

C. Remy
air P.

DECISION



**THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20548**

U4627

FILE: B-189566

DATE: December 29, 1977

MATTER OF: Richard Stamm - Transportation of Mobile Home

DIGEST: Transferred employee shipped 2,950 pounds of household goods separate from mobile home because carrier required reduction of weight before moving mobile home over icy roads. Since employee was reimbursed for transportation of household effects he may not be reimbursed for shipment of mobile home. Paragraph 2-7.1a of FTR limits reimbursement to either transportation of household effects or shipment of mobile home. There is no provision for allowing both.

This action is at the request of Mrs. Mary M. Rydquist, an authorized certifying officer for the Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior. Mrs. Rydquist requests our decision as to whether Mr. Richard Stamm, an employee of the Bureau of Land Management, may be reimbursed for the movement of his mobile home in addition to the reimbursement he has already received for the transportation of his household effects.

Incident to a permanent change of station, Mr. Stamm arranged to have his mobile home shipped on January 12, 1977, from his former duty station in Idaho Falls, Idaho, to his new duty station at Soda Springs, Idaho. Due to bad road conditions, the mobile home transporter required that the weight of the mobile home be reduced by removing some of the heavier items of household goods, which apparently weighed 2,950 pounds. It is reported that Mr. Stamm was required to move, at his own expense, the household goods which were removed from the trailer.

Mr. Stamm was reimbursed \$424.80 by the Bureau of Land Management, representing the commuted rate for moving 2,950 pounds of household effects. However, Mrs. Rydquist states that they were unable to reimburse Mr. Stamm for the cost of transporting his mobile home (\$254.52) in view of the provisions of Federal

B-189566

Travel Regulations (FTR) (FPMR 101-7) para. 2-7.1a (May 1973). That paragraph provides that an employee may be reimbursed an allowance for the transportation of a mobile home in lieu of the allowance for the transportation of his household goods. Mr. Stamm has submitted a reclaim voucher for the cost of shipping his mobile home on the basis that the application of FTR para. 2-7.1a imposes a hardship on him.

Reimbursement of the cost of moving a mobile home incident to an employee's transfer is authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5724(b) (1970). Eligibility is set out in paragraph 2-7.1a of the FTR, which provides, in pertinent part, that:

"An employee who is entitled to transportation of his household goods under these regulations shall, in lieu of such transportation, be entitled to an allowance, as provided in this part, for the transportation of a mobile home for use as a residence. * * *"

It is clear that the payment of the cost of transporting a mobile home is in lieu of paying for the shipment of household goods. Both allowances cannot be paid for the same transfer, even if they would not, in the aggregate, exceed the maximum allowance for the shipment of household goods. 51 Comp. Gen. 27 (1971); B-184908, May 26, 1976; and B-177237, March 2, 1973. In the last-cited case, an employee was required to remove some furnishings and all appliances from his mobile home before the transporter would move it. The employee claimed the allowance for the shipment of his mobile home after being reimbursed for the transportation of the furnishings and appliances removed. We held in that case that the employee had been reimbursed on the basis most advantageous to him, and that he was not entitled to any additional amounts.

Accordingly, since Mr. Stamm has been reimbursed on the basis most advantageous to him, i.e. for the transportation of his household effects, he may not be reimbursed an additional amount for the movement of his mobile home.

137 k 11/24
Acting Comptroller General
of the United States