

Questions regarding any *statutorily* related issues surrounding use-value assessment should be directed to Jason Hughes at the Property Tax Unit, Virginia Department of Taxation. Questions regarding the *technical* aspects of the methodology for the agricultural or horticultural use-value estimates should be directed to Gordon Groover at the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, Virginia Tech. Questions about forest use-value estimates should be directed to Dean Cumbia at the Department of Forestry in Charlottesville. Questions about open space use-value estimates should be directed to Sarah Richardson at the Department of Conservation and Recreation in Richmond.

Table 1: Income Approach - Estimated use value of agricultural land in Accomack (\$ / Acre).

Land Class	Use Value Without Risk	Use Value With Risk
I	3820	3640
II	3440	3270
III	2550	2420
IV	2040	1940
Avg. I – IV	3340	3170
V	1530	1450
VI	1270	1210
VII	760	730
Avg. V – VII	760	730
Avg. I – VII	3320	3160
VIII	250	240

Table 2: Income Approach - Estimated use value of orchards in Accomack (\$ / Acre).

Land Class	Use Value of Apple Orchard	Use Value of Other Orchard
I	2650	2650
II	1980	1980
III	1080	1080
IV	580	580
V	430	430
VI	400	400
VII	180	180
VIII	250	250

Table 3: Rental Rate Approach⁵ – Cropland and pastureland values based on NASS capitalized rental rates in Accomack or district value. (\$/Acre).

Cropland	1050
Irrigated Cropland	N/A
Pastureland	530

⁵For details see Estimates at <http://usevalue.agecon.vt.edu/>

Table 4: Forest Values (\$/Acre) - Accomack

	Site Productivity (\$/acre)			
	Fair	Good	Excellent	Non-Productive Land
Forest Land	232	348	470	100

Table 5: Open Space Recommended Values (\$/Acre) - Accomack

Golf Course	Swim and Racket Clubs
N/A	N/A

N/A = not applicable to the county/city

Transfers <: Data used to estimate agricultural use values for a jurisdiction (counties/cities) may not be published or is insufficient. When this occurs, data from a nearby county is used. This process is referred to as transferring-in. Transferring-in is also used for jurisdictions with large areas of land lying in more than one physiographic region, for example coastal plain and piedmont. A transfer-in jurisdiction is noted by use of an arrow < after the name.

Estimated Use Values For Accomack

Estimates apply to Tax Year 2015



**State Land Evaluation and
Advisory Council (SLEAC)**

Contacts

Virginia Department of Taxation

Jason Hughes, Property Tax Unit, Virginia Dept. of Taxation, Richmond, VA 23218-0560
(804) 371- 0842 Jason.Hughes@tax.virginia.gov

Agricultural/Horticultural Estimates

Lex Bruce, Senior Project Associate, Dept. of Agricultural and Applied Economics, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061
(540) 231- 4441 fbruce@vt.edu

Gordon Groover, Extension Economist, Farm Management, Dept. of Agricultural and Applied Economics, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061
(540) 231-5850 xgroover@vt.edu

Forest Estimates

Dean Cumbia, Dept. of Forestry, 900 Natural Resources Drive, #800, Charlottesville, VA 22903
(804) 786-2450 Dean.Cumbia@dof.virginia.gov

Open Space Estimates

Sarah Richardson, Real Estate and Land Conservation Manager, Dept. of Conservation and Recreation, 600 East Main Street 24th Floor, Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 225-2048 Sarah.Richardson@dcr.virginia.gov

Use Value Taxation in Virginia¹

Virginia law allows for *eligible* land in agricultural, horticultural, forest, or open space use to be taxed at the value in *use* (use value) as opposed to its *market* value.² The State Land Evaluation and Advisory Council (SLEAC) was created in 1973 with the mandate to estimate the use value of eligible land for each jurisdiction participating in the use-value taxation program. SLEAC provides for the development of an objective methodology for estimating the use value of land in *agricultural, horticultural, forest, and open space* use. The members of SLEAC have officially sanctioned the use value estimates reported in this brochure.

Role of the SLEAC Estimates

Section 58.1–3229 (et seq.) of the *Code of Virginia* requires each participating jurisdiction's assessment office to *consider* SLEAC estimates when assessing the use value of eligible land. However, the local assessing office is not required to use SLEAC estimates verbatim.

