BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE 
EXECUTIVE ETHICS BOARD

In the Matter of: 
Douglas Popwell, 
Respondent

EEB Case No. 2015-081

FINAL ORDER

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 24, 2017, the Executive Ethics Board (Board) found reasonable cause to believe that the Respondent, Douglas Popwell, violated the Ethics in Public Service Act while employed as an Engineering Aide 3 at the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Notice of the Reasonable Cause Determination and the right to request a hearing was served upon Mr. Popwell by regular mail and certified mail on March 27, 2017. Mr. Popwell failed to respond to the Reasonable Cause Determination within 30 days as required by WAC 292-100-060(2).

The Board entered an Order of Default on July 14, 2017. On July 17, 2017, Board staff provided Mr. Popwell with notice of the Board’s Order of Default by regular and certified mail.

Pursuant to WAC 292-100-060(4) Mr. Popwell was allowed 10 days to request vacation of the Order of Default. Mr. Popwell has not moved to vacate the order entered on July 14, 2017.

II. FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Mr. Popwell was hired by DNR in October of 1993 as an Engineering Aide 3 in the Public Land Survey Unit of the Engineering and General Service Division of DNR and was in that position for all times pertinent to this investigation.

2. The majority of work completed by Mr. Popwell for DNR involves indexing, a process of populating fields in the Application Xtender database with information derived
from land survey documents and maps. The information in the database is used by DNR customers (public, land survey professional, federal, state, county, and city agencies, and title companies) to research land boundary survey maps and documents statewide.

3. On October 4, 2014, Mr. Popwell was issued a Letter of Reprimand by his supervisor, Kris Horton (Ms. Horton), for his failure to meet indexing production expectations. Included in the Letter of Reprimand was expectations on his personal use of the internet, "[y]ou are expected to keep personal Internet use within the parameters of the DNR Policy P005-006 Use of State Electronic Communication Systems, which advises... approximately five minutes or less per occurrence and a norm not to exceed fifteen minutes per week."

4. On November 13, 2014, Dale Mix (Mr. Mix), Division Manager, requested an internal investigation be conducted by Human Resources (HR) into Mr. Popwell’s lack of productivity and especially into his non-work related internet activity during work hours.

5. The internal investigation of Mr. Popwell requested by Mr. Mix on November 13, 2014, was completed by HR on July 17, 2015. The internal investigation included interviews with Mr. Popwell’s supervisor, Ms. Horton, Mr. Popwell’s prior supervisor, Mick Sprouffske (Mr. Sprouffske), and a review of Mr. Popwell’s internet history for the period of April 13, 2015 through June 26, 2015.

6. Ms. Horton told DNR investigators that she had been Mr. Popwell’s supervisor since April 2013. Ms. Horton also told DNR investigators that she believed that Mr. Popwell was misusing his state computer and time browsing the internet for non-work related reasons. Ms. Horton stated that she believed that some of Mr. Popwell’s computer time was being used to manage his personal AdvoCare business.

7. Ms. Horton told DNR investigators that on July 2, 2013, she had a one-on-one conversation with Mr. Popwell concerning his personal use of the internet. Ms. Horton told
DNR investigators that Mr. Popwell responded that he already knew about the policy and
would make sure that he did not overuse the internet or go to sites that were not allowed.

8. On July 3, 2013 Ms. Horton had a staff meeting where she discussed the DNR
ethics policy. At that meeting Mr. Popwell became defensive and made statements about what
use of state resources should be allowed for personal reasons and that he has always been
allowed to use the internet. Following the meeting, Ms. Horton sent an email to her staff
requesting them to respond that they understood the DNR ethics policy. Mr. Popwell
responded that he understood and that he had a conversation with an HR staff member to get
clarification on “de minimis use.”

9. Ms. Horton told DNR investigators that on February 10, 2014, she again had to
meet with Mr. Popwell to discuss her concerns about his personal use of the internet during
work hours. On October 6, 2014, Ms. Horton issued a Letter of Reprimand to Mr. Popwell for
his failure to meet indexing production expectations. In the letter, Ms. Horton again includes
the DNR policy regarding personal internet use.

10. Ms. Horton indicated to the DNR investigator that Mr. Popwell’s internet use
has been “like a bad habit” and she had worked with him to change it but she had not seen a
change. Her observation of his computer screen and his low indexing production would
suggest a need to look at his internet use.

11. Mr. Sprouffske told the DNR investigator that he was Mr. Popwell’s supervisor
for the period of November 2005 through December 2012. Mr. Sprouffske told the
investigator that he had discussions with Mr. Popwell regarding tardiness and personal internet
use. He further stated that he had made it clear to Mr. Popwell that he was to follow DNR
policy. Mr. Sprouffske did not recall the dates of the conversation indicating that he did not
have documentation of the discussions.
12. DNR conducted a review of Mr. Popwell’s internet activity for the period of April 13, 2015 through June 26, 2015. A period of 50 working days. The review revealed that Mr. Popwell had 7,831 website visits, 671 appeared to be work related, 7,160 or 91.4% appeared not to be work related. A summary of the personal use is shown below:

- Google — 2,911 visits
- US Bank — 99 visits
- Walmart — 66 visits
- WSECU — 440 visits
- AdvoCare (personal outside business) — 162 visits
- Cabalas — 61 visits
- Craigslist — 214 visits
- Ebay — 103 visits
- Facebook — 249 visits
- YouTube — 205 visits
- Gmail — 259 visits
- Yahoo webmail (inbox) — 465 visits.

