



Marc Elrich
County Executive

Christopher R. Conklin
Director

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MEMORANDUM

November 30, 2022

TO: Jeffrey Zyontz, Chair
Planning Board

FROM: Timothy H. Cupples, PE, Deputy Director for Transportation Policy
Department of Transportation (MCDOT) *Timothy H. Cupples*

SUBJECT: Rustic Roads Functional Master Plan Update
Public Hearing Draft – MCDOT Comments

Thank you for the opportunity to review the October 2022 Public Hearing Draft of the Rustic Roads Functional Master Plan Update (“the Plan”). MCDOT strongly supports the vision of the Plan and welcomes the opportunity to maintain these roads in a context-sensitive manner while supporting our agricultural and tourism industries.

This Plan provides excellent history, narrative, and descriptions of the evaluated roads, including thoughtful traffic and collision data analysis. We are grateful for the responsiveness of staff throughout this process and believe the success of this partnership can be seen in the quality of the Plan.

The comments below summarize MCDOT’s most significant remaining concerns regarding the Plan:

- 1) **Dedicated But Unmaintained:** Roads appearing both in the plan and on the list of Dedicated But Unmaintained roads (DBU) include the entire length or portions of Aitcheson Lane, Belle Cote Drive, Bentley Road, Old Orchard Road, and Poplar Hill Road.

According to the DBU Policy adopted by Council, the County does not maintain roads on the DBU list. The adjacent property owners, as the successors of those who originally built the road, are responsible for their maintenance. This can represent a financial burden for the adjacent property owners. Under the DBU Policy, the County can only assume maintenance responsibility for those roads after those

Office of the Director

101 Monroe Street, 10th Floor, Rockville, MD 20850 · 240-777-7170 · 240-777-7178 Fax
www.montgomerycountymd.gov/mcdot

montgomerycountymd.gov/311



301-251-4850 TTY

adjacent property owners bring the road into compliance with current County standards.

The continued inclusion of these roads in the Rustic Roads program could limit the property owners' ability to bring the roads up to County standards, hindering them from transferring maintenance responsibilities to the County.

- 2) **State Roads:** Several State roads are included in the program, including MD 109 (Beallsville Road and Old Hundred Road), MD 117 (Bucklodge Road), and MD 355 (Frederick Road). We note that State roads are inherently regional in nature, and the State is not subject to County laws, potentially limiting the effectiveness of the Rustic designations.
- 3) **Batchellors Forest Road:** Batchellors Forest Road has experienced significant suburban growth, serves as a regional connector, and provides access to numerous schools and cultural and recreational destinations. Portions of this roadway do not appear to meet the Local Use and Traffic Volumes parameters of a Rustic Road. We recommend that the Planning Department reconsider the physical extents of the Rustic designation for this road.
- 4) **Frederick Road:** Frederick Road (MD 355), a State road providing regional connectivity, has the highest traffic volume in the program and a substantive history of crashes. It does not appear to meet the criteria of a Rustic Road and risks diluting the program's integrity. Furthermore, the road's significant features are buildings and views, which are better protected by the existing Hyattstown Historic District.
- 5) **Game Preserve Road:** Game Preserve Road, a well-traveled cut-through, has a substantive history of crashes. This road is seeing new development, particularly along the more suburban area at its western end, including a proposed assisted living facility. We recommend that staff review development patterns and collision history in the context of the Rustic Road criteria and consider refining the length of the Rustic Road designation.
- 6) **Meeting House Road & Bentley Road:** Meeting House Road and Bentley Road, both in the Sandy Spring area, partially run alongside CRN zoning. Bentley Road also provides access to the Sandy Spring Museum, and Meeting House Road has a large, proposed age-restricted, multi-family development. Reiterating comments made during the 2015 Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan: we note that the first 500 feet from MD 108 (Olney Sandy Spring Road) along each road does not appear to meet the criteria for inclusion as Rustic Roads and these segments should be reconsidered.
- 7) **Bridges:** We have attached our assessment of bridges that are unique and significant. Bridges not identified as such tend to be more modern or standard bridges with little structural significance. We suggest that the plan identify what other objectives should be achieved when these less significant bridges are rehabilitated or reconstructed.

