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John M. Giles - Limousine fare; carrier terminal to home
DIGEST:

> Where travel orders do not restrict employee's use of tari or limousine service between carrier terminal and residence based on availability of suitable Government or common carrier transportation facilities, employee may be reimbursed under paragraph l-2. Bc of the Federal Travel Regulations (FIR) (Fume 101-7) May 1973 for his use of limousine service for travel to his home from the carrier terminal.

By memorandum forwarded February 26, 1976, Department of the Navy Disbursing Officer, Naval Air Station, Noffet Field, California, has requested an advance decision concerning payment of the limousine fare claimed by Mr. John M. Giles incident to his training asaigament during November and December 1975.

Upon completion of his training assignment and return by air carrier to the Travis Air Force Base on December 7, 1975, Mr. Giles traveled the 90 miles from the carrier terminal to his home in Mountain View, California, by limousine at a cost of \$74. A receipt in that amount is submitted in support of his claim. Although the travel authorization issued Mr. Giles does not provide a limitation on the amount payable for transportation between terminal and residence, and does not otherwise provide for rental of a vehicle for performance of that travel, it has been administratively recommended that Mr. Giles' claim be allowed only insofar as the limousine fare "does not exceed cost of GSA Type IB auto rental." The Disbursing Officer questrons the propriety of the administrative racomendation of partial disallowance.

Paragraph 1-2.3c of the Federal Travel Regulations (FTR) (FPMR 101-7) May 1973, authorizes reimbursement of usual taxi and limousine fares from a carrier terminal to an employed's home. but further provides that an agency may restrict the use of taxis or place a monetary limitation on the amount of taxicab reimbursement when suitable Government or common carrier service is available.

Insofar as pertinent here, the Department of Defense's implementation of this provision appears at paragraph C6101 of
che Jaint rravel Regulations, Voluae II (JTR II) as followa:

## "C6101 TEPRORABY DUTY STATUS

"1. USE OF TASICABS. Officialo directing travel may restrict the ust of caxicabs then suitablo Governcont-ovned or leazed or comen carrier facilities, including airport il=ousine service, are available for all or part of the distance to or from terminale. A sraveler vill use ldrougina acrvice if it 13 available and practicable (see par. CEl01-4); othervise, refobursement ia resericted as provided in par, C9001-1. Cinleas restrictad, axployees in a tesporary duty travel statug may utilize tazicabs betwen:
"1. the cormon carrier or other terman end the employea's place of busionse or place of lodgine,
 in e temporary duty travel atatus fill utilize aixport limousine service betwean an airport and airport limoncine terminel whera such service is availabla and ita use is practicabla, Rafmbureament will be in accordance uith par. C9001."

Paragraph C9001 of JFR II, referenced in the above-quoted provision, provides as follows:
"C9001 TAXICAE ASD AIRPORT LIMOUSTXE FARES AKD IIFS
"2. FARES. Tha usual taxicab and/or alrport limousin fares will be allowed in accordance with Chapter 5 , Part C, between the poinet authorimed charein. If available lizoubine aervica is not utilized, refzbursement for ase of caxicab uill not be allowed in excess of the mome which would hava buta alloved for combined limousne and taxicab fares uniass a statement is furaiahed by the traveler that the use of such ilifousina sarvice was ixpracticable.
"2. IIPS. Zolmbursame for tips agy be allowed

In the amount of $\$ 0.15$ when the fare is $\$ 2.00$ or less, or $15 \%$ of the fare when it exceeds \$1.00. If the $15 \pi$ is not a multiple of $S$, it may be increased to the next multiple of 5.1

In $\overline{5}-179823$, July 14, 1975, we noted that unless restricted by officials directing travel on the basin of evailability of Government or common carrier transportation facilities, the partinent provisions of the JTR II, quoted above, authorize an employea in a temporary duty status to use a taxi or limousine where available between the common carrier and his place of abode. Vie believe thet the language of paragraph 1-2.3c of the FTR, supra, as weil as the implementing language of paragraph C6101-I of the JTR II, supra, contemplates that the employec be allowed taxi or limousine costa unless his authority to use either of those nethods of conveyance has been restricted In advance. Since Mr. Giles' travel orders contained no such restriction there is no basis for ilditing relrabursement for ilwousina transportation costs on the basis recommended adainistratively.

The record does not contain fuformation as to precisely what Government or public transportation vas available between Travis Air Force Base and Mr. Giles' residence. However, in view of the high cost of the inmosine service involved, we feel that this was a case in mich consideration should have been given to restricting the use of taxi or liwousine service by an appropriate notation to that effect on the employee's travel ordars. c£. B-179823, July 14: 1975.
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