13. Mr. Popwell told the DNR investigators that he understood DNR’s policy on the Use of State Electronic Communication Systems and that he understood Ms. Horton’s expectation regarding the use of work time and his work computer for personal activities.

14. The DNR Investigator showed Mr. Popwell an Excel spreadsheet showing all of Mr. Popwell’s personal internet use for the period of April 13, 2015 through June 26, 2015 and asked him if he believed it was personal use. After reviewing the spreadsheet for a few moments Mr. Popwell told the investigator that he agreed the activity was personal use stating, “sure looks personal.” Mr. Popwell further stated that he had no idea of just how much personal use there was.

15. Mr. Popwell admitted to the DNR investigator that he had made online purchases of items like vitamin supplements and an aviation headset from eBay. Mr. Popwell...
admitted to the DNR investigator that he was a distributor for the AdvoCare Company but claimed he never made money on the internet using his work computer. He admitted to accessing the AdvoCare website on his work computer to look at his earnings and to see what was new with the company.

16. Mr. Popwell was asked specifically about a June 17, 2015, entry showing a google search for “AdvoCare twill racing shirts” and asked the purpose of the visit. Mr. Popwell replied that he was inquiring for a friend and that he did not make a purchase.

17. The DNR investigator asked Mr. Popwell if he thought it was appropriate for him to spend work time using his computer to look into AdvoCare just one day after receiving discipline from the Division Manager, Mr. Mix, for not meeting indexing production expectations (refer #5 above). Mr. Popwell responded, “[n]o.”

18. Mr. Popwell admitted that he had created a post on Craigslist to sell an engagement ring during work hours using the state computer.

19. On September 18, 2015, Mr. Popwell was terminated for his continued failure to meet the minimum indexing production expectations and his unwillingness to adhere to DNR policy regarding the use of his work computer and time for personal non-work related internet browsing.

III. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. RCW 42.52.160(1) – Use of persons, money, or property for private gain, states:

   No state officer or state employee may employ or use any person, money, or property under the officer’s or employee’s official control or direction, or in his or her official custody, for the private benefit or gain of the officer, employee, or another.
2. Under WAC 292-110-010 Use of state resources, prior to April 2016, state employees may use state resources for personal use as long as the use is reasonably related to the conduct of the state agency; authorized by an agency head or designee as related to an official state purpose; or for a specific use that promotes organizational effectiveness or enhances job-related skills. Additionally, state employees are allowed occasional but limited use of state resources as long as the following conditions are met:

   (i) There is little or no cost to the state;
   (ii) Any use is brief;
   (iii) Any use occurs infrequently;
   (iv) The use does not interfere with the performance of any officer's or employee's official duties; and
   (v) The use does not compromise the security or integrity of state property, information, or software.

3. Pursuant to chapter 42.52 RCW, the Executive Ethics Board has jurisdiction over Mr. Popwell and over the subject matter of this complaint.

4. Based on the evidence, Mr. Popwell used his state issued computer and time for his private benefit or gain in violation of RCW 42.52.160. Mr. Popwell's activities do not meet the exceptions for the use of state resources as permitted in WAC 292-110-010.

5. The Board is authorized to impose sanctions for violations to the Ethics Act pursuant to RCW 42.52.360.

6. In determining the appropriateness of the civil penalty, the criteria in WAC 292-120-030 have been reviewed.

IV. FINAL ORDER

Based on the foregoing:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED Respondent Douglas Popwell is liable for and shall pay a civil penalty of four thousand dollars ($4,000). The payment shall be made to the Executive Ethics Board within forty-five (45) days of this Order.
V. AUTHORITY AND PROCEDURE

Pursuant to RCW 34.05.470, Respondent has the right to file a Petition for Reconsideration stating the specific grounds upon which relief is requested. The Petition must be filed with the Executive Ethics Board at 2425 Bristol Court SW, Olympia, Washington 98504, or by U.S. Mail at P.O. Box 40149, Olympia, Washington 98504-0149, within ten (10) days of service of the Final Order upon Respondent.

The Petition for Reconsideration shall not stay the effectiveness of this order nor is a Petition for Reconsideration a prerequisite for seeking judicial review in this matter. A timely Petition for Reconsideration is deemed denied if, within twenty (20) days from the date the petition is filed, the Board does not (a) dispose of the petition or (b) serve the parties with a written notice specifying the date by which it will act on a petition.

Respondent has the right to petition the superior court for judicial review of the Board’s action under the provisions of chapter 34.05 RCW. For the requirements for filing a Petition for Judicial Review, see RCW 34.05.510 and sections following.
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