We agree that bridge replacements should preserve the existing aesthetic to the extent feasible. When modern safety standards preclude maintaining a particular aesthetic, other options must be considered. This could include realigning the road and constructing a new bridge that complies with current standards while preserving the existing bridge in-place for pedestrian and bicycle use. Another option may be to thoroughly document the existing/previous bridge to preserve its history before replacing it.

Although not presently addressed in the Public Hearing Draft, we understand that the Rustic Roads Advisory Committee (RRAC) proposes two changes to the RRAC based on Council deliberations associated with updates to Chapter 49 under Bill 24-22 (Streets and Roads). We support adding two at-large members, bringing the total membership of the RRAC to nine. We also support removing the requirement that the members who are owner-operators of commercial farmland must “earn 50 percent or more of their income from farming”.

Should you have any questions regarding our comments on the Plan, please feel free to contact me or Mr. Andrew Bossi, Senior Engineer, at andrew.bossi@montgomerycountymd.gov.

THC:ab

Attachments: Detailed technical comments

cc: Dale Tibbitts, CEX
Chris Conklin, MCDOT
Darcy Buckley, MCDOT
Gary Erenrich, MCDOT
Andrew Bossi, MCDOT

| 0 | Team | Comme nter | Document | Page | Road / Section | Comment | Priority | Action / Response |
|---|--------|---------------|----------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|---|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | Policy | THC | General | General | General | <p>Several State roads are included in the program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MD 109 (Beallsville Road) - MD 109 (Old Hundred Road) - MD 117 (Bucklodge Road) - MD 355 (Frederick Road) <p>Note that as State roads these are inherently regional in nature and the State is not subject to County laws, potentially limiting the effectiveness of the Rustic designations.</p> | | |
| 2 | Policy | THC | General | General | General | There may be some roads that may arguably not really function as roads. Two examples appear to include Hoyles Mill Road and Hyattstown Mill Road / Prescott Road, which are mostly closed within gates and may be more akin to park trails. | | |
| 3 | DTE | DMS | General | 11-12 | Related Plans, Programs, and Policies | <p><u>Dedicated But Unmaintained Roads</u></p> <p>The full length of or portions of the following roads are on the DBU list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aitcheson Lane - Belle Cote Dr - Bentley Rd - Old Orchard Rd - Poplar Hill Rd <p>It is the responsibility of the adjacent properties, as the successors of those who originally built the roads and by policy adopted by Council, to bring these roads into compliance with County standards before it will be accepted by the County for maintenance.</p> <p>By adding one of these streets into the Rustic Roads program: this would limit the ability for these property owners to bring the roads up to County standards, making it more difficult for property owners from ever being relieved from their maintenance responsibilities & transferring the roads to the County.</p> <p>DBU Website: https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/dot-dte/projects/dedicated/index.html</p> <p>Direct Link to DBU List: https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/dot-dte/Resources/Files/DBU/120121%20DBU_List.pdf</p> | 1 | |
| 4 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 15 | Special Protection Areas | <p>Last word - Change "possible" to "feasible"</p> <p>Possible is fiscally unconstrained, which of course is not practical. Feasible, however, does imply resource constraints.</p> | 3 | |
| 5 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 17 | Roadway Character | <p>2nd Paragraph, 1st Sentence - Change "possible" to "feasible"</p> <p>Possible is fiscally unconstrained, which of course is not practical. Feasible, however, does imply resource constraints.</p> | 3 | |
| 6 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 17 | Roadway Character | <p>Last Paragraph, Last Word - Change "possible" to "feasible"</p> <p>Possible is generally unconstrained by physical or fiscal limitations, which of course is not practical. Feasible, however, implies both physical and resource constraints.</p> | 3 | |
| 7 | DO | DBB | Public Hearing Draft | 18 | Bridges | <p>RE: "Design exceptions are possible in some cases, but if a design exception is not granted, then 100 percent of costs will come from the county's budget, taking money away from other vital county programs."</p> <p>The way this sentence is phrased makes it sound like the only option is to pay using county funds, but the other option is to use a design that meets federal and state requirements. Master plans should not dictate how projects are paid for.</p> <p>Rephrase: "If a design exception is not granted, <i>the bridge must be designed to meet federal and state standards or</i> 100 percent of costs will come from the county's budget, taking money away from other vital county programs."</p> | | |

