

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

**CLAIMANT**

**EMPLOYER**

**APPEAL 16A-UI-08779-SC-T**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OC: 07/17/16**

**Claimant: Respondent (2)**

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct  
Iowa Code § 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quitting  
Iowa Code § 96.3(7) – Recovery of Benefit Overpayment  
Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 – Employer/Representative Participation Fact-finding Interview

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

The employer filed an appeal from the August 3, 2016, (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits based upon the determination it failed to provide sufficient information that it discharged the claimant for disqualifying misconduct. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on August 30, 2016. The claimant did not participate. The employer participated through the Manager of Customer Operations and was represented by the Senior Attorney. Employer's Exhibits 1 through 8 were received.

**ISSUES:**

Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?

Has the claimant been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits?

Can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?

Can charges to the employer's account be waived?

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: The claimant was employed full-time as a Gas Department Foreman beginning on December 4, 1989, and was separated from employment on June 3, 2016, when he was discharged. The claimant's position is considered a safety sensitive position and subjects him to drug testing under the US Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations. The employer also has a policy and testing procedure to maintain a drug-free workplace.

In 2014, the claimant was selected for drug testing and his test was positive for marijuana. He was placed on a last chance agreement in which he agreed to six additional drug tests per year for the next 60 months. He was also put on notice that any additional positive drug tests during the next 60 months would result in his discharge.

On May 27, 2016, the claimant was selected for a random drug test. He was sent to the local hospital for collection. A split sample was collected. The claimant's test was positive for marijuana. He opted to have the second sample tested. That test was positive for marijuana. The claimant was discharged for his second positive drug test in a 60-month period.

The administrative record reflects that the claimant has not received any unemployment insurance benefits since filing a claim with an effective date of July 17, 2016. The administrative record also establishes that the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview.

### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The first issue in this case is the effect of the confidentiality requirements of the federal law. The Omnibus Transportation Employee Testing Act of 1991 authorized the DOT to prescribe regulations for testing of commercial motor vehicle operators. 49 USC § 31306. Congress required that the regulations provide for "the confidentiality of test results and medical information" of employees tested under the law. 49 USC § 31306(c)(7). Pursuant to this grant of rulemaking authority, the DOT established confidentiality provisions in 49 CFR 40.321 that prohibit the release of individual test results or medical information about an employee to third parties without the employee's written consent. There is an exception, however, to that rule for administrative proceedings (e.g. unemployment compensation hearing) involving an employee who has tested positive under a DOT drug or alcohol test. 49 CFR 40.323(a)(1). The exception allows an employer to release the information to the decision maker in such a proceeding, provided the decision maker issues a binding stipulation that the information released will only be made available to the parties to the proceeding. 49 CFR 40.323(b). Although the employer did not request such a stipulation before the hearing, the administrative law judge stipulates that the information from the hearing record will only be made available to the parties to the proceeding or any other individuals authorized under 49 CFR 40.321.

This federal confidentiality provision must be followed despite conflicting provisions of the Iowa Open Records Act (Iowa Code chapter 22), the Iowa Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (Iowa Code chapter 17A), and Iowa Employment Security Law (Iowa Code chapter 96). Iowa Code § 22.2(1) provides: "Every person shall have the right to examine and copy a public record and to publish or otherwise disseminate a public record or the information contained in a public record." The exhibits, decision, and audio recording in an unemployment insurance case would meet the definition of "public record" under Iowa Code § 22.1-3. Iowa Code § 17A.12(7) provides that contested case hearings "shall be open to the public." Under Iowa Code § 96.6(3), unemployment insurance appeals hearings are to be conducted pursuant to the provisions of chapter 17A. The unemployment insurance rules provide that copies of all presiding officer decisions shall be kept on file for public inspection at the administrative office of the department of workforce development. Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-26.17(3).

