



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL  
1700 ARMY PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON DC 20310-1700

FEB 01 2018

SAIG-JAR

MEMORANDUM FOR U.S. Army Freedom of Information Office, Records Management & Declassification Agency, ATTN: Ms. Sasha Ward, 7701 Telegraph Road, Casey Building, RM 150, Alexandria, VA 22315-3860

SUBJECT: FOIA Reading Room Posting of Frequently Requested IG Record

1. As required by the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. 552, (a)(2)(D), request the enclosed IG report be posted in your FOIA reading room. This report documenting Senior Official Misconduct has been requested for release to the public at least three times under the FOIA.

Document

Subject

Keywords

DIG 17-00053

MG Gonsalves

Failed to treat a person with dignity and respect.

2. We will notify your office when to remove this report from the reading room.
3. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please call me or Ms. Rodriguez at (703) 545-4591.

Encl

MARGARET F. THOMAS  
Deputy Legal Advisor



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL  
1700 ARMY PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON DC 20310-1700

US ARMY INSPECTOR GENERAL AGENCY  
REPORT OF INVESTIGATION (ROI)  
(Case 17-00053)

**NAME / POSITION:** Major General (MG) Ryan F. Gonsalves, former Commanding General (CG), 4th Infantry Division (4ID), Fort Carson, CO.

**ALLEGATION / FINDING:** The allegation that MG Gonsalves failed to treat a person with dignity and respect was substantiated.

**BACKGROUND:**

1. On 20 July 2017, the United States (U.S.) Senate Committee on Armed Services (SASC) requested that the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) review an anonymous complaint alleging senior official impropriety. DoD forwarded the complaint to the Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA) Office of the Chief Legislative Liaison (OCLL). OCLL referred the complaint to the HQDA General Officer Management Office (GOMO).
2. On 20 July 2017, the Department of the Army Inspector General Agency (DAIG) received a referral from GOMO, forwarding a complaint against MG Gonsalves.
3. The complainant alleged that MG Gonsalves made disparaging comments to a female congressional staffer that visited Fort Carson in October 2016 as part of a congressional staff delegation (CSD) representing the House Armed Services Committee (HASC).
4. On 28 July 2017, The Inspector General directed an investigation by DAIG.

**SCOPE:**

1. The CSD consisted of [redacted] [redacted] for Congressman Austin Scott, Republican, 8th District, Georgia, HASC member; [redacted] [redacted] for Congressman Jim Langevin, Democrat, 2nd Congressional District, Rhode Island, HASC member; and [redacted] [redacted] former Army [redacted] OCLL, accompanied the CSD.

2. DAIG interviewed two of the three CSD members regarding the allegation that MG Gonsalves made disparaging comments towards [redacted] DAIG was restricted from interviewing [redacted] in person. However, on 4 August 2017, [redacted] provided a sworn statement with answers to questions DAIG provided to her. Although

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. DISSEMINATION IS PROHIBITED EXCEPT  
AS AUTHORIZED BY AR 20-1.

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) met with DAIG in person on 13 September 2017, DAIG was restricted from recording (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) interview and his testimony was not sworn or provided under penalty of perjury. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office of General Counsel (OGC), U.S. House of Representatives (USHoR), sought (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) participation in DAIG's investigation. As of 23 October 2017, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had not responded to DAIG's request to participate in an interview.

3. DAIG determined that ten people attended the 26 October 2016 CSD meeting with 4ID. These ten people were: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) MG Gonsalves; (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

4. In total, DAIG interviewed nine witnesses from 4ID. Three of the witnesses were not present for the October 2016 CSD meeting. However, they provided relevant information regarding discussions that occurred after MG Gonsalves met with the CSD members.

**STANDARD:** Army Regulation (AR) 600-20 (Army Command Policy), 6 November 2014, states in paragraph 4-19d(2), individuals are responsible for treating all persons as they should be treated, with dignity and respect.

#### DOCUMENTS / TESTIMONY:

1. On 20 July 2017, an anonymous complainant alleged that MG Gonsalves referred to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as "toots" and "sweetheart;" stated she was young to be doing policy work and inquired about her age; commented that she must not understand the budget process; and requested that she take detailed notes to remember why the military needed funding since she was a Democrat and did not believe in funding the military.