| 0 | Team | Comme nter | Document | Page | Road / Section | Comment | Priority | Action / Response |
|----|--------|---------------|----------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|---|----------|-------------------|
| 8 | Policy | THC | Public Hearing Draft | 17-18 | Bridges | <p><i>[the same comment is also made on p101-102]</i></p> <p>Included in this spreadsheet is a tab denoting bridges that we agree are significant as well as bridges that are perhaps less so, often more modern or standard bridges with little structurally significant about them. Those bridges include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Berryville Road (M-0028, M-0029) - Burnt Hill Road (M-0157) - Edwards Ferry Road (M-0181) - Glen Road (M-0013, M-0014, M-0015) - Gregg Road (M-0119) - Haviland Mill Road (M-0098) - Howard Chapel Road (M-0123) - Martinsburg Road (M-0042) - Mouth of Monocacy Road (M-0043) - Query Mill Road (M-0020, M-0329) - River Road (M-0038, M-0039, M-0040). - Sugarland Road (M-0034, M-0035) - Swains Lock Road (M-0022) - Sycamore Landing Road (M-0031, M-0032) - White Ground Road (M-0048) - Wildcat Road (M-0068) <p>We suggest that the plan identify what other objectives should be achieved when these less significant bridges are rehabilitated or reconstructed.</p> <p>We agree that bridge replacements, when necessary, should to the extent feasible preserve to the existing aesthetic. When it is not feasible to achieve current safety standards, however, other options may be necessary to consider. This could include realigning the road and constructing new bridge that complies with current standards, preserving the existing bridge in-place for pedestrian and bicycle use. Another option may be to replace the bridge with a modern bridge but thoroughly documenting the existing/previous bridge to preserve its history.</p> | 1 | |
| 9 | Policy | THC | Public Hearing Draft | 18 | Bridges | <p>Penultimate paragraph - MOM Road Bridge - the new structure built in 2007 is entirely prefab. We should also note that it is completely different from the concrete framed structure that it replaced. This is great example of how a new replacement structure can differ, sometimes significantly, from the one it replaced and still be a significant feature.</p> <p>The fact that everyone agrees that the new bridge is a significant feature point to the fact that replacement bridges need no match the original to contribute to the value of the road. The bridges section should point out that an approach such as this is an acceptable outcome when a bridge must be replaced.</p> <p>The bridges section should also point out that consideration can be given to realigning the road to build a new bridge that complies with current standards adjacent to an existing bridge, and preserving the existing bridge for ped or bike use. Or another option may be to replace the bridge, but documenting the existing/previous bridge to preserve its history.</p> | 1 | |
| 10 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 18 | Bridges | <p>4th Paragraph, Last Sentence - Change "possible" to "feasible"</p> <p>Possible is generally unconstrained by physical or fiscal limitations, which of course is not practical. Feasible, however, implies both physical and resource constraints.</p> | 3 | |
| 11 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 20 | Rustic Road Criteria Checklist | In the line for #5, change "accidents" to "crashes" | 3 | |

| 0 | Team | Comme nter | Document | Page | Road / Section | Comment | Priority | Action / Response |
|----|--------|---------------|----------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|---|----------|-------------------|
| 12 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 31 | Link Road | <p>Link Road is proposed to be removed from the program. As the recent update to Chapter 49 does not provide a new default classification for Rustic Roads, I suggest including a new classification here.</p> <p>The choice would be between either Country Road or Neighborhood Street.</p> <p>Country Road fits the context of the general area, but Neighborhood Street fits the immediate land uses. I have no strong opinion as to which should be applied.</p> | | |
| 13 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 32-39 | Summary of Criteria Evaluation | In the header row, change the word "accident" to "crash" | 3 | |
| 14 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 42 | Batchellors Forest Road | <p>1st Paragraph, Last Word - Change "possible" to "feasible"</p> <p>Possible is generally unconstrained by regulatory, physical, or fiscal limitations, which of course is not practical. Feasible, however, implies these constraints.</p> | 3 | |
| 15 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 58 | Link Road | 1st Paragraph, Last Sentence - Change "accident" to "crash" | 3 | |
| 16 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 75 | Traveling Experience | 2nd Sentence, Last Word - Change "possible" to "permitted" | 3 | |
| 17 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 76 | Map | <p>2nd Paragraph, Last Sentence - Change "whenver possible and practical" to "whenever feasible"</p> <p>Possible is fiscally unconstrained, which of course is not practical. Feasible addresses what appears to be intended by the inclusion of the word "practical"</p> | 3 | |
| 18 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 88 | Bridges | <p>Under #12 - Change "possible" to "feasible"</p> <p>Possible is fiscally unconstrained, which of course is not practical. Feasible, however, does imply resource constraints.</p> | 3 | |
| 19 | Policy | ADB | Public Hearing Draft | 99 | Special Protection Areas | <p>3rd Sentence, Last Word - Change "possible" to "feasible"</p> <p>Possible is fiscally unconstrained, which of course is not practical. Feasible, however, does imply resource constraints.</p> | 3 | |