Agricultural/Horticultural Estimates

Tables 1 & 2 list the estimated use values of agricultural and horticultural land using an **income approach**. These estimates are based on capitalized net income - from agricultural or horticultural enterprises in each participating county. These values are updated annually. Note, the local assessing office can only make changes to assessed property values during a reassessment year.

Table 1 lists the estimated use value of land in *agricultural* use for each of the eight USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) land capability classifications.

For explanation of soil classifications see Procedures Manual on the use value website <http://usevalue.agecon.vt.edu/>. Because data on the land class composition of individual parcels is often unavailable, average use values have also been provided.³ The average of land in classes I–IV represents the average use value of *cropland*. The average of land in classes V–VII represents the average use value of *pastureland*. The average of land in classes I–VII represents the average use value of *all agricultural land*.⁴

The *without risk* estimates apply to land that is not at risk of flooding. *The with-risk estimates should only be applied to land parcels that are at risk of flooding due to poor drainage that cannot be remedied by tilling or drainage ditches.*

Table 2 lists the estimated use value of land in orchard use. Values are reported for both apple orchards and “other” orchards for each of the eight NRCS land capability classifications. “Other” orchard refers to peach, pear, cherry, or plum production. Table 3 lists the estimated use values of cropland and pastureland using a **rental rate approach**. These use-values are based on capitalized rental rates obtained annually from the USDA National Agricultural Statistical Service (NASS). If there are sufficient numbers of responses to meet the NASS nondisclosure requirements for a jurisdiction then the value is published. However, if there are not enough responses in a jurisdiction to meet non-disclosure requirements, then all the non-disclosed

jurisdictions within a crop reporting district are summarized and published as a *Combined Counties (District) value*.

Forest Estimates

Table 4 lists, when appropriate, the estimated use values for forest land. For information pertaining to Forest land use taxation see

<http://www.dof.virginia.gov/land/usetax/introduction.htm>

Open Space Estimates

Table 5 lists, when appropriate, the estimated use values recommended for open space land. A locality may have values for golf courses or swim and racket clubs.

Participating agencies:

- Virginia Department of Taxation <http://www.tax.virginia.gov/>
- Virginia Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics <http://www.aaec.vt.edu/>
- Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation <http://www.dcr.virginia.gov/>
- Virginia Department of Forestry <http://www.dof.virginia.gov/>



Virginia Cooperative Extension programs and employment are open to all, regardless of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, genetic information, marital, family, or veteran status, or any other basis protected by law. An equal opportunity/affirmative action employer. Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension work, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia State University, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture cooperating. Edwin J. Jones, Director, Virginia Cooperative Extension, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg; Jewel E. Hairston, Administrator, 1890 Extension Program, Virginia State, Petersburg.

¹ Information about Virginia's Use Value Assessment Program can be found at <http://usevalue.agecon.vt.edu/>.

² A locality may adopt any combination of the four types of use-value taxation.

³ Data limitations prohibited the computation of average use values in a few counties and in most independent cities and townships.

⁴ **Note.** Class VIII land is not considered suitable for agricultural production and is therefore not included in this average.

Table 2: The composite farm and average net returns in Accomack.

Annual net returns are determined through enterprise budgeting for crops that contributed one or more acres to the composite farm. The estimated net returns shown in the table below are "olympic" averages¹ for each crop in the composite farm for the proceeding 7 budget years. A budget year lags a given tax year by 2 years (e.g., tax year 2014 corresponds to the budget year 2012).

Additional information about these estimates can be found at Virginia's Use Value Assessment Program website, <http://usevalue.agecon.vt.edu>.

Estimates apply to tax-year **2015**.

Number of Farms: 226²

Commodity	Total Acreage ³	Composite Farm (Acres) ¹	Estimated Net Return (\$/acre)
Corn ⁴	19,015	84	\$174.77
Alfalfa	0		
Hay ⁵	329	1	\$0.00
Wheat	13,645	60	\$128.72
Barley	2,366	10	\$2.96
Soybeans	37,930	168	\$171.98
Potatoes	0	11	\$838.04
Cotton	1,031		
Pasture	0	5	\$8.62
Peanuts	0		
Tobacco	0		
Snap Beans	(D)		
Pumpkins	0		
Sweet Corn	6		
Tomatoes	(D)		
Watermelons	2		
Double-Cropped ⁶	(-) 16,011	71	
Total Cropland Harvested	60,716	269	
		Net Return	\$224.53⁷

Notes

(D) = Withheld to avoid disclosing data of individual farms.

