

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

ROBERT D GROVES
PO BOX 108
510 W MAIN
GRAFTON IL 62037

ALTER BARGE LINE INC
STE G50
2117 STATE ST
BETTENDORF IA 52722-1400

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-11950-LT
OC: 10-30-05 R: 12
Claimant: Respondent (2)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319**.

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge/Misconduct
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Act (FMCSA) 49 CFR 40 and 382
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) - Recovery of Benefit Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Employer filed a timely appeal from the November 21, 2005, reference 01, decision that allowed benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on December 20, 2005. Claimant did participate. Employer did participate through Randy Kirschbaum. Employer's Exhibit 1 was received.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full-time first mate through August 14, 2005, when he was discharged. Employer found what appeared to be illegal drugs on the boat and issued a reasonable

suspicion drug test to all employees on the boat on August 9. Claimant was the only employee who tested positive for marijuana and was discharged on August 14 pursuant to federal DOT regulations because of his safety sensitive position. Claimant has completed the suggested treatment program as of September 21 and will contact employer about the possibility of reemployment.

The claimant has received unemployment benefits since filing a claim with an effective date of October 30, 2005.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct.

Iowa Code section 96.5-2-a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

a. The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

871 IAC 24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

(1) Definition.

a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Act (FMCSA) generally provides:

49 CFR 382.411 requires that the employer notify the employee of the test results and, if positive, which controlled substance was present.

Section 382.501 requires the employer or designated employer representative (DER) to remove the driver from performing safety-sensitive functions.

Section 382.601 The employer is required to develop a policy about the misuse of alcohol and controlled substances and provide proof of employee receipt.

49 CFR 40.15 allows for the use of a service agent, such as a medical review officer (MRO) to act on behalf of the employer to meet DOT testing requirements.

Section 40.131 requires the employer or MRO to speak directly to the employee about the test result.

Section 40.137 The MRO must offer the employee a chance to provide a legitimate medical explanation for the positive test result.

Section 40.153 The MRO must notify the employee of the right to a split specimen test at their cost and how to obtain that test. See also, 49 CFR 40.171.

Section 40.163 The MRO must report the initial and split test results, if any, to the employer and employee. See also, 49 CFR 40.187.

Upon employer's drug screen pursuant to reasonable suspicion, claimant tested positive for use of marijuana and did not dispute the results. The claimant is required to be drug free in the workplace and employer properly removed him from his safety sensitive position. The violation of the known work rule and DOT regulations constitutes misconduct as it presents a safety hazard to the employee and the general public and potential liability for the employer. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of Iowa law.

DECISION:

The November 21, 2005, reference 01, decision is reversed. The claimant was discharged from employment due to job-related misconduct. Benefits are withheld until such time as he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$1,745.00.

dml/kjw