| 0 | Team | Comme nter | Document | Page | Road / Section | Comment | Priority | Action / Response |
|----|--------|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------|------------------|---|----------|-------------------|
| 20 | Policy | THC | Public Hearing Draft | 101-102 | Bridges | <p><i>[the same comment is also made on p17-18]</i></p> <p>Included in this spreadsheet is a tab denoting bridges that we agree are significant as well as bridges that are perhaps less so, often more modern or standard bridges with little structurally significant about them. Those bridges include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Berryville Road (M-0028, M-0029) - Burnt Hill Road (M-0157) - Edwards Ferry Road (M-0181) - Glen Road (M-0013, M-0014, M-0015) - Gregg Road (M-0119) - Haviland Mill Road (M-0098) - Howard Chapel Road (M-0123) - Martinsburg Road (M-0042) - Mouth of Monocacy Road (M-0043) - Query Mill Road (M-0020, M-0329) - River Road (M-0038, M-0039, M-0040). - Sugarland Road (M-0034, M-0035) - Swains Lock Road (M-0022) - Sycamore Landing Road (M-0031, M-0032) - White Ground Road (M-0048) - Wildcat Road (M-0068) <p>We suggest that the plan identify what other objectives should be achieved when these less significant bridges are rehabilitated or reconstructed.</p> <p>We agree that bridge replacements, when necessary, should to the extent feasible preserve to the existing aesthetic. When it is not feasible to achieve current safety standards, however, other options may be necessary to consider. This could include realigning the road and constructing new bridge that complies with current standards, preserving the existing bridge in-place for pedestrian and bicycle use. Another option may be to replace the bridge with a modern bridge but thoroughly documenting the existing/previous bridge to preserve its history.</p> | 1 | |
| 21 | Policy | ADB | Traffic and Crash Analysis Report | 3 | | Typo in the parenthetical sentence: "from the intersections use in this analysis" should be "from the intersections used in this analysis" | 3 | |
| 22 | Policy | ADB | Traffic and Crash Analysis Report | 16 | | <p>Consider rephrasing "...pedestrians dare only use the least traveled of the roads" with something like:</p> <p>"...due to either the distance from destinations or caution about safety: pedestrian volumes tend to be low along rustic roads."</p> <p>This softens the language slightly but also opens up another likely reason why pedestrian volumes are low.</p> <p>This also gets away from saying that pedestrians only use the least traveled roads, as I'm not sure we have good ped volume data to support that claim (but if we do, feel free to keep your language!).</p> | | |
| 23 | Policy | ADB | Traffic and Crash Analysis Report | 18 | | The asterisk footnote for Table 15 should use the word "Exceptional" instead of "Exceptionally" | 3 | |
| 24 | Policy | THC | Road Profiles | General | General | Profiles should reference the # of lanes, rather than presence or absence of lane markings. The presence or lack of markings is not a significant feature, and markings may change overtime for safety reasons. | | |
| 25 | Policy | THC | Road Profiles | General | General | Measurements of existing lane widths should be noted as tentative, as along some roads there may be existing pavement buried beneath foliage or accumulated soil, or the edge may have eroded over time. | | |
| 26 | Policy | THC | Road Profiles | 9 | Barnesville Road | There is no feasible way to rehab or preserve the railings of the bridge over Little Monocacy River. They do not meet current standards for crashworthiness. Given the ADT and speed limit, the only feasible approach if/when this bridge needs to be replaced will be to realign the road if it is desired to keep the existing bridge, or document it and replace it in compliance with current standards. Should verify that this road meets the local traffic criteria. The segment east of MD-109 may not carry predominantly local traffic. | | |

