



Comptroller General  
of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20548

# Decision

**Matter of:** Richard Nold

**File:** B-247382

**Date:** May 20, 1992

---

## DIGEST

An employee on extended temporary duty received a temporary promotion that erroneously listed his temporary duty station as his permanent duty station. We hold that a temporary promotion while on extended temporary duty does not, in and of itself, effect a change of permanent duty station, that the employee is entitled to his temporary duty subsistence expenses, and that the Interior Department may correct its official documents to show the employee's correct permanent duty station.

---

## DECISION

The Department of the Interior requests a decision on whether an employee on extended temporary duty who received a temporary promotion that erroneously listed his temporary duty station as his permanent duty station may be paid temporary duty subsistence expenses for the period involved.<sup>1</sup> For the following reasons, we hold that the employee is entitled to be reimbursed subsistence expenses.

Mr. Richard Nold, is employed by the Department of the Interior as a GS-13 systems accountant with the Bureau of Reclamation in Denver, Colorado. In January 1991, the Secretary of the Interior authorized a special project team to undertake financial management improvements in the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Mr. Nold was highly qualified and was selected to be one of the team members. Since the estimated relocation costs were averaging in excess of \$40,000 per employee, the Interior Department decided that it would be in the best interests of the government to place Mr. Nold on detail to this project

---

<sup>1</sup>This request was submitted by Mr. William Bettenberg, Deputy Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs. The period involved in this claim is from May 5 to September 1, 1991, and the transportation and subsistence expenses amount to \$9,086.

for 15 months starting in February 1991 and to pay his temporary duty subsistence expenses.

Due to the quality of his work on the detail and increased responsibilities, the Interior Department gave Mr. Nold a temporary promotion to grade GS-14 on May 5, 1991. The purpose of that promotion was to acknowledge his performance of duties at the higher grade level and not to change his permanent duty station nor his temporary assignment to the project. However, the documentation for his temporary promotion erroneously listed Albuquerque, New Mexico, as his permanent duty station. Approximately 45 days later, the travel office of the Interior Department decided that Mr. Nold was not entitled to receive subsistence expenses for temporary duty because his permanent duty station had been changed to Albuquerque.

Thus, we are dealing with a legitimate detail to extended temporary duty and a mistake on temporary promotion documents in changing a permanent duty station.<sup>2</sup> In this regard, our decisions quite clearly state that a temporary promotion while on temporary duty, in and of itself, does not effect a change of an employee's permanent duty station, and that, if an employee on extended temporary duty who is scheduled to return to the old station receives a temporary promotion, the employee is entitled to both the temporary promotion and reimbursement for temporary duty expenses. Ruth Wilson, 55 Comp. Gen. 836 (1976) and cases cited therein.

Accordingly, the vouchers submitted by Mr. Nold for his subsistence expenses while on temporary duty in Albuquerque, New Mexico, for the period involved may be paid, if otherwise proper, and the Interior Department may make the appropriate corrections to its official documents to show that Mr. Nold's permanent duty station remained in Denver, Colorado.

*for Seymour E. Hinchman*  
James E. Hinchman  
General Counsel

---

<sup>2</sup>For the criteria of a legitimate detail to extended temporary duty see Dessauer and Wells, 68 Comp. Gen. 454 (1989), and Edward W. DePiazza, B-234262, June 2, 1989.