Regulated Experience Access

A Public Health Framework for Psychedelic Policy

Juston Purcell

Institute for Regulated Experience

April 28, 2026

Policy Whitepaper

Abstract

Psychedelic substances present a challenge to conventional drug policy frameworks. Their effects are highly dependent on psychological and environmental conditions, resulting in outcomes that range from therapeutic benefit to acute distress. Existing models of prohibition and commercialization fail to adequately address this variability. Prohibition displaces use into unregulated environments, while commercialization abstracts substances from the contextual variables that shape their effects. This paper proposes a third approach: *Regulated Experience Access*, a non-commercial public health framework that structures the conditions under which psychedelic experiences occur. Drawing on psychological theory, emerging clinical research, and policy analysis, the model emphasizes preparation, supervised administration, and post-experience integration as core components of risk management and outcome optimization. The conceptual foundations of this approach are outlined herein, examining its implications for public health and situating it within the evolving relationship between federal and state regulatory systems in the United States. It argues that psychedelic policy represents an early test case for a broader shift in governance from regulating substances to structuring experiences.

1. Introduction: The Policy Gap

Contemporary drug policy operates within a binary framework: substances are either prohibited or permitted within regulated markets. This model has proven inadequate for a class of compounds whose effects are not primarily determined by pharmacology alone, but by the interaction between substance, individual, and environment.

Under prohibition, psychedelics are classified as Schedule I substances, defined by a lack of accepted medical use and high potential for abuse. This classification restricts research and channels use into unregulated contexts, where variability in outcomes is unmanaged, and support systems are absent. Despite these constraints, use persists, indicating that prohibition does not eliminate demand but redistributes risk.

At the opposite end of the spectrum, the commercialization model exemplified by cannabis legalization treats psychoactive substances as consumer products. This approach prioritizes cultivation, distribution, and retail while placing responsibility for context, preparation, and interpretation on the individual. While effective for substances with relatively stable effects, this model is poorly suited to psychedelics, where outcomes are highly contingent on situational variables.

Between these models lies a policy gap. Psychedelics are neither well managed by prohibition nor appropriately governed through conventional commercialization. Addressing this gap requires a framework that recognizes the central role of context in shaping experience.

2. Psychological Foundations of Experience

The conceptual basis for Regulated Experience Access rests on a well-established principle within psychology: experience is constructed, not passively received. From Fechner's early work in psychophysics to contemporary models of perception, sensory input is understood as being actively organized through cognitive processes that integrate expectation, prior knowledge, and environmental cues (Fechner, 1860/1966; Leahey, 2018).

Recent developments in predictive processing further support this view. According to this framework, the brain continuously generates models of the world and updates them based on incoming information. Psychedelics appear to alter this process by reducing the influence of top-down predictions, allowing bottom-up sensory and associative signals to exert greater influence (Carhart-Harris & Friston, 2019).

The result is not simply distortion, but reorganization. Perception, emotion, and meaning become more fluid, revealing the underlying mechanisms through which experience is structured. Importantly, this reorganization does not occur in isolation; it is shaped by the psychological state of the individual and the environment in which the experience unfolds.

This perspective has direct implications for policy. If psychedelic effects emerge from the interaction between substance and context, then any regulatory framework that ignores context is inherently incomplete.

3. Variability and the Role of Context

The variability of psychedelic experiences has long been recognized, often summarized through the concepts of "set and setting." While useful, this formulation understates the complexity of the variables involved.

"Set" encompasses not only immediate mood or intention, but also personality traits, cognitive schemas, trauma history, and implicit beliefs. "Setting" includes not only physical surroundings, but also interpersonal dynamics, cultural framing, and perceived safety. A third dimension often less emphasized is integration, referring to the processes through which the experience is interpreted and incorporated into ongoing life.

Together, these factors determine whether an experience leads to therapeutic insight, emotional destabilization, or negligible impact. Variability is therefore not an anomaly; it is an intrinsic feature of how these substances interact with human cognition.

From a public health perspective, unmanaged variability constitutes risk. A system that leaves individuals to navigate these conditions without guidance effectively externalizes responsibility while amplifying uncertainty. Conversely, a system that structures these variables can reduce risk and increase the likelihood of beneficial outcomes.

4. Limitations of Existing Policy Models

Prohibition

Prohibition seeks to eliminate harm by restricting access. In practice, it displaces use into informal or underground contexts where safety measures are inconsistent or absent. Screening, preparation, and integration are rarely formalized, and individuals may lack access to support during challenging experiences.

The result is a system in which risk is not eliminated but redistributed often to those least equipped to manage it.

Commercialization

Commercial models treat substances as products, focusing on production, distribution, and consumer access. This approach assumes that individuals can independently manage the conditions that shape their experiences.

For psychedelics, this assumption is problematic. The abstraction of substance from context removes the most influential variables from regulatory oversight. As seen in cannabis markets, commercialization can also incentivize potency, product diversification, and rapid scaling: dynamics that may not align with public health objectives in the context of psychedelics.

Neither model adequately addresses the core issue: outcomes are contingent on conditions.