| 0 | Team | Comme nter | Document | Page | Road / Section | Comment | Priority | Action / Response |
|----|--------|---------------|---------------|---------|-------------------------|--|----------|-------------------|
| 27 | Policy | ADB | Road Profiles | 14-16 | Batchellors Forest Road | <p>We have substantial safety concerns with increasing development and traffic along this street, noting that the street has been substantively redeveloped with suburban-type development patterns and includes multiple civic destinations: a high school, a middle school, an Academy, a park at the southern end, and a major theatre center at the northern end.</p> <p>The street also sees substantial school traffic (particularly among buses and students traveling by foot or bike) as well as cut-through traffic, exceeding the intent of rustic roads as being for local use. There have been several crashes, a fatality in 2013, and longstanding student safety concerns along this street.</p> <p>We request that the Planning Department reconsider the limits of what falls within the Rustic Road program on the basis that portions of this roadway do not appear to meet the #2 (Local Use) and #3 (Traffic Volumes Consisted w/ Rustic) parameters of a Rustic Road.</p> | 1 | |
| 28 | Policy | ADB | Road Profiles | 29-31 | Bentley Road | <p>The first 500' from MD 108 runs along CRN zoning and also includes the Sandy Spring Museum. We suggest this initial 500' be reconsidered as to whether it complies with #1 of the Rustic Roads criteria (Zoning).</p> <p>This should support ped/bike, roadway, intersection, and access treatments associated with potential expansion of the Museum or land uses on the west side of Bentley Road.</p> | 1 | |
| 29 | Policy | ADB | Road Profiles | 107-109 | Frederick Road (MD 355) | <p>This is a State road providing regional connectivity and has the highest traffic volumes of any of the evaluated roads, as well as a substantive history of crashes. It does not appear to meet criteria #1 (Local Use), #2 (Traffic Volumes), and #5 (Safety) of a Rustic Road and risks diluting the integrity of the program.</p> <p>The significant features appear to focus on the buildings and views, both of which appear to already be protected by the Hyattstown Historic District.</p> | | |
| 30 | Policy | ADB | Road Profiles | 110-113 | Game Preserve Road | <p>This street is seeing a development on its west end. It also has significant traffic volumes as a cut-through road, considering also the lack of ped/bike facilities, as well as a high number and rate of crashes.</p> <p>Consider whether this street meets the Rustic Roads checklist on the basis of #1 (Land Use & Zoning), #2 (Local Use), and #3 (Traffic Volumes Consistent w/ Rustic), and #5 (Safety) of the Rustic Roads Checklist. Consider refining the limits of the Rustic designation accordingly.</p> | 1 | |
| 31 | Policy | ADB | Road Profiles | 202-204 | Meeting House Road | <p>The first 500' from MD 108 runs along CRN zoning and also includes a substantial proposed age-restricted multi-family development. We suggest this initial 500' be reconsidered as to whether it complies with Rustic Roads criteria #1 (Zoning) and #5 (Safety).</p> <p>This should support ped/bike, roadway, intersection, and access treatments associated with potential development of the CRN zones.</p> | 1 | |