¹In an olympic average, the highest and lowest are dropped prior to calculating the arithmetic mean.

²Data taken from the 2007 Census of Agriculture.

³Some data do not add exactly due to rounding and some categories are not listed due to disclosure rules.

⁴Corn acreage is corn-grain plus corn-silage acreages.

⁵Hay acreage is (all hay + all haylage, grass silage, greenchop) - (alfalfa hay + haylage or greenchop from alfalfa or alfalfa mixtures).

⁶Double-cropped acreage is subtracted from the crops listed to arrive at the total cropland harvest acreage.

⁷Weighted average of crop estimated net returns by the composite farm acreage.

Table 3: Worksheet for estimating the use value of agricultural land in Accomack

Additional information about these estimates can be found at Virginia's Use Value Assessment Program website, <http://usevalue.agecon.vt.edu/>.

Estimates are applicable to tax-year **2015**

1. Estimated net return \$224.53

2. Capitalization rates

a) Interest rate component ¹	0.0635	
b) Property tax component ²	0.0038	
c) Rate without risk	0.0674	(sum a and b)
d) Risk component	0.0034	(0.05 times 2c)
e) Rate with risk ³	0.0707	(sum c and d)

3. Unadjusted Use Value	<u>Without Risk⁴</u>	<u>With Risk⁵</u>
	\$3,332.74	\$3,174.04

4. Soil Index	Land Class	Crop Acreage (No Pasture Acreage) ⁶	Productivity Index	Weighted Acreage
	I	22,210	1.5	33,315
	II	43,189	1.35	58,305
	III	18,702	1	18,702
	IV	430	.8	344
	Total:	84,531		110,666

Soil Index Factor⁷: 1.3092

5. Agricultural use value adjusted by land class

<u>Class</u>	<u>Land Index</u>	<u>Without Risk</u>	<u>Reported⁸</u>	<u>With Risk</u>	<u>Reported⁸</u>
I	1.50	\$3,818.51	3820	\$3,636.67	3640
II	1.35	\$3,436.66	3440	\$3,273.01	3270
III	1.00	\$2,545.67	2550	\$2,424.45	2420
IV	0.80	\$2,036.54	2040	\$1,939.56	1940
V	0.60	\$1,527.40	1530	\$1,454.67	1450
VI	0.50	\$1,272.84	1270	\$1,212.22	1210
VII	0.30	\$763.70	760	\$727.33	730
VIII	0.10	\$254.57	250	\$242.44	240

¹ The 10-year average of the long-term interest rates charged by the various Agriculture Credit Associations serving the state.

² The 10-year average of the effective true tax rates reported by the Virginia Department of Taxation.

³ Rate should only be used when the soil has poor drainage that is not remedied by tilling or drainage ditches or when the land lies in a floodplain.

⁴ Estimated Net Return (Line 1) divided by Rate without risk (Line 2c).

⁵ Estimated Net Return (Line 1) divided by Rate with risk (Line 2e).

⁶ Data provided by the Virginia Conservation Needs Inventory (1967).

⁷ Index factor = (Total Weighted Acreage) / (Total Cropland Acreage).

⁸ Rounded to the nearest \$10 and reported in Table 1a.

Transfers < Data used to estimate agricultural use values for a jurisdiction (counties/cities) may not be published or is insufficient. When this occurs, data from a nearby county is used. This process is referred to as transferring-in. Transferring-in is also used for jurisdictions with large areas of land lying in more than one physiographic region, for example coastal plain and piedmont. A transfer-in jurisdiction is noted by use of an arrow < after the name.

Table 5: Worksheet for estimating the use value of orchard land in Accomack

The estimated net returns assume a planting density of 135 trees per acre. Additional information about these estimates can be found at Virginia's Use Value Assessment Program website, <http://usevalue.agecon.vt.edu/>.

