

**From:** Woods, Otis L - DHS Otis.Woods@dhs.wisconsin.gov  
**Subject:** Re: Question about fraudulent document  
**Date:** June 2, 2022 at 6:01 PM  
**To:** Bill Lueders blueders@gmail.com



Dear Mr. Lueders,

This letter responds to your June 2, 2022 email, in which you suggested that the Statement of Deficiency currently published regarding Pro Health Care Regency Senior Community New Berlin is “fraudulent.” There is nothing fraudulent about this document.

Pursuant to standard practice, at the conclusion of an onsite survey or complaint investigation, the Division of Quality Assurance (DQA) sends the results of the review to the provider on a document called a Statement of Deficiencies (SOD). If there is a violation of state or federal regulations, the SOD identifies them. If there are no deficiencies, the SOD states that fact. DQA strives to ensure that the published SOD provides an accurate and current status of the facility’s compliance with the regulations reviewed.

At the conclusion of the complaint investigation conducted of Pro Health Care Regency Senior Community New Berlin, DQA identified two deficiencies, which were documented in an SOD. Consistent with standard practice, that SOD was posted on the DHS website. After the facility initiated an appeal, it was determined that those deficiencies did not meet the threshold for a regulatory citation. As a result, the deficiencies were rescinded by DQA. Once the deficiencies were rescinded, the initial SOD was removed, and the new SOD was posted, according to DQA’s practice that the published SOD accurately reflect the current results of a survey.

DQA stands by its determination that the conduct of the facility with respect to this resident did not meet the threshold for a regulatory violation. The assessment done by the facility was sufficient. Wis. Stat. § 50.01 (6d) defines a Residential Care Apartment Complex (RCAC) as an independent apartment complex. Residents who live on their own in a RCAC are generally independent. The resident’s declining condition and resulting escalating series of falls made placement at a resident care apartment complex inappropriate, and continued placement there would likely have resulted in danger to the resident.

Otis L. Woods, Administrator  
Division of Quality Assurance

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Bill Lueders <blueders@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 2, 2022 9:35:38 AM  
**To:** Woods, Otis L - DHS <Otis.Woods@dhs.wisconsin.gov>  
**Cc:** Goodsitt, Elizabeth S - DHS <Elizabeth.Goodsitt@dhs.wisconsin.gov>; Benesh, Patricia A - DHS <Patricia.Benesh@dhs.wisconsin.gov>; Noble, Patricia - BOALTC <Patricia.Noble@wisconsin.gov>; Holman, Hillary A - DHS <hillary.holman@dhs.wisconsin.gov>; Lyons, Kathleen D - DHS <Kathleen.Lyons@dhs.wisconsin.gov>; Mike Helbick <mike\_helbick@baldwinconcrete.gov>; Snow, Shannon M - DHS

<MIKE\_HEIDICK@dairwin.senate.gov>, SNOW, SHANNON M - DHS  
<shannonm.snow@dhs.wisconsin.gov>; Spitzer, GERALYN W - DHS  
<Geraldyn.Spitzer@dhs.wisconsin.gov>; Perron, Daniel J - DHS  
<Daniel.Perron@dhs.wisconsin.gov>; Wittman, Vicky M - DHS  
<Vicky.Wittman@dhs.wisconsin.gov>; DHS WebmailDQA  
<DHSWebmailDQA@dhs.wisconsin.gov>; Ellis, Matthew S - DHS  
<Matthew.Ellis@dhs.wisconsin.gov>; Jennifer Miller <Miller@co.dane.wi.us>; Bergstrom,  
Leanne C - DHS <Leanne.Bergstrom@dhs.wisconsin.gov>; Timberlake, Karen E - DHS  
<karen.timberlake@dhs.wisconsin.gov>  
**Subject:** Question about fraudulent document

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization.  
Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Woods, DHS staff, media reps, members of Legislature, and others:

I am addressing this to Otis Woods, administrator of the Division of Quality Assurance within DHS, because we have [previously corresponded](#), in response to my [April 27 letter](#) to Secretary Designee Timberlake. I am sharing it with the same group of others to whom I sent links to my story yesterday in the [Wisconsin Examiner](#), [Isthmus](#), and [The Progressive](#).

In response to the appearance of this story, about my discovery of a fraudulent document in the case involving the eviction of my mother, one of my journalist colleagues asked whether I had asked anyone from the Division of Quality Assurance or DHS "why they did this." My colleague wondered: "Did they at least provide some kind of answer, no matter how far-fetched?"

While I sense that any explanation from you for why someone did this would in fact be far-fetched, the reason I didn't ask is that I did not think you would respond, as you did not to my last email.

But my colleagues' point is well-taken: Can you explain why someone in DHS and presumably your division replaced a [document](#) that said a Nov. 8, 2021, inspection by a surveyor from the Division of Quality Assurance identified two deficiencies and concluded "The complaint was substantiated" with a [fraudulent document](#) that claims the Nov. 8 inspection identified "no deficiencies" and "The complaint was noted substantiated"?

It's okay if your answer is far-fetched. I just wanted to ask, for the record, about this latest development.

I will gladly include your response in my next article.

I would point out that none of my [fairly extensive reporting](#) on the eviction of my mother and subsequent developments has been

challenged on factual grounds. But I don't claim to be an objective observer of these events. I am not likely to be persuaded that you were right to alter the public record to suggest that the Division of Quality Assurance inspector reached conclusions directly contrary to those she in fact reached.

But, my journalist colleague is right: Someone should ask you for an explanation. Consider yourself asked.

--

Bill Lueders  
[blueders@gmail.com](mailto:blueders@gmail.com)  
608-669-4712