5. The Regulated Experience Access Model

Regulated Experience Access proposes a shift in the object of regulation: from substances to the conditions under which experiences occur. It is a non-commercial framework that structures use as a process rather than a transaction.

The model is organized around three core phases:

Preparation

Screening procedures assess suitability and identify potential contraindications. Preparation sessions establish expectations, provide psychological orientation, and develop strategies for navigating the experience.

Administration

Experiences occur in controlled environments under the supervision of trained facilitators. The goal is not to direct the experience, but to maintain safety and provide support as needed.

Integration

Post-experience processes support reflection, meaning-making, and incorporation into daily life. Integration may involve structured sessions, ongoing support, or community-based resources.

Together, these phases form a continuum that addresses the full temporal arc of the experience. Rather than treating psychedelic use as a discrete event, the model recognizes it as a process unfolding over time.

6. Public Health Implications

A structured approach to psychedelic experiences offers several clear public health advantages. By situating these experiences within controlled environments supported by trained facilitators, the likelihood of acute distress and adverse outcomes can be meaningfully reduced. Standardized processes improve the consistency of outcomes, increasing predictability across individuals and settings.

Screening and ongoing monitoring enable earlier identification of contraindications and emerging issues, allowing for timely intervention. Beyond the acute phase, structured integration supports the translation of experience into sustained behavioral and psychological change.

At the system level, regulated frameworks create the conditions for systematic data collection, enabling continuous policy refinement.

These effects align directly with core public health objectives, including minimizing harm, improving outcome reliability, enabling early intervention, supporting long-term behavioral change, and generating data for evidence-based policy development.

7. Implementation Considerations

The transition from conceptual framework to operational system requires deliberate and staged implementation. Pilot programs provide a practical entry point, allowing models to be tested and refined prior to broader deployment.

Several structural elements are essential. Facilitator training must be standardized and grounded in psychological principles, ethical guidelines, and practical competencies. Service environments must be intentionally designed to support stability, reduce external disruption, and ensure participant safety.

Equally important is the integration of data systems from the outset. Continuous collection and analysis of outcomes allow the system to evolve in response to evidence rather than assumption. Maintaining a non-commercial orientation during early phases is critical to prevent market pressures from driving premature expansion at the expense of safety.

Implementation should proceed incrementally, with feedback mechanisms embedded at each stage, ensuring that the system remains adaptive and responsive.

8. Federal and State Dynamics

Psychedelic policy in the United States is evolving within a dual framework. At the federal level, substances remain Schedule I, while state-level initiatives have begun to establish regulated access models.

The federal pathway, primarily through the FDA, emphasizes clinical approval and pharmaceutical integration. State models, by contrast, operate outside traditional medical structures, focusing on supervised experiential access.

This dual system reflects different forms of legitimacy: one grounded in clinical evidence, the other in structured practice and observed outcomes. The interaction between these systems will shape the future of psychedelic policy.

Rather than converging into a single model, it is likely that both pathways will persist, addressing different aspects of the same phenomenon.

9. Ethical Framework

The regulation of psychedelic experiences raises fundamental ethical questions. Traditional models of governance focus on behavior; this framework engages with experience itself.

The challenge is to balance autonomy with responsibility. Individuals retain the right to engage with altered states, but systems can be designed to support safe and informed engagement. This represents a shift from paternalism to stewardship.

Stewardship does not eliminate risk, but seeks to manage it in a way that respects individual agency while acknowledging collective impact.

10. Conclusion: Toward a Policy of Consciousness and Experience

Psychedelic policy represents an early test case for a broader transformation in governance. As new modalities emerge that alter perception and meaning, the limitations of substance-focused regulation become increasingly apparent.

Regulated Experience Access offers one approach to addressing this challenge. By structuring the conditions under which experiences occur, it aligns policy with the underlying mechanisms that shape outcomes.

The central question is no longer whether these experiences will occur. They already do.

The question is whether they will remain unstructured or be intentionally designed to promote safety, understanding, and benefit.

References

Carhart-Harris, R. L., & Friston, K. J. (2019). REBUS and the anarchic brain: Toward a unified model of the brain action of psychedelics. *Pharmacological Reviews, 71*(3), 316–344.

Fechner, G. T. (1966). *Elements of psychophysics* (H. E. Adler, Trans.). Holt, Rinehart & Winston. (Original work published 1860)

Griffiths, R. R., et al. (2016). Psilocybin produces substantial and sustained decreases in depression and anxiety. *Journal of Psychopharmacology, 30*(12), 1181–1197.

Johnson, M. W., Richards, W. A., & Griffiths, R. R. (2008). Human hallucinogen research: Guidelines for safety. *Journal of Psychopharmacology, 22*(6), 603–620.

Leahey, T. H. (2018). *A history of psychology: From antiquity to modernity* (8th ed.). Routledge.

McAdams, D. P., & McLean, K. C. (2013). Narrative identity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 22*(3), 233–238.

Pickren, W. E., & Rutherford, A. (2010). *A history of modern psychology in context*. Wiley.