

Table 1. Comparison of TY2017 Values to TY2016 Values				
	TY2016 Use Values	TY2017 Use Values	\$	%
	Type III Land w/out Risk	Type III Land w/out Risk	Change	Change
Counties:				
Accomack	2,420	2,420	0	0%
Albemarle	160	120	-40	-25%
Alleghany	0	0	0	0%
Amelia	820	840	20	2%
Amherst	0	20	20	100%
Appomattox	100	100	0	0%
Augusta	380	400	20	5%
Bath	40	30	-10	-25%
Bedford	60	60	0	0%
Bland	220	220	0	0%
Botetourt	130	120	-10	-8%
Campbell	120	130	10	8%
Caroline	1,440	1,530	90	6%
Carroll	160	160	0	0%
Chesterfield <Amelia	750	780	30	4%
Clarke	190	190	0	0%
Culpeper	550	610	60	11%
Cumberland	310	290	-20	-6%
Dinwiddie, Coastal <Sussex	880	910	30	3%
Dinwiddie, Piedmont <Brunswick	1,170	1,230	60	5%
Essex	1,890	1,980	90	5%
Fairfax <Loudoun	270	280	10	4%
Fauquier	420	440	20	5%
Floyd	130	150	20	15%
Fluvanna	180	190	10	6%
Franklin	370	390	20	5%
Frederick	80	90	10	13%
Giles	120	170	50	42%
Gloucester	1,730	1,810	80	5%
Goochland	620	690	70	11%
Greene	40	40	0	0%
Greensville	1,020	1,050	30	3%
Halifax	220	210	-10	-5%
Hanover, Coastal <King William	1,320	1,330	10	1%
Hanover, Piedmont <Louisa	1,040	1,100	60	6%
Henrico, Coastal <King William	1,850	1,920	70	4%
Henrico, Piedmont <Louisa	1,500	1,600	100	7%
Henry	10	10	0	0%
Isle Of Wight	1,650	1,640	-10	-1%
James City <New Kent	450	590	140	31%
King George	480	510	30	6%
King William	1,980	2,020	40	2%
Lancaster	1,760	1,770	10	1%
Loudoun	270	270	0	0%
Louisa	280	310	30	11%
Madison	650	660	10	2%
Middlesex	1,720	1,790	70	4%
Montgomery	120	120	0	0%

Table 1. Comparison of TY2017 Values to TY2016 Values				
	TY2016 Use Values	TY2017 Use Values	\$	%
	Type III Land w/out Risk	Type III Land w/out Risk	Change	Change
Nelson	80	60	-20	-25%
New Kent	1,260	1,300	40	3%
Northampton	2,350	2,290	-60	-3%
Northumberland	2,040	2,160	120	6%
Nottoway	490	510	20	4%
Orange	500	520	20	4%
Page	290	260	-30	-10%
Pittsylvania	320	340	20	6%
Powhatan	460	490	30	7%
Prince Edward	110	100	-10	-9%
Prince George	1,210	1,280	70	6%
Prince William	320	350	30	9%
Pulaski	100	90	-10	-10%
Rappahannock	10	10	0	0%
Richmond	1,790	1,880	90	5%
Roanoke	10	10	0	0%
Rockbridge	160	150	-10	-6%
Rockingham	970	980	10	1%
Russell	70	70	0	0%
Shenandoah	480	450	-30	-6%
Smyth	180	230	50	28%
Southampton	1,680	1,660	-20	-1%
Spotsylvania	380	430	50	13%
Stafford	330	360	30	9%
Tazewell	130	120	-10	-8%
Warren	20	30	10	50%
Washington	330	310	-20	-6%
Westmoreland	1,720	1,780	60	3%
Wise	30	30	0	0%
Wythe	190	200	10	5%
York <New Kent	450	600	150	33%
Cities:				
Buena Vista <Rockbridge	150	150	0	0%
Chesapeake	2,450	2,550	100	4%
Danville <Pittsylvania	310	330	20	6%
Franklin City <Isle of Wight	1,590	1,580	-10	-1%
Fredericksburg <Spotsylvania	390	430	40	10%
Hampton <New Kent	430	560	130	30%
Harrisonburg <Rockingham	970	970	0	0%
Lynchburg <Bedford	50	50	0	0%
Newport News <New Kent	430	570	140	33%
Petersburg <Prince George	1,130	1,180	50	4%
Radford <Pulaski	100	80	-20	-20%
Roanoke City <Roanoke	10	10	0	0%
Staunton <Augusta	360	380	20	6%
Suffolk	1,250	1,240	-10	-1%
Virginia Beach	2,070	2,010	-60	-3%
Waynesboro <Augusta	370	390	20	5%
Winchester <Frederick	80	90	10	13%
AVERAGES	\$653	\$676	\$23	

¹ For TY2015 James City uses New Kent as a transfer-in county because of 2012 Ag Census non-disclosure requirements.

Also, York, Hampton City, and Newport News City now use New Kent as their transfer-in county.

<: Transfer-in county; for explanation see end of document.