2. In an email (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) sent on 28 October 2016, Subject: EXSUM & Storyboard: STAFFDEL (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to Colorado Springs, Colorado, 23 - 27 October 2016, he stated the delegation visited military sites in Colorado from 23 - 27 October 2016 and that the HASC staffers received broad experience during the trip to include 4ID preparation and funding for the European Reassurance Initiative (ERI).

3. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) testified:

a. MG Gonsalves disparaged her when he remarked that she looked young to be doing policy work and subsequently asked her age. She remained professional and answered his question, but she "did not respond" to his other comments.

b. MG Gonsalves insulted her when he stated that she did not understand the budget process and when he directed her to take detailed notes to remind her why the military needed the funding he requested since she and her boss were Democrats and "don't understand the budget process" or "support defense spending."

c. MG Gonsalves disrespected her when he called her "toots" and "sweetheart." After his comment, she wrote a note to a nearby congressional colleague that read, "Did this guy really just call me sweetheart??" She then closed her notebook and stopped taking notes.

d. After the meeting, she informed MG Gonsalves' aide that the meeting was helpful and informative, but she considered MG Gonsalves' comments about her as inappropriate. She later discussed MG Gonsalves' behavior with [REDACTED] and Congressman Langevin. [REDACTED] asked her if she wished to report MG Gonsalves' behavior to the Army Inspector General. She declined.

[Investigating Officer's (IO) Note: [REDACTED] provided a sworn statement with answers to questions DAIG provided to her.]

4. Email, 12 October 2017, Subject: RE: Official Matter - Department of the Army Inspector General (DAIG) Agency. [REDACTED] informed DAIG that Congressman Langevin authorized the release of a redacted version of [REDACTED] notes from the 26 October 2016 CSD meeting. The redacted information reflected substantive matters discussed during the meeting. The comment referenced in [REDACTED] 4 August 2017 declaration was provided in its entirety.

5. [REDACTED] stated:

a. The CSD first met MG Gonsalves in the downstairs lobby area of the 4ID command group building. MG Gonsalves remarked to [REDACTED] "I've never heard of you" after [REDACTED] commented that they were both Armor officers. Each of the CSD members and [REDACTED] considered MG Gonsalves' comments sarcastic and unprofessional. He recalled during the formal meeting that MG Gonsalves directed several comments towards [REDACTED] that were "sexist, inappropriate, and unprofessional." He did not remember exactly what MG Gonsalves stated to [REDACTED] but he was adamant that MG Gonsalves addressed [REDACTED] age and referred to her as "sweetheart." He stated MG Gonsalves made the disparaging comments within the first 20 minutes of the meeting.

b. He knew [REDACTED] for more than a year and the two were "very familiar" with one another. He sat next to [REDACTED] during the meeting. He recalled MG Gonsalves discussed counterterrorism and total warfare in Europe in response to questions [REDACTED] asked. Though they did not "physically kick each other," they

both reacted to MG Gonsalves' inappropriate comments at the same time. However, the two CSD members did not have any "side conversations" with one another because doing so would have been unprofessional. He did not recall MG Gonsalves asking anyone to take notes; using the phrase "toots;" or making derogatory statements about Democrats.

c. After the 4ID meeting, he [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had "several discussions" which they were "equally" offended by MG Gonsalves comments before and after the meeting. He did not remember the comments he expressed during the multiple conversations regarding MG Gonsalves; nor did he recall the comments [REDACTED] communicated.

6. [REDACTED] testified:

a. When he met MG Gonsalves in the entrance of 4ID's headquarters building, the two discovered that they were both Army Armor officers. MG Gonsalves commented to [REDACTED] that the Armor officer branch was relatively small, "that's funny, I never heard of you," or words to that effect. He was initially stunned by MG Gonsalves' statement. In retrospect, he believed MG Gonsalves attempted to be funny, but his delivery was poorly executed.

