

# **Board of Contract Appeals**

General Services Administration  
Washington, D.C. 20405

---

July 27, 2006

---

GSBCA 16888-RELO

In the Matter of RONALD R. FOREMAN

Ronald R. Foreman, White City, OR, Claimant.

JoAnne Rountree, Supervisor, Travel Section, Financial Services Center, Department of Veterans Affairs, Austin, TX, appearing for Department of Veterans Affairs.

**GOODMAN**, Board Judge.

Claimant, Ronald R. Foreman, is an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs. He asks this Board to review the agency's denial of reimbursement of real estate expenses incurred during a permanent change of station (PCS) move.

## Factual Background

Claimant accomplished a PCS move from Roseburg, Oregon, to White City, Oregon, with a report date of May 16, 2002. He purchased a home on January 31, 2006, at his new duty station, and on March 17, 2006, he submitted a travel voucher to the agency for reimbursement of real estate expenses incurred in the purchase of the home. With his travel voucher, claimant included a memorandum dated February 21, 2006, which states, "I am certain that I expressed a desire in writing to extend the date for two years; neither [the agency] [n]or I can find a copy of the memo asking or authorizing the extension." The agency denied the claim because it did not have sufficient evidence that claimant had requested or received an extension of time within which to complete his real estate transaction.

### Discussion

The Federal Travel Regulation effective on the date claimant reported to his new duty station required that the settlement dates for real estate transactions for which reimbursement is requested must not be later than two years after the date the employee reported for duty at the new duty station. Upon an employee's written request, this two-year limitation period may be extended by the head of the agency or his/her designee for an additional period of time not to exceed two years. The employee's written request should be submitted to the appropriate official before the expiration of the two-year limitation, but in no case later than thirty calendar days after the expiration date unless this thirty-day period is specifically extended by the agency. Approval of this additional period shall be based on a determination that extenuating circumstances, acceptable to the agency, have prevented the employee from completing the transaction in the initial time period. 41 CFR 302-11.22, -11.23 (2002); 66 Fed. Reg. 58,194 (Nov. 20, 2001).

While claimant asserts that he requested and received an extension of the initial two-year period, he was unable to provide evidence of the request and subsequent approval. Under these circumstances, the agency correctly determined that claimant did not fulfill the regulatory requirements for reimbursement, as his transaction occurred after the expiration of the initial two-year period. We suggest that claimant continue to search for the documentation that he believes exists to support his request for and receipt of the extension, and that he resubmit his claim to the agency if he finds this documentation.

### Decision

The claim is denied.

---

ALLAN H. GOODMAN  
Board Judge