

From: [Beth Ann Kelly](#)
To: [Clark, Jacob, DOH](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please consider these changes
Date: Tuesday, September 29, 2026 12:53:48 PM

[You don't often get email from bethannkelly4@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email originated outside of our organization. Exercise caution prior to clicking on links or opening attachments.

To the New Mexico Department of Health:

I am a New Mexico resident in Taos, and I am also a caregiver and a hospice care worker. I am writing to comment on proposed rule 7.35.3 NMAC ahead of the October 2, 2026 hearing.

I work with populations who stand to gain from a psilocybin program and it's really important for the sake of all present and future providers and patients that this rollout avoid obvious pitfalls.

I ask the department to make the following changes in the final rule.

1. The property-owner statement, 7.35.3.11(B)(9).

Delete paragraph (B)(9) of 7.35.3.11.

The landlord interest that justifies the cannabis provision, smoking on the property, is not present in a supervised psilocybin session administered by a licensed facilitator. A signed acknowledgment gives an owner nothing to gain and something to lose, so many will decline to sign, and care at home for anyone who does not own their home will end before they are able to receive treatment.

2. The certifying clinician, 7.35.3.8 and 7.35.3.9(D).

Remove the certifying clinician design. In its place, regulate around the specific contraindications, medical histories and medications that warrant clinical review. Where a risk factor is identified, require an attestation from a clinician whose scope of practice fits that risk that screening was conducted and benefits outweigh risks.

The design exceeds the Act and misunderstands where the risk is. The most significant risks in psilocybin-assisted therapy are psychological, or medical risks that must be screened on the day of administration, such as intoxication. A one-time "prescriber" gateway misses them. It also creates a clinical encounter whose only purpose is program entry, which insurers will treat as lacking independent medical necessity, inviting claim denials and clawbacks.

3. The patient application, 7.35.3.8.

Strike the patient application process.

It has no legal or policy justification in a supervised-use program. It adds administrative burden for the department, lengthens the wait for care, creates another store of patient data that can be accessed without consent or unlawfully taken, and further stigmatizes patients.

Thank you for considering my comment.

beth
Taos, New Mexico

B.KELLY
970.729.1700