b. During the meeting with the CSD members, [REDACTED] asked MG Gonsalves a question regarding the Northern Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the rising Russian threat, and the immigration of Islamic State of Iraq and Syria personnel. MG Gonsalves responded by asking [REDACTED] her age. After she answered [REDACTED] MG Gonsalves remarked he was serving in the Fulda Gap, Germany, watching the Soviet Union Army's 8th Guard when he was [REDACTED] [REDACTED] immediately appeared stunned and attempted to disengage from the discussion. She closed her notebook, backed away from the table, placed her pen down, and crossed her arms and legs. MG Gonsalves noticed [REDACTED] behavior and requested she come back to the table, reopen her notebook, and take notes because it was important for her "Democratic Boss" needed to understand why military funding was important. He was shocked by MG Gonsalves' use of the word "Democrat" and believed it indicated that MG Gonsalves lacked understanding that the HASC was made up of Democrats and Republicans. Therefore, MG Gonsalves did not need to delineate or highlight that [REDACTED] boss was a Democrat.

c. While he did not perceive MG Gonsalves' comments as disrespectful towards [REDACTED] definitely considered MG Gonsalves' comments as disrespectful towards her. At that evening's dinner, [REDACTED] expressed that MG Gonsalves targeted her due to her age and gender. However, he did not feel that MG Gonsalves targeted [REDACTED] or singled her out because she was a woman. MG Gonsalves simply made a miscalculation. Nonetheless, the other two staffers

stated they perceived MG Gonsalves' comments indicated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not understand the military because she worked for a Democratic member of Congress and that Democrats did not support the military. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that she intended to make a formal complaint regarding MG Gonsalves' comments.

d. After returning to Washington, D.C., (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed his (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) U.S. House of Representatives, OCLL, of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) concerns. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) directed him to verify if (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) wished to make a formal complaint. Ultimately, she elected not to because she wanted to continue to engage military members in the future.

e. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was very "sensitive" to gender bias. Before meeting MG Gonsalves, she expressed to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that it was rare for a woman to work defense issues on Capitol Hill and senior military members often failed to take the women who did seriously.

f. After Stars and Stripes announced MG Gonsalves' pending nomination [to serve as the next commander of U.S. Army Europe], (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) posted "angry" and "very negative" comments to her Facebook page. She stated the Army was making a "bad decision" choosing to promote MG Gonsalves and that MG Gonsalves did not understand how Congress worked. She further stated that MG Gonsalves referred to her as "sweetheart" and another expression (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) could not recall during the October 2016 meeting. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated he would have remembered if MG Gonsalves referred to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as "sweetheart" or other similar expressions during their meeting. However, he did not recall MG Gonsalves doing so.

[IO Note: DAIG interviewed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on three separate occasions. On 14 August 2017, he provided a sworn statement to DAIG. On 19 September 2017 and 4 October 2017 he conducted sworn and recorded interviews with DAIG. DAIG used (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) testimonies from 19 September and 4 October 2017 to summarize the comments above.]

[IO Note: On 12 July 2017, John Vandiver wrote "Report: 4th Infantry Division general to lead USAREUR" for Stars and Stripes online (<https://www.stripes.com/news/europe/report-4th-infantry-division-general-to-lead-usareur-1.477568#>).]

7. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) testified:

a. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was an honest and candid person whose character was never in question. Following the October 2016 CSD visit to Fort Carson, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed him that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) perceived MG Gonsalves as disrespectful. He directed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to verify whether (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was indeed insulted by MG Gonsalves'

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. DISSEMINATION IS PROHIBITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY AR 20-1.

behavior. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) never discussed the matter with him again. Therefore, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) considered (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) concerns "blown out of proportion" and resolved.

b. OCLL "frequently" received reports from congressional staffers who were "rather young," and felt insulted when senior military leaders failed to provide them the courtesies they believed were appropriate based upon the MoC the staffer represented. He believed the issue (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported to him was one of those instances.

8. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) testified:

a. He recalled the 4ID staff briefed the CSD members on the division's ongoing and future operations within Europe. The meeting was a positive and open conversation, and MG Gonsalves provided "very good" comments to the CSD members. His comments were professional and candid.

b. MG Gonsalves discussed the Army's budget, the need for predictable funding, and the impacts of continuing Congressional resolutions to military readiness. He did not recall any conversations regarding political affiliations occurring between MG Gonsalves and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). He had observed MG Gonsalves in several CSD engagements. He regarded MG Gonsalves as incredibly professional and self-disciplined and never commented on political affiliations. MG Gonsalves did not use the terms "toots" or "sweetheart," nor did MG Gonsalves make disparaging comments to any member of the CSD.

9. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) testified he did not attend the CSD meeting in October 2016 because he was away visiting Fort Leavenworth, KS. After he returned to Fort Carson, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed him that the CSD visit was "successful."

10. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) testified:

a. The CSD members genuinely sought to assist 4ID as they asked insightful questions regarding the division's tactical operations, European mission, and funding requirements. He was "more certain than not" that MG Gonsalves expressed the military's need for "consistent and predictable" funding from Congress to sustain readiness. MG Gonsalves highlighted that continuing resolutions from Congress were counterproductive to military readiness.

b. MG Gonsalves might have inquired about (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) military experience during the meeting, but he did not recall if MG Gonsalves commented on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) age. MG Gonsalves had addressed audience members' ages in "past" forums to emphasize his talking point, particularly if the audience was younger. However,

MG Gonsalves did not disparage anyone's intellect or experience when addressing audience member's ages.

c. During the October 2016 meeting, MG Gonsalves attempted to explain to the CSD members the Army's training strategy before 11 September 2001. The discussion was a productive and positive engagement about 4ID's ERI mission, budget challenges, and training. "There was absolutely no political tone – Absolutely none!" MG Gonsalves' remarks were "apolitical," nothing inappropriate was said, and the entire meeting was completely "benign."

d. He acknowledged there might have been some "small talk" between himself and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) regarding 4ID's mission in Germany following the CSD meeting. However, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not complain to him after the meeting that she considered MG Gonsalves' comments during the meeting as inappropriate.

[IO Note: DAIG used comments from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) 14 August 2017 sworn statement and his 23 August 2017 recorded testimony to summarize the testimony above.]

11. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) testified:

a. He attended the initial five to ten minutes of the October 2016 CSD meeting. The meeting proceeded smoothly, was "on par" with briefings that the division provided to other CSDs, and was a "pretty good discussion. The delegation members appeared particularly interested in 4ID's European affairs and its brigade element that was assigned to Europe. The CSD members began asking questions prior to his departure and MG Gonsalves answered most of their questions. They appeared very interested in his responses.

b. MG Gonsalves was very calm and professional. He took congressional staff visits very seriously and did a lot to prepare for them. MG Gonsalves' was typically aware of who the CSD members were and which MoC they represented. He tried to foster open conversation and dialogue with the congressional staffers and was interested in learning about each individual staffer's interests.

c. The CSD members asked MG Gonsalves what support 4ID needed from Congress. MG Gonsalves discussed the military's need for "consistent and predictable funding" to ensure readiness. It was a theme MG Gonsalves routinely espoused in various forums and was not unique to the October 2016 CSD visit.

d. He did not recall MG Gonsalves making any disparaging or negative comments during the CSD meeting, nor the CSD members complaining that MG Gonsalves behaved inappropriately during the meeting. Such behavior or complaints would have

"stuck out." Nothing about the visit "stood out as a concern." The "whole tone was professional and informative. There was nothing I thought was disparaging in any way."

12. [REDACTED] testified:

a. The meeting between the 4ID staff and the CSD members was a successful engagement. The CSD members asked "very good" questions regarding the division's capabilities and shortfalls and the interactions between U.S. Soldiers and Russian forces. He recalled that [REDACTED] asked some "general" questions and elicited MG Gonsalves' opinion regarding national strategic policy on Europe. MG Gonsalves inquired about her experience within the European theater to appropriately answer her questions. He never insulted her, made inappropriate comments towards her, addressed her inappropriately, used derogatory terms such as "toots" or "sweetheart," or made any politically offensive comments. [REDACTED] never appeared upset or offended by MG Gonsalves' comments.

b. At the conclusion of the meeting, [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] that 4ID provided the CSD with greater clarity and insight regarding 4ID's mission challenges within Europe.

[IO Note: DAIG used [REDACTED] sworn statement from 16 August 2017 to summarize the testimony above.]

