DOCUMENT RESUME

02599 - [A1872919]

[Determining Net Weight of Household Goods]. B-187924. June 30, 1977. 3 pp.

Decision re: W. Glenn Dcoley; by Robert F. Keller, Deputy Comptroller General.

Issue Area: Personnel Management and Compensation: Compensation (305).

Contact: Office of the General Counsel: Civilian Personnel. Budget Function: General Government: Central Personnel Hanagement (805).

Organization Concerned: Department of Housing and Orban Development.

Authority: F.T.R. (FPNR 101-7), para. 2-8.2b(1-2).

T. J. O'Connor, Director, Office of Finance and Accounting, Department of Housing and Urban Development, requested a decision on the computation of a transferred employee's shipment by van and trailer of 21,150 pounds, gross weight, of household goods under the commuted rate system. Agency computed net weight as 52% of total pounds multiplied by applicable commuted rate. Claim was not allowed since cited regulation applies to crated shipments only, and not 11,470 pounds sent by van. (Author/DJH)

FILE: B-187924 DATE: June 30, 1.977

MATTER OF:

W. Glenn Dooley - Determining net weight

of household goods

DiGEST: Employee shipped 21,150 pounds, gross weight, of household goods under commuted rate system incident to transfer, 11,470 pounds by van uncrated and total of 9,680 pounds of crated items by trailer. In determining net weight pursuant to FTR para. 2-8.2b(2) agency computed net weight of household goods shipped as 52 percent of 21,150 pounds, or 10,998 pounds, and reimbursed him for 10,998 pounds multiplied by applicable commuted rate. Employee claims 21,150 pounds multiplied by applicable commuted rate on basis that net weight of all household goods shipped was less than maximum weight limitation. Claim may not be allowed, since FTR gara. 2-8.2b(2) applies only to crated shipments and should not have been applied to 11,470 pounds shipped by van. Thus, net weight of van shipment alone, defermined under FTR para. 2-8.2b(1), exceeded maximum weight limitation.

This action is at the request of T.J. O'Connol, Director, Office of Finance and Accounting, Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Mr. O'Connor requests our decision concerning the computation of an employee's reimbursement under the commuted rate system.

Incident to a transfer, effective September 15, 1975, from St. Louis, Missouri, to Kansas City, Missouri, Mr. W. Glenn Dooley, an employee of HUD, was authorized to ship 11,000 pounds of household goods. Mr. Dooley's schedule of expenses and amount; claimed shows the following shipments of household goods:

11-16-75	shipped by trailer	3,360 lbs.	gross weight
11-20-75	shippod by trailer	-	gross weight
12-06-75	shipped by trailer	4,140 lbs.	gross weight
12-15-75	shipped by van	11,470 lbs.	net weight

The record shows that the three shipments by trailers were crated items and the van shipment of 11,470 pounds not was uncrated items. For the purpose of determining the net weight of Mr. Dooley's household goods, HUD applied the provisions of Federal Travel Regulations (FPMR 101-7) para. 2-8.2b(2)(May 1973), which provides as follows:

"Crate's shipments. When property is transported crated, the net weight shall not include the weight of the crating material; therefore, the net weight shall be computed as being to percent of the gross weight. However, if the net weight computed in this manner exceeds the applicable weight limitation and if it is determined that, for reasons beyond the employee's control, unusually heavy crating and packing materials were necessarily used, the net weight may be computed at less than 60 percent of the gross weight."

The Department of Housing and Urban Development determined that, for reasons beyond Mr. Dooley's control, unusually heavy crating and packing materials were necessarily used, and computed the net weight as 52 percent of the gross weight. Since Mr. Dooley shipped a total of 21,150 pounds of household goods, applying a 52 percent rate would result in a net weight of 10,998 pounds.

However, HUD computed Mr. Dooley's entitlement on the basis of 10,998 pounds of household goods multiplied by the applicable commuted rate. Mr. Dooley claims reimbursement for 21,150 pounds multiplied by the applicable commuted rate, on the basis that he qualified all 21,150 pounds gross weight under the provisions of FTR para. 2-8.2b(2). Since the net weight of his household goods computed under that paragraph was 10,998 pounds, which was less than the 11,000 pounds net weight authorized, he claims the resulting difference of \$1,406.06.

It is clear from the record that HUD applied the 52 percent rate for determining net weight to the total 21,150 pounds of household goods shipped. In the submission, it is stated that:

"The movement of Mr. Dooley's household goods and personal effects consisted of three shipments by trailer of heavily crated items and one van shipment of uncrated items." (Emphasis added.)

Thus, it is clear that the provision of FTR para. 2-8.2b(2) should not have been applied to the van shipment of 11,470 pounds. Rather, the net weight should have been computed under FTR para. 2-8.2b(1), which provides in part as follows:

"Uncrated shipments. When household goods are shipped uncrated as in a household mover's van or similar conveyance, the net weight shall be that shown on the bill of lading or on the weight certificate attached thereto, which, under Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) regulations, includes the weight of barrels, boxes, cartons, and similar materials used in packing, but does not include pads, chains, dollies, and other equipment needed to load and secure the shipment. * * *"

The net weight of household goods shipped by Mr. Dooley by the van shipment of December 15, 1975, was 11,470 pounds. That amount, by itself, was in excess of the 11,000 pounds maximum net weight authorized to be shipped at Government expense. Thus, the voucher claiming an additional \$1,406.06 may no be certified for payment.

Deputy Comptroller General of the United States