The federal confidentiality laws regarding drug testing and medical information must be followed because, under the Supremacy Clause, U.S. Const., Art. VI, cl. 2, state laws that "interfere with, or are contrary to the laws of congress, made in pursuance of the constitution" are invalid. *Wisconsin Public Intervenor v. Mortier*, 501 U.S. 597, 604 (1991). One way that federal law may pre-empt state law is when state and federal law actually conflict. Such a conflict arises when "compliance with both federal and state regulations is a physical impossibility or when a

state law "stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress." *Id.* at 605. Although the general principle of confidentiality is set forth in a federal statute (49 USC § 31306(c)(7)), the specific implementing requirements are spelled out in the federal regulation (49 CFR 40.321). The United States Supreme Court has further ruled that "[f]ederal regulations have no less preemptive effect than federal statutes." *Capital Cities Cable, Inc. v. Crisp*, 467 U.S. 691, 699 (1984) (ruling that federal regulation of cable television pre-empted Oklahoma law restricting liquor advertising on cable television, and Oklahoma law conflicted with specific federal regulations and was an obstacle to Congress' objectives).

In this case, the Iowa Open Records law, APA, and Employment Security law actually conflict with the federal statute 49 USC § 31306(c)(7) and the implementing regulations 49 CFR 40.321 to the extent that they would require the release of individual test results or medical information about an employee to third parties beyond the claimant, employer, and the decision maker in this case. It would defeat the purpose of the federal law of providing confidentiality to permit the information regarding the test results to be disclosed to the general public. Therefore, the public decision in this case will be issued without identifying information. A decision with identifying information will be issued to the parties; but that decision, the audio record, and any documents in the administrative file (all of which contain confidential and identifying information) shall be sealed and not publicly disclosed.

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

Iowa law disqualifies individuals who are discharged from employment for misconduct from receiving unemployment insurance benefits. Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a. They remain disqualified until such time as they requalify for benefits by working and earning insured wages ten times their weekly benefit amount. *Id.* Iowa regulations define misconduct:

"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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)a. This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Huntoon v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

Employees in DOT safety-sensitive positions are required to submit to random drug testing and remain drug free while at work. The claimant was tested and found to be at work with marijuana in his system. The claimant's violation of the employer's policy and DOT regulations constitutes misconduct. The employer has met the burden of proof to establish that the claimant acted

deliberately or with recurrent negligence in violation of company policy, procedure, or prior warning. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code § 96.7 provides, in pertinent part:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits.

a. 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.

b. (1) (a) 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. The employer shall not be relieved of charges if benefits are paid because the employer or an agent of the employer failed to respond timely or adequately to the department's request for information relating to the payment of benefits. This prohibition against relief of charges shall apply to both contributory and reimbursable employers.

(b) However, provided the benefits were not received as the result of fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual, benefits shall not be recovered from an individual if the employer did not participate in the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to section 96.6, subsection 2, and an overpayment occurred because of a subsequent reversal on appeal regarding the issue of the individual's separation from employment.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10(1) provides:

Employer and employer representative participation in fact-finding interviews.

(1) "Participate," as the term is used for employers in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means submitting detailed factual information of the quantity and quality that if unrebutted would be sufficient to result in a decision favorable to the employer. The most effective means to participate is to provide live testimony at the interview from a witness with firsthand knowledge of the events leading to the separation. If no live testimony is provided, the employer must provide the name and telephone number of an employee with firsthand information who may be contacted, if necessary, for rebuttal. A party may also participate by providing detailed written statements or documents that provide detailed factual information of the events leading to separation. At a minimum, the information provided by the employer or the employer's representative must identify the dates and particular circumstances of the incident or incidents, including, in the case of discharge, the act or omissions of the claimant or, in the event of a voluntary separation, the stated reason for the quit. The specific rule or policy must be submitted if the claimant was discharged for violating such rule or policy. In the case of discharge for attendance violations, the information must include the

circumstances of all incidents the employer or the employer's representative contends meet the definition of unexcused absences as set forth in 871—subrule 24.32(7). On the other hand, written or oral statements or general conclusions without supporting detailed factual information and information submitted after the fact-finding decision has been issued are not considered participation within the meaning of the statute.

The claimant's separation was disqualifying; however, he has not made his weekly claims for benefits or received any unemployment insurance benefits. He has not been overpaid benefits. The issues of repayment and the chargeability of the employer's account are moot.

**DECISION:**

The unemployment insurance decision dated August 3, 2016 (reference 01) 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 has not been overpaid unemployment insurance benefits rendering the issues of repayment and the chargeability of the employer's account moot.

---

Stephanie R. Callahan  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

src/