13. MG Gonsalves testified:

a. He hosted 10 to 15 CSD visits during his 27 months as the 4ID CG. Though he might have been aware of CSD member's political affiliations, he did not discuss their affiliations during the meeting. He considered both Republicans and Democrats equally responsible for the nation's budget process.

b. He believed he interacted well with [REDACTED]. He asked her age, and thought he asked all of the CSD members their ages to provide context to the challenges associated with the U.S. transitioning from counter-insurgency (COIN) operations to decisive action engagements. He explained that many of today's Soldiers and military leaders have limited experience with decisive action engagements and were unfamiliar with Europe's defensive strategy. He emphasized that considerable time and money were needed to prepare U.S. forces for decisive action engagements in defense of Europe.

c. During the meeting, he discussed 4ID's budget challenges and stressed that 3rd Armored Brigade Combat Team (ABCT) consumed nearly 60 percent of the division's annual budget preparing for its' mission within Europe. He emphasized that 4ID needed "predictable and consistent funding" to safeguard the division's military

readiness. He expressed that Congress' "continuing resolution" approach to the nation's budget process impacted military readiness. He asked the CSD to take notes and highlight the military's need for consistent and predictable funding.

d. He recalled telling the CSD, "this is important, you may want to take some notes on this..." He did not single [REDACTED] out, and his recommendation to take notes was merely a suggestion and not "forceful." He did not notice any negative reactions from [REDACTED] or the other CSD members. His comments were common themes he expressed during other CSD visits and distinguished visitor meetings. His comments were not unique to the October 2016 meeting.

e. He denied referring to [REDACTED] as "toots" or "sweetheart," or making any comments about the CSD members' political affiliations. He regarded CSD visits as essential engagement sessions and he understood their importance. Therefore, he remained apolitical during the meeting. He believed it was important for the CSD members to provide their respective MoCs with quality information and he did not want to prevent that from occurring.

f. He considered the CSD members as engaging and intelligent people whom he treated with dignity and respect. He recalled leaving the meeting thinking the CSD members were pretty smart, knowledgeable about the meeting's subject matter, and they asked great questions. He subsequently informed [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] via email that the CSD visit went well. He was surprised that someone expressed concerns about the CSD visit nine months later.

[IO Note: MG Gonsalves and [REDACTED] testified that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] MCE, attended the CSD meeting via VTC from Europe. Evidence revealed that [REDACTED] was the [REDACTED] MCE, when the CSD met with 4ID in October 2016, not [REDACTED]. Therefore [REDACTED] was not present for the CSD meeting. [REDACTED] replaced [REDACTED] in mid-November 2016.]

14. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] did not recall attending the CSD meeting on 26 October 2016. She estimated that she attended seven of eight CSD meetings 4ID hosted over the preceding 12 months. She provided a copy of the email MG Gonsalves sent to [REDACTED] on 28 October 2016; Subject: 4ID SITREP to IIC (28 OCT). In the email, MG Gonsalves informed [REDACTED] that the CSD members "were very happy with their visit, interactions, and the information 4ID provided."

15. [REDACTED] testified:

a. The 4ID staff as a whole sought to ascertain the CSD members' level of experience and determine how much detail to provide when explaining issues to them. "I think we got to a point collectively where we tried to break things down in a very basic way to make sure that they got a good grasp of it." MG Gonsalves responded in more "common terms."

b. The VTC portion of the meeting lasted approximately 30 minutes, but he recalled [REDACTED] asked questions regarding NATO's view of Russia's aggression in Europe. In response, MG Gonsalves addressed the CSD members' ages as they appeared to be a "younger group." No one within the CSD appeared upset with MG Gonsalves discussed their ages

c. He did not recall MG Gonsalves directing [REDACTED] to take notes or stating that Democrats did not support the military's need for funding. "If he had said that, I would have taken note because I am a Democrat. It would be a very odd comment to make" and out of character for MG Gonsalves to make such comments. He never heard MG Gonsalves discuss politics or compare Democrats and Republicans. Nothing concerning, "out of place," or "awkward" occurred during the meeting. The meeting "went very well, was very positive, and the staffers appeared very receptive."

16. [REDACTED] testified he was not present for the October 2016 CSD meeting. However, he participated in approximately six or more CSD meetings while assigned to 4ID. MG Gonsalves was typically engaging during CSD meetings as he was interested in the CSD member's concerns and sought to provide comments relative to their personal and professional experiences. He never observed MG Gonsalves demean another person, use the expressions "toots" or "sweetheart," or treat someone with disrespect.

17. The 26 October 2016 itinerary for [REDACTED] CSD visit to 4ID indicated that [REDACTED] represented a Republican MoC, and [REDACTED] represented a Democrat MoC.

