

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: 98-00610

FEB 5 1999

COUNSEL: T [REDACTED]

HEARING DESIRED: NO

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

The additional "Excess Cost" of \$334.11 she was assessed for shipping her Household Goods (HHG) to Wichita, KS, vice Kansas City, MO, be eliminated.

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

Had she been initially given the correct cost, she may have decided not to ship all of the property.

In support of her request, the applicant submits a personal statement and a letter from the Excess Cost Adjudication Function (DFAS-DE/FYDCI) (Exhibit A).

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The relevant facts pertaining to this application, extracted from the applicant's military records, are contained in the letter prepared by the appropriate office of the Air Force. Accordingly, there is no need to recite these facts in this Record of Proceedings.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

The Joint Personal Property Shipping Office - San Antonio (DoD), JPPSO-DIR, stated that the applicant was released from active duty, effective 30 September 1996. She was authorized travel and transportation entitlements to either her home of record (HOR), St. Louis, MO, or the place of entry on active duty (PEAD), Kansas City, MO. A shipment of Household Goods (HHG) moved from Belleville, IL, to Wichita, KS. The shipment was placed in storage-in-transit (SIT) at origin for 8 days. The applicant elected to ship her property to an alternate destination, Wichita, KS, vice the authorized destination, Kansas City, MO. The origin Traffic Management Office, Scott AFB, IL, charged her \$336.84 for shipping to a higher cost destination. Since the

applicant was no longer in a pay status, a Cash Collection Voucher was issued to collect the charges prior to shipment. When all transportation vouchers had been paid by the Defense Finance & Accounting Service, Indianapolis (DFAS-IN), the documentation was provided to the Excess Cost Adjudication Function (ECAAF) for their review. ECAAF determined the excess cost charges had been incorrectly computed by the origin transportation office and the applicant owed an additional \$334.11. She had been assessed \$336.84 vice the correct charges of \$670.95.

JPPSO-DIR stated that while it is regrettable the applicant was initially given incorrect figures regarding the cost of her shipment, the incorrect information did not increase the excess cost, or cause her to pay more than what she should have paid. Her statement that she could have removed an amount of weight from the load which might have reduced the excess cost to zero is without merit. When HHG are packed, loaded on the van, and drayaged to the scale for weighing, charges have occurred at that point. Additionally, the excess cost charges are not due to the member exceeding her weight entitlements. The charges occurred because it cost more to ship HHG to the alternate point than to the authorized destination. Therefore, regardless of the shipment weight, the applicant would have still incurred excess cost charges to ship the property to the alternate destination.

JPPSO-DIR recommended denial of the applicant's request to avoid paying the additional charges due for the shipment of her HHG to an alternate point. At her request, her HHGs were shipped to Wichita, KS, in lieu of the authorized destination of Kansas City, MO. Based on the amount of HHG involved, it would have cost \$10,682.21 to ship the HHG to the authorized destination. The Government paid \$11,353.16 to ship the HHG to the alternate destination. In accordance with paragraph U5340-C, Joint Federal Travel Regulation (JFTR), the applicant is responsible for the cost difference.

A complete copy of this evaluation is appended at Exhibit C.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

The applicant reviewed the advisory opinion and indicated that she is aware that she incurred excess costs to ship her HHG to the alternate destination of Wichita, KS. It was her understanding, however, that her payment of \$334.11 represented the correct calculation of excess costs due. She was flabbergasted to receive notification 13 months later that an additional \$336.84 was owed due to a calculation error beyond her control or knowledge. She fully believed that she had paid her obligation on 31 October 1996. She is now being held accountable for an additional \$336.84. From her perspective, her excess cost has in fact more than doubled. She was denied the opportunity to

reduce or eliminate excess costs. A complete copy of this response is appended at Exhibit E.

THE BOARD CONCLUDES THAT:

1. The applicant has exhausted all remedies provided by existing law or regulations.
 2. The application was timely filed.
 3. Insufficient relevant evidence has been presented to demonstrate the existence of probable error or injustice. We took notice of the applicant's complete submission in judging the merits of the case; however, we agree with the opinion and recommendation of JPPSO-DIR and adopt their rationale as the basis for our conclusion that the applicant has not been the victim of an error or injustice. Therefore, absent sufficient evidence to the contrary, we find no compelling basis to recommend granting the relief sought in this application.
-

THE BOARD DETERMINES THAT:

The applicant be notified that the evidence presented did not demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice; that the application was denied without a personal appearance; and that the application will only be reconsidered upon the submission of newly discovered relevant evidence not considered with this application.

The following members of the Board considered this application in Executive Session on 3 November 1998, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

Ms. Rita S. Looney, Panel Chair
Mr. Steven A. Shaw, Member
Mr. Patrick R. Wheeler, Member

The following documentary evidence was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 21 Feb 98, w/atchs.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, JPPSO-DIR, dated 20 May 98, w/atchs.
- Exhibit D. Letter, SAF/MIBR, dated 15 Jun 98.
- Exhibit E. Letter from applicant, dated 6 Jul 98.


RITA S. LOONEY
Panel Chair