

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

Claimant	<b>APPEAL 19A-UI-06114-JC-T</b>
Employer	<b>ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION</b>
	<b>OC: 07/07/19 Claimant: Respondent (2)</b>

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct  
49 CFR 40.321 – Sealed Record Confidential Information  
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Act (FMCSA) 49 CFR 40 and 382  
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/appellant filed an appeal from the July 30, 2019 (reference 01) Iowa Workforce Development (“IWD”) unemployment insurance decision that allowed benefits. The parties were properly notified about the hearing. A telephone hearing was held on August 26, 2019. The claimant did not respond to the notice of hearing to furnish a phone number with the Appeals Bureau and did not participate in the hearing. The employer participated through a Human Resources Supervisor.

The administrative law judge took official notice of the administrative records including the fact-finding documents. Employer Exhibits A-D were admitted. Based on the evidence, the arguments presented, and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**ISSUES:**

Shall the hearing record and decision be publicly disclosed?  
Was the claimant discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct?  
Has the claimant been overpaid any unemployment insurance benefits, and if so, can the repayment of those benefits to the agency be waived?  
Can any 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 driver and was separated from employment on June 18, 2019, when he was discharged due to federal Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations.

Employer has a written drug and alcohol policy. The policy provides for random drug testing and states a positive test will result in termination. (Employer Exhibit A). Based upon the nature

of its business, employer must also comply with federal DOT regulations. Claimant signed an acknowledgment of receipt of employer policies upon hire in 2018 (Employer Exhibit B).

Claimant was selected for a random drug screen on June 13, 2019. Claimant went to a facility in Waterloo, Iowa to receive the test. Employer utilizes a third party vendor in assistance of selecting applicants for drug screenings at random. Claimant consented to the drug screening and a urine sample tested positive for amphetamines (Employer Exhibit C). Upon claimant's initial positive test, the testing facility contacted him to let him know that he tested positive. The contact was verbal. Claimant was given the opportunity to have a split sample tested, but did not. No evidence was presented that the claimant provided an explanation for sample. No evidence was presented that the claimant participated in a substance abuse evaluation based upon the employer's referral. He was subsequently discharged.

The administrative record reflects that claimant has received unemployment benefits in the amount of \$518.00, since filing a claim with an effective date of July 7, 2019. A human resources administrator, participated.

### **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 United States Department of Transportation (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, I conclude that this does cause the information to be excluded from the hearing record. In the statement of the case, a stipulation in compliance with the regulation has been entered, which corrects the failure of the employer to obtain the stipulation before submitting the information to the appeals bureau.

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.**

Iowa Code § 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.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(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 Dep't of Job Serv.*, 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 382.601 The employer is required to develop a policy about the misuse of alcohol and controlled substances and provide proof of employee receipt.

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.

The Iowa Supreme Court has held that an employer may not "benefit from an unauthorized drug test by relying on it as a basis to disqualify an employee from unemployment compensation benefits." *Eaton v. Iowa Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 602 N.W.2d 553, 557, 558 (Iowa 1999).

The employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. IDJS*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. IDJS*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa App. 1988). Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." *Newman v. Iowa Department of Job Service*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa App. 1984).

Employees are required to be drug free in the workplace. The violation of the known work rule constitutes misconduct as it presents a safety hazard to the employee and the general public and potential liability for the employer. In this case, the employer had an established procedure for drug and alcohol screening, which was provided to claimant at hire, and notified him that he could be discharged for a positive drug screening. The claimant tested positive for amphetamines after being selected for a random test. He had no explanation for the test results. He did not request a split sample testing. He was made aware of the results by way of

the medical review officer. The results do not have to be provided in writing for a DOT drug screening.

The claimant did not attend the hearing to refute the credible evidence of the employer. Based on the evidence presented, the administrative law judge concludes the claimant violated the employer's policy by testing positive for a controlled substance and the employer was required to disqualify him from driving under federal law. Work-connected misconduct by the claimant has been proven in this case. Benefits are denied.

**The next issues to address are overpayment and relief of charges for the employer.**

Iowa Code § 96.3(7)a-b provides:

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 § 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 § 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.

(1) An accounting firm, agent, unemployment insurance accounting firm, or other entity that represents an employer in unemployment claim matters and demonstrates a continuous pattern of failing to participate in the initial determinations to award benefits, as determined and defined by rule by the department, shall be denied permission by the department to represent any employers in unemployment insurance matters. This subparagraph does not apply to attorneys or counselors admitted to practice in the courts of this state pursuant to § 602.10101.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10 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.

(2) "A continuous pattern of nonparticipation in the initial determination to award benefits," pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, as the term is used for an entity representing employers, means on 25 or more occasions in a calendar quarter beginning with the first calendar quarter of 2009, the entity files appeals after failing to participate. Appeals filed but withdrawn before the day of the contested case hearing will not be considered in determining if a continuous pattern of nonparticipation exists. The division administrator shall notify the employer's representative in writing after each such appeal.

(3) If the division administrator finds that an entity representing employers as defined in Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, has engaged in a continuous pattern of nonparticipation, the division administrator shall suspend said representative for a period of up to six months on the first occasion, up to one year on the second occasion and up to ten years on the third or subsequent occasion. Suspension by the division administrator constitutes final agency action and may be appealed pursuant to Iowa Code section 17A.19.

(4) "Fraud or willful misrepresentation by the individual," as the term is used for claimants in the context of the initial determination to award benefits pursuant to Iowa Code section 96.6, subsection 2, means providing knowingly false statements or knowingly false denials of material facts for the purpose of obtaining unemployment insurance benefits. Statements or denials may be either oral or written by the claimant. Inadvertent misstatements or mistakes made in good faith are not considered fraud or willful misrepresentation.

This rule is intended to implement Iowa Code section 96.3(7)"b" as amended by 2008 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2160.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which he was not entitled. The claimant has been overpaid benefits in the amount of \$518.00. The unemployment insurance law provides that benefits must be recovered from a claimant who receives benefits and is later determined to be ineligible for benefits, even though the claimant acted in good faith and was not otherwise at fault. However, the overpayment will not be

recovered when it is based on a reversal on appeal of an initial determination to award benefits on an issue regarding the claimant's employment separation if: (1) the benefits were not received due to any fraud or willful misrepresentation by the claimant and (2) the employer did not participate in the initial proceeding to award benefits. The employer will not be charged for benefits if it is determined that it did participate in the fact-finding interview. Iowa Code § 96.3(7), Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.10.

In this case, the claimant has received benefits but was not eligible for those benefits. The employer satisfactorily participated in the scheduled fact-finding interview by way of a human resources administrator. Since the employer did participate in the fact-finding interview, the claimant is obligated to repay the benefits he received and the employer's account shall not be charged.

**DECISION:**

The July 30, 2019, (reference 01) unemployment insurance 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 he weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant has been overpaid benefits in the amount of \$518.00 and must repay the benefits because the employer participated in the fact-finding interview. The employer's account is relieved of charges. This record is sealed and shall not be publicly disclosed.

---

Jennifer L. Beckman  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jlb/scn