Estimates are applicable to tax-year 2015.

1. Estimated net returns (loss) per acre applicable to tax-year TaxYear (see Table 4 for more detail).

	<u>Age of Trees</u>	<u>Processed Fruit</u>	<u>Fresh Fruit</u>
Pre-production	1-3 years	-\$2,694.01	-\$2,812.06
Early-production	4-6 years	\$656.32	\$1,290.03
Full-production	7-15 years	\$599.51	-\$664.59
Late-production	16-20 years	\$597.24	\$606.28
	Discounted (20 Yr Cycle)	-\$2,284.50	-\$7,053.02
	Utilization of Sales (10 Yr Avg %)	74%	26%
	Apple Insurance (Annual Avg/acre)	\$100.75	

2. Weighted Average Net Return Values

a)	2015 ¹	-\$3,403.09
b)	2014	-\$7,533.62
c)	2013	-\$15,274.96
d)	2012	\$13,848.76
e)	2011	-\$8,748.31
f)	2010	-\$1,615.75
g)	2009	-\$585.53

3. Net Returns

a)	Net return to "trees and land" (Olympic average of 2a thru 2g) ²	\$0.00
b)	Net return attributable to "land only" (Class III) ³	\$171.50
c)	Net return attributable to "trees only" (line a minus line b)	-\$171.50

4. Capitalization Rate

a)	Interest Rate ⁴	0.0635
b)	Property Tax ⁵	0.0038
c)	Depreciation of Apple Trees ⁶	0.0500
d)	Depreciation of "Other" Trees ⁷	0.0500
e)	Apple Orchard Capitalization Rate (sum 4a, 4b, 4c)	0.1174
f)	"Other" Orchard Capitalization Rate (sum(4a, 4b, 4d)	0.1174

5. Use Value of Apple Orchard and "Other" Orchard

Class	Orchard Index ⁸	APPLE ORCHARD		OTHER ORCHARD	
		Apple Trees	Apple Trees and Land ⁹	Other Trees ⁹	Other Trees and Land ⁹
I	.80	-\$1,168.97	\$2,649.54	-\$1,168.97	\$2,649.54
II	1.00	-\$1,461.21	\$1,975.45	-\$1,461.21	\$1,975.45
III	1.00	-\$1,461.21	\$1,084.46	-\$1,461.21	\$1,084.46
IV	1.00	-\$1,461.21	\$575.33	-\$1,461.21	\$575.33
V	0.75	-\$1,095.91	\$431.50	-\$1,095.91	\$431.50
VI	0.60	-\$876.73	\$396.11	-\$876.73	\$396.11
VII	0.40	-\$584.48	\$179.22	-\$584.48	\$179.22
VIII	0.00	\$0.00	\$254.57	\$0.00	\$254.57

¹ Average net return of the eight orchard categories listed in Section 1 of this table. The weights are provided by the percent of total trees represented by each category.

² In an olympic average, the highest and lowest values are dropped prior to calculating the arithmetic mean.

³ This is determined by dividing the unadjusted net return value (Table 3, Line 1) by the soil index factor (Table 3, Section 4).

⁴ The 10-year average of long term interest rates charged by the Virginia Department of Taxation.

⁵ The 10-year average of the effective true tax rates charged by the Virginia Department of Taxation.

⁶ The depreciation rate applicable to apple trees assumes that trees are replaced on a 30-year rotation.

⁷ "Other" trees refer to peach, cherry, pear, and plum trees. The depreciation rate applicable to "other" trees assumes that trees are replaced on a 20-year rotation.

⁸ The orchard index is applicable only in determining the value of the trees. The land index (Table 3, Section 5) is applied to land.

⁹ The use value of trees and land is determined by adding the appropriate without-risk land-use-value (Table 3, Section 5) to the use value of the trees.

Transfers < Data used to estimate agricultural use values for a jurisdiction (counties/cities) may not be published or is insufficient. When this occurs, data from a nearby county is used. This process is referred to as transferring-in. Transferring-in is also used for jurisdictions with large areas of land lying in more than one physiographic region, for example coastal plain and piedmont. A transfer-in jurisdiction is noted by use of an arrow < after the name.