[IO Note: [REDACTED] itinerary did not indicate [REDACTED] political affiliation.]

[IO Note: Multiple witnesses testified they recalled a woman who was a member of the CSD attended the October 2016 meeting. However, they did not remember her name. The evidence established that the woman was [REDACTED]. For simplicity, DAIG referred to [REDACTED] by her actual name within their testimonies, although the witnesses never mentioned her by name.]

**ANALYSIS / DISCUSSION:**

1. On 20 July 2017, an anonymous complainant alleged that during a meeting held on 26 October 2016, MG Gonsalves disparaged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) when he inquired about her age; stated she must not understand the Congressional budget process; requested that she take detailed notes to remember why the military needed funding since she was a Democrat and did not believe in funding the military; and referred to her as "toots" and "sweetheart."

2. AR 600-20 states in paragraph 4-19d(2), individuals are responsible for treating all persons as they should be treated, with dignity and respect.

3. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) testimony supported the 20 July 2017 complaint. She testified that MG Gonsalves disparaged her age, experience, political affiliation, and gender during the October 2016 meeting. In addition to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) recalled that MG Gonsalves invoked the word "Democrat" in connection with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) believed MG Gonsalves referred to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as "sweetheart" during the meeting.

4. With regards to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) age and experience:

a. The evidence established that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) elicited MG Gonsalves' opinion regarding counterterrorism in Western Europe versus Russian aggression within Eastern Europe and the impacts on 4ID's mission in the theater. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) testified that MG Gonsalves remarked how young she looked to be doing policy work and asked her age. Nearly all witnesses recalled MG Gonsalves addressed the issue of age and experience during the meeting. However, opinions differed as to whether MG Gonsalves asked (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) her age, or he asked the ages and experiences of the CSD members as a whole.

b. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated that MG Gonsalves commented to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) "You wouldn't understand. You are not old enough to know." MG Gonsalves testified the full context of his statement regarded him explaining to the CSD members that for 17 years, the military's official doctrine focused on counterinsurgency. However, to combat Russian aggression, he believed the military needed to transform from its current counterinsurgency doctrine back to its pre 9/11 European warfare doctrine which involved "decisive action." He highlighted age to try and explain why the CSD members might not have been aware of the military's official doctrine before 9/11. MG Gonsalves believed that many of today's Soldiers and military leaders have limited experience with decisive action engagements and were unfamiliar with Europe's defensive strategy. Therefore, his comments were not specific to the CSD members.

c. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) believed that MG Gonsalves attempted to ascertain (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) experience with European affairs to appropriately answer her questions. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) further regarded the CSD as a whole to be a "younger group" in comparison to other CSDs. Therefore, the 4ID staff tried to determine how much detail to provide when explaining issues to them. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) believed MG Gonsalves responded in more "common terms." (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) testified that MG Gonsalves routinely addressed audience members' ages in past forums to emphasize his talking points, particularly if they were younger. However, he never insulted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) or made inappropriate comments towards her.

d. Of the nine meeting attendees, two witnesses, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not recall any discussion of age or experience; one witness, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) thought the discussion focused on experience, rather than age; and one (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was not certain if MG Gonsalves discussed audience members' ages, but testified that MG Gonsalves had addressed audience members' ages in past forums to emphasize his talking point. Five of the seven witnesses who recalled some discussion of age or experience during the meeting did not consider MG Gonsalves' comments as offensive or targeting (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Therefore, the evidence failed to establish that MG Gonsalves insulted or disparaged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) when he inquired about her age and experience. Instead, the preponderance of the evidence indicates that any questions regarding age were intended simply to gauge the experience level of the audience.

