



UNITED STATES
CIVILIAN BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

June 30, 2026

CBCA 8832-RELO

In the Matter of COLIN B.

Colin B., Claimant.

Renee Achille-Williamson, Supervisory Budget Analyst, Air Force Personnel Center, Department of the Air Force, Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph Air Force Base, TX, appearing for Department of the Air Force.

VOLK, Board Judge.

Claimant seeks review of a decision by the Department of the Air Force (Air Force) denying his requested extension for storage in transit (SIT) costs. We deny the claim.

Background

Claimant was a civilian employee of the Air Force with a duty station outside the continental United States (OCONUS). In March 2025, he accepted an offer for deferred resignation and began administrative leave. In April 2025, he received permanent change of station orders to return to the continental United States (CONUS). His household goods were packed in May 2025, and he arrived in CONUS in June 2025.

Claimant's household goods were placed in storage in CONUS on July 9, 2025. SIT costs were authorized for an initial period of ninety days, establishing an October 7, 2025, deadline for claimant to accept delivery of his household goods. Claimant would be responsible for storage costs after October 7, 2025, absent approval of a SIT extension by the Air Force.

On August 28, 2025, claimant requested a ninety-day SIT extension from his former OCONUS unit, explaining that he had not yet been able to purchase a home. The OCONUS

unit notified claimant that his requested extension had been approved on September 3, 2025, but two days later it followed up to advise him that it lacked authority to approve the extension request. Claimant's former OCONUS unit provided him with an email address for the office that had the necessary approval authority. Claimant sent his extension request to that office on September 9, 2025. Later that day, he received a reply requesting that he complete an attached questionnaire and submit supporting documentation. Claimant provided the requested information on September 19, 2025.

On September 23, 2025, the Air Force asked claimant for additional information, including the date of his return to CONUS, the date he began searching for a home, and his search criteria. Claimant responded later that day. He explained that he was searching for a home "with at least 4 bedrooms, preferably 5, at least 3 bathrooms, and enough land to have a small homestead (ideally 10+ acres)."

On October 1, 2025, a lapse in appropriations began, triggering furloughs that prevented claimant from communicating with Air Force personnel regarding the matter until mid-November 2025. Claimant did not receive a decision on his SIT extension request before the lapse in appropriations began. The last communication he received from the Air Force before the lapse in appropriations was a September 30, 2025, email with subject "7 Day Conversion Notice." That email stated that the Air Force's "Transportation Officer has reviewed your temporary storage entitlement and determined the final day of storage at government expense is 10/7/2025." The September 30, 2025, email was one of several similar notices that the Air Force began sending 45 days before the October 7, 2025, SIT expiration date. Although claimant was not able to communicate with the Air Force during the lapse in appropriations, he was able to communicate with the private company storing his goods throughout this period and could have elected to have his goods removed from storage.

On November 14, 2025, after appropriations were restored, the Air Force emailed claimant to ask if he was still requesting the extension or had arranged for delivery of his household goods before the expiration date. On November 18, 2025, claimant replied that his goods were still in storage and he was still requesting the SIT extension.

On November 19, 2025, the Air Force notified claimant that it had denied his request for an extension. The Air Force concluded that claimant's inability to secure a home that fit his search criteria, including at least ten acres of land for homesteading, did not establish that he faced a lack of suitable housing.

Discussion

Claimant's relocation allowances are governed by the Federal Travel Regulation (FTR), as supplemented by the Joint Travel Regulations (JTR). *See Bryan L.*, CBCA 8470-RELO, 25-1 BCA ¶ 38,920, at 189,428. Those regulations authorize an initial SIT period of ninety days for OCONUS-to-CONUS relocations. 41 CFR 302-7.9(b) (2025) (FTR 302-7.9(b)); JTR 054307.A (Sept. 2025). Under the JTR, a "Service or Agency official may authorize or approve an extension of up to 90 days due to" various factors, including "[l]ack of suitable civilian housing." JTR 054307.A.2. However, "[i]f additional storage is not authorized or approved, the civilian employee is financially responsible for additional storage expense." *Id.* 054307.A.1. "[W]hen regulations vest discretion in an agency with respect to the authorization of particular relocation expenses, the agency's judgment will not be disturbed unless the determination is arbitrary, capricious, or clearly erroneous." *Bryan L.*, 25-1 BCA at 189,428 (quoting *William F. Brooks, Jr.*, CBCA 2595-RELO, 12-2 BCA ¶ 35,064, at 172,238).

In this case, the Air Force concluded that the circumstances presented by claimant did not meet the criteria for a SIT extension under JTR 054307.A.2. We find no error in that decision. The record in this matter indicates that claimant's difficulty in securing a home resulted from his search criteria, particularly his preference for a property with at least ten acres of land. The Air Force found claimant's "acreage criteri[on] to be a personal preference, beyond the actual housing he stated was needed." Agency Response at 3. We agree. Claimant has not provided any evidence to suggest that he could not have promptly secured adequate housing for his family had he forgone the acreage parameter. Claimant has not established that he faced a lack of suitable civilian housing, and he has not asserted that any other factor in JTR 054307.A.2 supports his extension request.

Nonetheless, claimant also seeks reimbursement on the basis that he could have avoided liability for the extended storage costs if not for the Air Force's delay in resolving his extension request and his inability to communicate with Air Force personnel during the lapse in appropriations. The Air Force concluded that these circumstances do not provide a basis for it to grant a SIT extension. We find no basis to disturb that determination. While the effect of the lapse in appropriations on claimant was unfortunate, by electing to leave his household goods in storage without having received approval for a SIT extension, he accepted the risk that the extension request would ultimately be denied.

Decision

The claim is denied.

Daniel B. Volk

DANIEL B. VOLK

Board Judge