

Board of Contract Appeals
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C. 20405

May 20, 2004

GSBCA 16344-RELO

In the Matter of ANGELA R. KEEN

Angela R. Keen, Del City, OK, Claimant.

James F. Damron, Chief, Financial Services Division, Comptroller Directorate, Headquarters Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center, Department of the Air Force, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, appearing for Department of the Air Force.

GOODMAN, Board Judge.

Claimant, Angela R. Keen, is a civilian employee of the Department of the Air Force. She has requested that this Board review the agency's decision denying reimbursement of costs arising from her permanent change of station (PCS) move.

Factual Background

Claimant was issued travel orders dated July 22, 2003, to transfer from Sand Springs, Oklahoma, to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma. She moved her household goods herself on July 31, 2003, from her old duty station to her new duty station. She reported for duty at the new duty station on August 11, 2003.

Her travel orders stated that she was authorized reimbursement for shipment of household goods (HHG) by the government bill of lading (GBL) method. Claimant states that she was not familiar with the procedures and regulations governing PCS moves, and no one advised her accordingly. She was given a packet containing relevant portions of the Federal Travel Regulation (FTR) and the Joint Travel Regulations (JTR) before she accomplished her move. She moved her HHG with the help of family members and paid the cost herself.

On September 25, 2003, claimant submitted a travel voucher for reimbursement of her actual expenses of \$218.28 for truck rental, gas for the rental truck, and the turnpike toll. The agency reimbursed her these actual costs. She subsequently requested that she be reimbursed an additional \$2480.62, which she calculated would be her reimbursement

pursuant to the commuted rate methodology. The agency denied her claim and she asked this Board to review the agency's denial.

Discussion

Claimant's travel orders authorized reimbursement of costs incurred in moving her HHG pursuant to the GBL method. Under this method, the Government assumes responsibility for making arrangements for movement of HHG, ships the goods under a GBL, and compensates the carrier directly. See Federal Travel Regulation (FTR), 41 CFR 302-7.13(b) (2003); Joint Travel Regulation (JTR) C8210 A. (August 2003).

Claimant asserts that she was not advised as to the various methods available for shipping her HHG, and she therefore accomplished the move herself with the aid of family members. She now seeks to be compensated by the commuted rate method, under which the employee makes the arrangements for the move and is compensated by the agency based upon a published rate schedule. See 41 CFR 302.713(a); JTR C8205.

Claimant is not entitled to reimbursement at the commuted rate. If the agency had authorized the commuted rate method, the agency would have violated regulation, since the FTR provides that the commuted rate method does not apply to intra-state moves. 41 CFR 302-7.14(b); Linda G. Williams, GSBCA 15964-RELO, 03-01 BCA ¶ 32,148 (2002). The fact that claimant believes that she was not given sufficient advice by the agency cannot enlarge claimant's entitlement contrary to statute or regulation. Pamela S. Maanum, GSBCA 15654-RELO, 02-1 BCA ¶ 31,696.

When an employee chooses to use a method for shipping HHG other than the one authorized by the Government, reimbursement is limited to actual expenses incurred by the employee, not to exceed the cost of a government-arranged move. JTR C8210. The actual expense of claimant's move was \$218.28 and the agency reimbursed this amount to her. The agency correctly computed claimant's entitlement for her shipment of HHG as provided in the JTR.

Decision

The claim is denied.

ALLAN H. GOODMAN
Board Judge