5. With regards to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) political affiliation:

a. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) confirmed that MG Gonsalves commented on the political affiliation of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) boss, who was a Democrat, stating her boss needed to understand the importance of military funding. MG Gonsalves' comments led the staffers to perceive that MG Gonsalves believed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and potentially others, "did not understand the military because she worked for a Democratic member of Congress." (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) believed MG Gonsalves' comments were disrespectful and indicated that she and her Democratic boss didn't "understand the budget process" or didn't "support defense spending."

b. Although MG Gonsalves sought to explain the importance of military funding, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) believed his comments regarding the political affiliation of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) boss were shocking. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) explained that MG Gonsalves lacked an understanding of the CSD audience and makeup of the HASC. Nonetheless, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) testified that he did not believe MG Gonsalves' comments were inappropriate, derogatory, disparaged the members of the CSD, or targeted any individual. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported the incident to his superior, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). However, the evidence demonstrated that he did so because (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was considering whether to file a formal complaint.

c. [REDACTED] recalled MG Gonsalves discussing Congress' need to provide "consistent and predictable funding" to adequately support military readiness. According to [REDACTED] MG Gonsalves' comments regarding Congressional funding were not unique to the October 2016 CSD meeting. He routinely espoused the comments in various forums.

d. MG Gonsalves denied addressing the CSD members' political affiliations, and he did not recall anyone expressing political comments during the meeting. He considered both Republicans and Democrats equally responsible for the nation's budget process. He recalled discussing that 4ID spent nearly 60 percent of its annual budget preparing the 3rd ABCT for deployment to Europe. Therefore, he highlighted that Congressional Continuing Resolutions impacted the division's military readiness and tried to elicit the CSD members' support to stress the importance of military funding to their respective MoCs.

e. [REDACTED], who attended the initial ten minutes of the meeting, recalled the CSD members began asking questions prior to his departure and MG Gonsalves answered most of their questions. [REDACTED] speculated that MG Gonsalves' disparaging comments towards [REDACTED] occurred within the first 20 minutes of the meeting, but he did not recall MG Gonsalves commenting on [REDACTED] political affiliation or expressing that Democrats did not support the military. [REDACTED] testified he was present for the first 30 minutes of the meeting and did not recall MG Gonsalves directing [REDACTED] to take notes or stating that Democrats did not support the military's need for funding. He believed it would have been a very odd comment for MG Gonsalves to make. He believed he would have taken note if MG Gonsalves had made such a comment because he was a Democrat.

f. Of the nine meeting attendees who participated in the investigation, only [REDACTED] testified that MG Gonsalves made an insulting or disrespectful comment regarding political affiliation. MG Gonsalves denied making such a statement. Five witnesses, including [REDACTED] did not recall a comment regarding political affiliation being made, and [REDACTED] denied any insulting politically offensive comments being made. While [REDACTED] confirmed the word "Democrat" was used and was "shocked" by MG Gonsalves' comments regarding the political affiliation of [REDACTED] boss, he did not believe MG Gonsalves' were disrespectful or derogatory. Although MG Gonsalves' comments were perceived as insulting by [REDACTED] the evidence did not support a conclusion that MG Gonsalves' comments were objectively disrespectful, derogatory, disparaging, or insulting towards [REDACTED]. Rather, the evidence demonstrated that the context of the conversation was the need for consistent and predictable military funding. Thus, while noting the political affiliation of [REDACTED] boss may have been unnecessary, the use of the term "Democrat" was not objectively viewed as disrespectful by the other attendees. Therefore, the preponderance of the credible evidence indicated that

MG Gonsalves' use of the word "Democrat" to describe [REDACTED] boss was not a violation of the requirement to treat all persons with dignity and respect.

6. With regards to MG Gonsalves referring to [REDACTED] as "toots" and "sweetheart:"

a. [REDACTED] testified that after MG Gonsalves called her "toots" and "sweetheart," she wrote a note to a nearby congressional colleague that read, "Did this guy really just call me sweetheart??" She then closed her notebook and stopped taking notes. [REDACTED] provided an excerpt from her notebook which reflected the note she wrote to her colleague, during the meeting. [REDACTED] stated that he sat next to [REDACTED] but never had any "side conversations" with [REDACTED] during the meeting.

b. [REDACTED] was adamant that MG Gonsalves referred to [REDACTED] as "sweetheart," and that his comments were "sexist, inappropriate, and unprofessional." [REDACTED] recalled the CSD members, to include [REDACTED] had "several discussions" following the meeting regarding MG Gonsalves' comments, and that each of them were "equally" offended. Nonetheless, [REDACTED] was unable to recall relevant aspects regarding MG Gonsalves' use of the expression "sweetheart," or recall the comments he or others expressed during subsequent discussions between the CSD members and [REDACTED]

[IO Note: [REDACTED] elected not to testify under penalty of perjury.]