TY2017 Data Comparison Summary

Increase % Change (Top)		Increase \$ Change (Top)	
1 Amherst	100%	York <New Kent	\$150
2 Warren	50%	James City <New Kent	\$140
3 Giles	42%	Newport News <New Kent	\$140
4 York <New Kent	33%	Hampton <New Kent	\$130
5 Newport News <New Kent	33%	Northumberland	\$120
6 James City <New Kent	31%	Chesapeake	\$100
7 Hampton <New Kent	30%	Henrico, Piedmont <Louisa	\$100
8 Smyth	28%	Essex	\$90
9 Floyd	15%	Richmond	\$90
10 Spotsylvania	13%	Caroline	\$90
11 Frederick	13%		
12 Winchester <Frederick	13%		
Decrease % Change (Top)		Decrease \$ Change (Top)	
1 Albemarle	-25%	Virginia Beach	-\$60
2 Bath	-25%	Northampton	-\$60
3 Nelson	-25%	Albemarle	-\$40
4 Radford <Pulaski	-20%	Page	-\$30
5 Page	-10%	Shenandoah	-\$30
6 Pulaski	-10%	Nelson	-\$20
7 Prince Edward	-9%	Radford <Pulaski	-\$20
8		Cumberland	-\$20
9		Washington	-\$20
10		Southampton	-\$20

Overall

Average change was \$23 increase per acre

26% of localities had \$ changes of \pm \$50 or more per acre

7% of localities had \$ changes of \pm \$100 or more per acre

22% of localities had no change

Alleghany had \$0 Type III Land Use Values for TY2017.

Table 2. Overview: TY2017 Use-Value Assessment Program Values

Type III w/out risk Land Estimate		Number of counties/cities that increased or decreased
Average \$ Decrease	-\$20	21
Average \$ Increase	\$47	57
No change	\$0	19
Average change in value from 2016 to 2017	\$23 AVG Increase	

General Comments

- High grain prices over the last 5-6 years have continued to influence counties that have enough crop acreage of corn, wheat, barley, and/or soybeans in their composite farm to increase their use-value estimates.
- For tax year 2011, the format of the Direct and Counter-Cyclical Program (DCP) payments received from USDA-FSA changed. In that year, DCP payments were only jurisdiction-specific. In previous years and for tax years 2012 through 2016, DCP payments were crop specific.
- Alleghany county had a \$0 value for Type III Land Use Value for TY2017; and, Henry, Roanoke, Roanoke City, and Rappahannock all had a \$10 value for Type III land.
 - Possible ways to address zero or low values would be to use rental rates.
- For TY2017, Dinwiddie, Piedmont <Brunswick (transfer-in) had a \$1,230 value for Type III land while Dinwiddie, Coastal <Sussex (transfer-in) had a value of \$910. This was because of higher soybean profits in Brunswick county, overall. During the last seven years Brunswick soybean yields have averaged 35.7 Bu/acre while Sussex yields have averaged 31.5 Bu/acre. Therefore, when soybean budgets are olympic averaged Dinwiddie, Piedmont soybean net return is higher.

Selected Counties/Cities: Explanatory Notes (Increases and Decreases)**Increases (Type III w/out risk):**

In general, increases in estimates were due to increases in profits from grains.

Counties with Most % Increases			
	% Change	\$ Increase	
Amherst	100%	\$20	Increased profits from pasture and corn.
Warren	50%	\$10	Slight increase in profits from alfalfa and corn.
Giles	42%	\$50	Increased profits from pasture, corn, and alfalfa.
York<New Kent	33%	\$150	Increased profits in soybeans, corn, and wheat.
Newport News <New Kent	33%	\$140	Increased profits in soybeans, corn, and wheat.
James City	31%	\$140	Increased profits from soybeans and corn, and wheat.
Hampton <New Kent	30%	\$130	Increased profits in soybeans, corn, and wheat.
Smyth	28%	\$50	Increased profits from pasture, corn, and alfalfa.
Floyd	15%	\$20	Increased profits from alfalfa and corn.
Spotsylvania	13%	\$50	Increased profits from pasture and corn.
Frederick	13%	\$10	Slight increases in profits from corn, alfalfa, and soybeans.
Winchester <Frederick	13%	\$10	Slight increases in profitability of corn, alfalfa, and soybeans.

Decreases (Type III w/out risk):

In general, decreases in estimates were due to decreases in profits from grains and pasture. Note, in TY2016, for the first time since it was included in the use value model, pasture had 7 years of data which could be Olympic averaged. Prior to TY2016, pasture budgets were straight averaged.

	% Change	\$ Decrease	
Albemarle	-25%	-\$40	Decrease in profitability of pasture, corn, and alfalfa.
Bath	-25%	-\$10	Slight decrease in profits from corn.
Nelson	-25%	-\$20	Decrease in profits from pumpkins
Radford <Pulaski	-20%	-\$20	Decrease in profit from pasture.
Page	-10%	-\$30	Decrease in profits from pasture and corn.
Pulaski	-10%	-\$10	Decrease in profit from pasture.
Prince Edward	-9%	-\$10	Decrease in profits from corn and soybeans.

Transfers (<): The data used for estimating the use value of agricultural land are not published for all towns and for only a few of Virginia's independent cities. When data does not exist for a town or city participating in the use value taxation program, the estimated use values from an adjacent or surrounding county are 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. When a transfer-in jurisdiction has been used, it appears after an arrow (<).