| Road | PDF Page # | Bridge # | Bridge Description | DTE Feedback | Coords |
|------------------------|------------|----------|--|---|----------------------|
| Barnesville Road | 15 | M-0045 | Concrete and pipe rail bridge over the Little Monocacy River | Significant | 39.227071,-77.405598 |
| Berryville Road | 38 | M-0028 | Two narrow bridges over tributaries to Seneca Creek | Ordinary | 39.090679,-77.32677 |
| Berryville Road | 38 | M-0029 | Two narrow bridges over tributaries to Seneca Creek | Ordinary | |
| Black Rock Road | 45 | M-0047 | A one-lane steel bridge over Great Seneca Creek, one of the longest rustic bridges in the county | Significant | |
| Bucklodge Road | 63 | | National Register-eligible two-lane bridge over Bucklodge Branch | No bridges listed in County Inventory (Rte 117 maintained by MSHA-MDOT) | |
| Bucklodge Road | 63 | | One-lane bridge over Bucklodge Branch tributary | No bridges listed in County Inventory (Rte 117 maintained by MSHA-MDOT) | |
| Burnt Hill Road | 71 | M-0157 | Narrow bridge near Kingstead Road | Ordinary | |
| Comus Road | 84 | | Two concrete bridges (between Comus and the county line) | Significant | |
| Edwards Ferry Road | 100 | M-0181 | Narrow bridge over Broad Run | Ordinary | |
| Game Preserve Road | 116 | | 1906 B&O Railroad bridge | Significant | |
| Glen Road | 124 | M-0014 | One-lane bridge over Watts Branch | Ordinary | |
| Glen Road | 124 | M-0013 | Narrow bridge over Kilgour Branch | Ordinary | |
| Glen Road | 124 | M-0015 | Narrow bridge over Piney Branch | Ordinary | |
| Gregg Road | 135 | M-0119 | Narrow bridge over Hawlings River tributary | Ordinary | |
| Haviland Mill Road | 145 | M-0098 | One-lane bridge over the Hawlings River | Ordinary | |
| Howard Chapel Road | 160 | M-0123 | Narrow bridge over Hights Branch | Ordinary | 39.249406,-77.066085 |
| Martinsburg Road | 203 | M-0164 | Concrete paneled bridge over direct Potomac tributary | Significant | |
| Martinsburg Road | 203 | M-0042 | Narrow bridge over direct Potomac tributary | Ordinary | |
| Montevideo Road | 211 | M-0030 | Truss bridge over Dry Seneca Creek | Significant | 39.093655,-77.347162 |
| Mouth of Monocacy Road | 233 | M-0135 | One-lane timber deck bridge across the railroad | Significant | |
| Mouth of Monocacy Road | 233 | M-0043 | One-lane bridge across the Little Monocacy River | Ordinary | |
| Pennyfield Lock Road | 268 | M-0198 | One lane bridge over the Pennyfield tributary to Muddy Branch | Significant | |
| Query Mill Road | 283 | M-0020 | Two one-lane bridges over tributaries to Muddy Branch | Ordinary | |
| Query Mill Road | 283 | M-0329 | Two one-lane bridges over tributaries to Muddy Branch | Ordinary | |
| River Road | 293 | | Open vista of iron bridge and sandstone culvert | N/A | |
| River Road | 293 | M-0040 | One-lane bridge over Broad Run | Ordinary | |
| River Road | 296 | M-0038 | Two one-lane bridges over Horsepen Branch and one of its tributaries | Ordinary | |
| River Road | 296 | M-0039 | Two one-lane bridges over Horsepen Branch and one of its tributaries | Ordinary | |
| Schaeffer Road | 306 | M-0137 | National Register-eligible pipe rail bridge across Little Seneca Creek | Significant | |
| Sugarland Road | 331 | M-0034 | Two narrow bridges over tributaries of Dry Seneca Creek and the Potomac River | Ordinary | |
| Sugarland Road | 331 | M-0035 | Two narrow bridges over tributaries of Dry Seneca Creek and the Potomac River | Ordinary | |
| Swains Lock Road | 339 | M-0022 | One-lane bridge just north of the C&O Canal parking lot | Ordinary | |
| Sycamore Landing Road | 342 | M-0031 | Two one-lane bridges over Horsepen Branch and one of its tributaries | Ordinary | |
| Sycamore Landing Road | 342 | M-0032 | Two one-lane bridges over Horsepen Branch and one of its tributaries | Ordinary | |
| West Harris Road | 373 | M-0046 | National Register-eligible, seven-ton pipe railing bridge surrounded by sycamore trees | Significant | |
| White Ground Road | 394 | M-0138 | One-lane [prestressed concrete slab] bridge over Bucklodge Branch near Schaeffer Road | Significant | |
| White Ground Road | 394 | M-0048 | One-lane bridge over Little Seneca Creek tributary near Edward U. Taylor School | Ordinary | |
| White Ground Road | 394 | M-0299 | Two narrow bridges over Little Seneca Creek tributaries near the south end of the road | Significant | |
| White Ground Road | 394 | M-0300 | Two narrow bridges over Little Seneca Creek tributaries near the south end of the road | Significant | |
| Whites Ferry Road | 399 | M-0186 | National Register-eligible, concrete-paneled bridge west of Wasche Road | Significant | |
| Wildcat Road | 404 | M-0068 | One-lane bridge over Wildcat Branch | Ordinary | |