c. DAIG interviewed nine of the ten people who attended the CSD meeting on 26 October 2016. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were the only two witnesses who recalled MG Gonsalves referring to her as "sweetheart." [REDACTED] was the only witness who recalled MG Gonsalves referring to her as "toots."

d. [REDACTED] recalled the CSD members discussed, more than once, how they were offended by MG Gonsalves' comments. However, [REDACTED] testified he never heard MG Gonsalves use the expressions "sweetheart" or "toots." [REDACTED] first learned that MG Gonsalves referred to [REDACTED] as "sweetheart" when he read the comments [REDACTED] posted to her Facebook page, which occurred after "Stars and Stripes" announced on 12 July 2017 that MG Gonsalves had been nominated for the USAREUR commander position. [REDACTED] believed that he would have recalled if MG Gonsalves used an expression, such as "sweetheart," during the October 2016 meeting. However, he did not recall MG Gonsalves doing so.

e. [REDACTED] stated that she reported her concerns regarding MG Gonsalves to [REDACTED] after the meeting. However, DAIG interviewed [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] as it was unclear who specifically [REDACTED] regarded as [REDACTED]. Both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

SAIG-IN (17-00053)

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) testified that no one from the CSD ever complained to them about inappropriate behavior by MG Gonsalves during the CSD meeting.

f. Although MG Gonsalves testified that he did not refer to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as "sweetheart" at any time during the meeting, the evidence did not support his recollection. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated that she heard MG Gonsalves refer to her as "sweetheart." Additionally, she stated that she contemporaneously wrote the comment in her notebook, which she subsequently provided to corroborate that she heard him call her "sweetheart." Furthermore, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was adamant that MG Gonsalves referred to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as "sweetheart." Although (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also alleged that MG Gonsalves referred to her as "toots," there was no evidence that corroborated that he referred to her as "toots."

g. The preponderance of the evidence indicated MG Gonsalves referred to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as "sweetheart" during the October 2016 meeting. By MG Gonsalves referring to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as "sweetheart," MG Gonsalves violated Army Command Policy by not treating her with dignity and respect.

**CONCLUSION:** The allegation that MG Gonsalves failed to treat a person with dignity and respect was substantiated.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. DISSEMINATION IS PROHIBITED EXCEPT  
AS AUTHORIZED BY AR 20-1.

SAIG-IN (17-00053)

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Record the allegation that MG Gonsalves failed to treat a person with dignity and respect in the investigations database as substantiated.
2. Refer this report to the Judge Advocate General for appropriate action.

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

IG, Investigator

**APPROVED:**

QUANTOCK, DAVID  
EARL (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

DAVID E. QUANTOCK  
Lieutenant General, USA  
The Inspector General

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. DISSEMINATION IS PROHIBITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY AR 20-1.**

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

**EXHIBIT    ITEM**

**A            Authority/Complaint**

- A-1: Complaint
- A-2: Directive
- A-3: Legal Review

**B            Standard: AR 600-20 (Army Command Policy), 6 November 2014, paragraph 4-19d(2)**

**C            Documents**

- C-1: Email, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) U.S. House of Representatives
- C-2: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Notebook Excerpt
- C-3: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Statement
- C-4: Email, 28 October 2016, Subject: EXSUM & Storyboard: STAFFDEL (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to Colorado Springs, Colorado, 23-27 October 2016
- C-5: Email, 28 October 2016, Subject: 4ID SITREP to IIC (28 OCT)
- C-6: 26 October 2016, Command Brief, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) CSD visit
- C-7: Itinerary for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) CSD visit
- C-8: Request for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Participation with DAIG's Investigation
- C-9: Stars and Stripes announces MG Gonsalves' selection for EUCOM CG

**D            Testimony**

- D-1: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
- D-2: [Redacted]
- D-3: [Redacted]
- D-4: [Redacted]
- D-5: [Redacted]
- D-6: [Redacted]
- D-7: [Redacted]
- D-8: [Redacted]
- D-9: MG Gonsalves
- D-10: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
- D-11: [Redacted]
- D-12: [Redacted]

**E            Notifications**

- E-1: (b)(6);(a)(7)(C)
- E-2: [Redacted]
- E-3: MG Ryan F. Gonsalves

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. DISSEMINATION IS PROHIBITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY AR 20-1.**