

Mr. Cates has submitted a voucher claiming $\$ 63.86$ for mileage driven while on ten!porary duty. He arrived at that amount by subiracting 140 miles, representing the nileage which he ordinarily would have driven as a member of a carpool, from the 552 miles traveled on temporary duty, claiming reimburseme:t for the 412 excess miles. In explanation, Mr. Cates states that he participates in a 5 -member carpool in which each persun customarily drives to work 1 day per week. The cartool route is 17.5 miles in one direction, or 35 miles round trip. Since the temporary duty assignment covered 4 weeks, Mr. Gates subtracted from his mileage on that assignment the distance he otherwise would have driven in 4 weeks while participating in the carpool.

The certifying officer states that, regarding claims arising from assignments within the headquarters area, it is the practice of his office to permit claims for mileage in excess of that, required for travel between the employee's residence and his headquarters. In that regard, he noted that Department of Transportation iravel Manual 1500.6 , chapter 8 , section 1 , paragraph 814 c provides as follows:
> "c. Beginning and Ending Foints. When a vehicle is used for TDY or PCS travel, mileage begins from whatever point the traveler begins his journey (such as abode, place of business or other points of departure) and ends at the hotel, residence or place of duty at the destination. No deduction of the distance from horis to headquarters is required. An exception to this rule is for application, when a POV is used for TDY (not including an overnigit stay) and the employee uses his POV to travel from his residence to $\operatorname{TDY}$ point(s) but reports first to his headquarters office. Similar situations exist when the employee has to perfonm official assignments en route from his residence to permanent headquarters office or en route from his office to his residence. In these situations where part of the travel is between residence and permanent duty station, the employee is entitled only i:o mileage in excess of that normally traveled between his residence and headquarters."
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In viow thereof, the certifying officer asks whether Mr. Cates' voucher may be certified t- provide for:
"(1) Reimbursement as submitted;
"(2) Reimbunsement with deduction for round trip mileage (residence to headquarters office) each day that the employee reportec to his office except for December 6 (one way oril:);
"(3) Reimbursement with appropriate deduction Sor mileage each day regardless of whether or not the employee reported to inis headquarters office, since mileage to the temporery duty assignment was less than that required for travel to his headquarters office."

We have long held that as a general rule, an employee must bear the cost of transport tion between his residence and his place of duty at his of fi=ini station. 46 Comp. Gen. 718 (1967). However, without abrogating that rule, we held in 36 Comp. Cen. 795 (1957) that it is within administrative discretinn to permit an employee, authorized to use a privately owned vehicie on official business, an allowance for mileage from whatever point he begins his journey without a deduction for the distance he would normally travel between his home and headqua'ters, and irrespective of whether he performs duty at his headquarters on that day. We cautioned, however, that admanistrative officials may and should exercise their diseretion where appropriate to restrict the amount of reimbursement by way of a reduced rate oi distance. Under these decisions, therefore, we have held that it is a proper exercise of administrative discretion for an agency to issue regulations which impose restrictions on the mileage allowance which nay be paid to its employees. B-175608, December 28, 1073.

In the present case, the Department of Transportation has validly regulated the extent to which its employees may be reimbursed for mileage ciriven on official duty. The above-quoted paragraph of the Department of Transportation Travel Manual does not contain a specific provision governing reimbursement when the employee ordinarily commutes to work in a carpool. Thus, the voucher may not be certified as submilied by Mr. Cates. However, the regulation provides generally that no deduction of the distance 1 rom home to heacquarters is required. The exception to this ruse is
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When the employee reports to his headquarters while performing of ficial duty not including an overnight stay. Thus, under the Department of Transportation regulation, no deduction of the distance between Mr. Gates' home and headquarters is required on those days when he traveled from his home to the temporary station only, returning to his residence in the evening. The regulation cos, however, provide that the employee "is entitled only to mileage in excess of that normally traveled between his residence and headquarters" on days when he reports to his headquarters office at some time during the day. It is our view that the language "between his residence and headquarters" contemplates the employee's normal roundtrip commuting distance. See B-164189, June 25, 1968. In view of the above, the appropriate round trip deduction may be made only for those days on which Mr. Gates reported to his headquarters office at some time during the day, and not for the days on which ha reported to the temporary station only. Accordingly, reimbursement should be made in accordance with the second alternafive proposed by the certifying officer,

Action on the voucher should de taken in accordance with the foregoing.

