RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF: DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2011-01032

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING DESIRED: NO

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

He be compensated for his Personally Procured Move (PPM) as briefed to him by the Hickam Transportation Management Office (TMO).

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

The TMO office incorrectly used "low cost" rates to counsel him on his PPM application rather than the newly implemented "Best Value" rates. As such, the counselor incorrectly estimated the amount of compensation he would receive for a "Do-it-Yourself" (DITY) move.

Based on the information he received from the TMO counselor, he contracted with the PODS Company to ship his household goods from Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii to Eglin Air Force Base, Florida.

On 25 June 2010, he received a telephone call from the Hickam TMO informing him that he would be paid at a significantly lower rate than he was originally quoted due to a change in the law. However, he researched the Joint Federal Travel Regulation (JFTR) and could not find any change.

Had he been briefed correctly, he would not have agreed to a PPM that provided no incentive and resulted in extra costs. It is the responsibility of the local TMO to properly counsel service members on their benefits. In this case, a policy decision, not a change in law, has dramatically reduced his benefit.

In support of his appeal, the applicant provides a personal statement, a letter from the Commander, and other forms associated with his move.

The applicant's complete submission, with attachments, is at Exhibit A.

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The applicant is in the Regular Air Force serving at the grade of lieutenant colonel.

On 23 April 2010, pursuant to Permanent Change of Station orders, the applicant personally procured a move from Hickam AFB, HI to Eglin AFB, FL. On 23 April 2010, a TMO counselor gave the applicant's agent a quoted \$24,568.43 as the "Estimated Gross Incentive" to personally procure a move. Based on that amount, the applicant was given an advance payment of \$15,516.90.

On 30 July 2010, the Eglin TMO computed the applicant's actual costs as \$13,627.51. Since the applicant received an advance, he owed the government, \$1,138.70. On 5 January 2011, the Air Force remitted that debt.

Effective 1 April 2010, change 283, to the JFTR, requires that Government Constructed Costs (GCC) be used to determine the incentive payments in PPM be based on "best value" versus the "low cots" charges.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

PPA HQ/DD recommends denial. DD states the JFTR requires the member's incentive be based on 95 percent of the GCC, and at the time of the applicant's shipment, the GCC was based on "best value" rates. The applicant's total moving expenses totaled \$13,627.51. Although, he did not receive as much incentive as he was initially advised, he did not lose any money on the PPM. The applicant applied for and was approved for remission of the debt established for the excess advance payment he received in the amount of 1,696.25.

The complete DD evaluation, with attachments, is at Exhibit C.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

A copy of the Air Force evaluation was forwarded to the applicant on 29 July 2011, for review and comment within 30 days (Exhibit D). As of this date, this office has not received a response.

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 an error or injustice. Although it does appear the applicant was miscounseled regarding the amount of reimbursement he could expect to receive for a Personally Procured Move, he was fully compensated for his move and in reality received a de facto incentive through remission of the debt incurred for the excess advance initially received. We believe this constitutes proper and fitting relief. Therefore, we agree with the opinion and recommendation of PPA HQ/DD and adopt its rationale as the basis for our conclusion the applicant has not been the victim of an error or injustice warranting further action by this Board. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, we find no 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 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 AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2011-01032 in Executive Session on 8 September 2011, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

- , Vice Chair
- , Member
- , Member

The following documentary evidence was considered:

Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 14 Mar 11, w/atchs.

Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.

Exhibit C. PPA HQ/DD, Letter, dated 7 Jul 11, w/atchs.

Exhibit D. SAF/MRBR, Letter, dated 29 Jul 11.

Vice Chair