gonzales, DOH

Cathy Augeri, DOH

Dr. Robert Truckner, DOH

Katy Freytag, DOH

Jonathan Mouchet, DOH

Ismail Zoutat, DOH

Participants and Public Attendees

Kate Hawke

Priscilla Smith

Estevan Hernandez

Gregory Evans

Brett Phelps

Stephanie Dukette

James Brown

Dr. Lida Fatemi

Matthew (Inday Animosh) Armstrong

Catherine Sanchez

Shane McDaniel

Lisa Ginzburg
Denali Wilson
Orion
Jordan Higgins
Abegail Salugsugan

Public Comment submitted by email

Discussion and comments on the “Permit Application Requirements” was taken on 3/11/26 on-line and in person at the West Side Community Center.

Comment:

The importance of providing clear and concise rules cannot be overstated. Ultimately, the goal is to provide the “rule user” (public) with a clear understanding of what is required of them in order to, in this case, apply for and obtain a permit. The “Permit Application Requirements” as provided in the handout on 3/11/26 makes numerous references to a variety of state and local government agencies, requiring them to do certain things. My concern is that once adopted, the permittee will show up at a given agency and that agency will have no idea what is being requested, no resources have been identified as to accomplishing the goal and the result will be a cumbersome, difficult and frustrating process for both the agency, but also the permittee. It may likely lead to having to process these requirements with another public hearing on rules adoption.

The analogy here, is when this legislation was passed, a number of impacted state agencies were requested to make comments. These comments are intended to identify potential problems or gaps in service and to assure that the agency is aware of the legislation and, if passed, can make accommodations within the agency to respond appropriately. The “Permit Application Requirements” are to be listed in the New Mexico Registry for all to receive notice of the pending rules. It is a leap of faith to believe that each agency, and in this case state and local government, to have resources who actively and consistently read the Registry to identify if their agency is being impacted.

It would seem easier and more efficient for the DOH to simply reach out to its fellow state agency and local government via the NM Municipal League and Association of Counties,

provide them with these “Permit Application Requirements” in advance of adoption, in hopes of identifying any gaps in the provision of these services. Relying on an agency to read the NM Registry does not provide any assurance that they will, however, they will be impacted regardless of reading the NM Registry or not.

It is a simple process to reach out to the agencies and briefly explain the reason they are receiving a copy of these rules. Then we know they received notice. It is far easier to reach out in this manner, than to go through the entire rule making process, learn there is a gap or problem, then having to repeat this process again. Actively collaborating with these government agencies prior to rules adoption is the best approach.

The “Permit Application Requirements” identifies the following state and local agencies that are being requested to take some action, or organizations that can forward these rules to the appropriate local government agency for comment:

- New Mexico Secretary Of State
- New Mexico Taxation and Revenue Department
- Construction Industries Division
- New Mexico Municipal League
- New Mexico Association of Counties

Please respond to this email verifying receipt.

Respectfully,

Randy L. Traynor
TRAYNOR ASSOCIATES, LLC