



UNITED STATES
CIVILIAN BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

July 16, 2020

CBCA 6797-RELO

In the Matter of CAITLIN C. CLINTON-SELIN

Caitlin C. Clinton-Selin, Claimant.

Catharine S. Debelle, Office of Counsel, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Alexandria, VA, appearing for Department of the Army.

VERGILIO, Board Judge.

The agency properly capped the payment of the claimant's actual expenses incurred in self-moving household goods (HHG) based upon the actual weight. The estimated weight used in pre-move calculations did not establish the basis for payment.

Caitlin C. Clinton-Selin, a civilian employee, completed a permanent change of station within the continental United States, with a report date in April 2019. The Government had authorized use of Government-arranged transportation of household goods. Based upon an estimated weight of HHG, the agency identified an estimated cost, which was conveyed to the claimant with the admonition "anything over that you are responsible."

The Joint Travel Regulation (JTR) 0543 specifies that "[i]f a Government move is authorized, but the civilian employee chooses to move him or herself, then the Government reimburses only the actual expenses, limited to what it would have cost the Government to ship the HHG." JTR 054305-E.3 conveys the same limitation ("Reimbursement is limited to actual expenses incurred by the civilian employee, limited to the 'Best Value' cost of a Government-arranged move for the same HHG weight."). Consistent with regulation, the claimant's authorization specified (emphasis added):

Based on cost comparison, shipment of HHG's by Government Bill of Lading (GBL) is authorized. Traveler may choose to make his/her own shipping arrangements. However, reimbursement is limited to the lesser of *actual*

CBCA 6797-RELO

expense of the cost the Government would have incurred had the goods been shipped by GBL.

The claimant opted for a self-move. Upon completion of the move, the claimant sought reimbursement of her actual costs, which were below the Government's estimate. However, with the actual weight of the shipment, the Government calculated and paid the lesser of her actual costs and what the cost would have been for the actual weight as a Government move. The claimant notes that she relied upon the Government's estimate in determining her actions. Perhaps the claimant did not realize that, as is explicit in the regulation and authorization, the actual expense of the cost the Government would have incurred indicates a cap based upon the actual weight of the goods, not the estimated weight utilized in the estimate.

The agency acted in accordance with regulation and paid the correct amount for the claimant's shipment of HHG. The claimant does not prevail here.

Joseph A. Vergilio
JOSEPH A. VERGILIO
Board Judge