

**Table 1. Comparison of TY2012 Values to TY2011 Values**

	TY2011 Use Values	TY2012 Use Values	\$ Change	% Change
	Type III Land w/out Risk	Type III Land w/out Risk		
County of--				
Accomack	650	930	280	43%
Albemarle	80	50	-30	-38%
Alleghany	70	0	-70	-100%
Amelia	180	210	30	17%
Amherst	10	10	0	0%
Appomattox*	50	50	0	0%
Augusta	150	150	0	0%
Bath	30	40	10	33%
Bedford	80	60	-20	-25%
Bland	150	100	-50	-33%
Botetourt	60	60	0	0%
Campbell	20	30	10	50%
Caroline	290	470	180	62%
Carroll	90	80	-10	-11%
Chesterfield	170	200	30	18%
Clarke	100	100	0	0%
Culpeper	190	210	20	11%
Cumberland	130	100	-30	-23%
Dinwiddie_Coastal	260	290	30	12%
Dinwiddie_Piedmont	240	250	10	4%
Essex	860	1070	210	24%
Fairfax	30	50	20	67%
Fauquier	90	90	0	0%
Floyd	30	20	-10	-33%
Fluvanna	20	30	10	50%
Franklin	40	50	10	25%
Frederick	40	50	10	25%
Giles	60	40	-20	-33%
Gloucester	380	610	230	61%
Goochland	110	210	100	91%
Greene	160	130	-30	-19%
Greensville*	420	560	140	33%
Halifax	50	90	40	80%
Hanover_Coastal	320	450	130	41%
Hanover_Piedmont	220	290	70	32%
Henrico_Coastal	370	500	130	35%
Henrico_Piedmont	210	250	40	19%
Henry	0	0	0	0%
Isle Of Wight	440	500	60	14%
James City	420	210	-210	-50%
King George	130	220	90	69%
King William	550	730	180	33%
Lancaster	380	610	230	61%
Loudoun	30	50	20	67%
Louisa	70	90	20	29%
Madison	260	270	10	4%
Middlesex	400	560	160	40%
Montgomery	40	40	0	0%
Nelson	10	10	0	0%
New Kent	410	530	120	29%
Northampton	910	1120	210	23%
Northumberland	540	760	220	41%

<b>Table 1. Comparison of TY2012 Values to TY2011 Values</b>				
	<b>TY2011 Use Values</b>	<b>TY2012 Use Values</b>	<b>\$ Change</b>	<b>% Change</b>
	<b>Type III Land w/out Risk</b>	<b>Type III Land w/out Risk</b>		
Nottoway	70	70	0	0%
Orange	100	120	20	20%
Page	170	150	-20	-12%
Pittsylvania	110	90	-20	-18%
Powhatan	90	130	40	44%
Prince Edward	40	40	0	0%
Prince George	230	340	110	48%
Prince William	100	100	0	0%
Pulaski	120	80	-40	-33%
Rappahannock	20	20	0	0%
Richmond	290	420	130	45%
Roanoke	0	0	0	0%
Rockbridge	70	50	-20	-29%
Rockingham	400	430	30	8%
Russell	10	10	0	0%
Shenandoah	230	240	10	4%
Smyth	110	110	0	0%
Southampton	640	620	-20	-3%
Spotsylvania	80	140	60	75%
Stafford	130	170	40	31%
Tazewell	100	70	-30	-30%
Warren	0	0	0	0%
Washington	290	210	-80	-28%
Westmoreland	300	430	130	43%
Wise	10	10	0	0%
Wythe	100	70	-30	-30%
York	430	210	-220	-51%
<b>City of--</b>				
Buena Vista City	70	50	-20	-29%
Chesapeake City	580	1010	430	74%
Danville City	110	90	-20	-18%
Franklin City	430	480	50	12%
Fredericksburg City	80	140	60	75%
Hampton City	410	200	-210	-51%
Harrisonburg City	400	430	30	8%
Lynchburg City	80	60	-20	-25%
Manassas City	100	100	0	0%
Newport News City	420	210	-210	-50%
Petersburg City	210	320	110	52%
Radford City	130	90	-40	-31%
Roanoke City	0	0	0	0%
Staunton City	150	140	-10	-7%
Suffolk City	440	520	80	18%
Virginia Beach City	510	890	380	75%
Waynesboro City	150	150	0	0%
Winchester City	40	50	10	25%
<b>AVERAGES</b>	<b>\$202</b>	<b>\$235</b>	<b>\$34</b>	

\*New use-value participant TY2009

## TY2012 Data Comparison Summary

<b>Increase % Change (Top 10)</b>		<b>Increase \$ Change (Top 10)</b>		
1	Goochland	91%	Chesapeake City	\$430
2	Halifax	80%	Virginia Beach City	\$380
3	Fredericksburg City	75%	Accomack	\$280
4	Spotsylvania	75%	Gloucester	\$230
5	Virginia Beach City	75%	Lancaster	\$230
6	Chesapeake City	74%	Northumberland	\$220
7	King George	69%	Essex	\$210
8	Fairfax	67%	Northampton	\$210
9	Loudoun	67%	Caroline	\$180
10	Caroline	62%	King William	\$180

<b>Decrease % Change (Top 10)</b>		<b>Decrease \$ Change (Top 10)</b>		
1	Alleghany	-100%	York	-\$220
2	Hampton City	-51%	Hampton City	-\$210
3	York	-51%	James City	-\$210
4	James City	-50%	Newport News City	-\$210
5	Newport News City	-50%	Washington	-\$80
6	Albemarle	-38%	Alleghany	-\$70
7	Bland	-33%	Bland	-\$50
8	Pulaski	-33%	Pulaski	-\$40
9	Giles	-33%	Radford City	-\$40
10	Floyd	-33%	Albemarle	-\$30
			Cumberland	-\$30
			Greene	-\$30
			Tazewell	-\$30
			Wythe	-\$30

### **Overall**

Average change was **\$34 increase per acre**

**35%** of localities had \$ changes of **±\$50 or less per acre**

**25%** of localities had \$ changes of **±\$100 or more per acre**

**22%** of localities had **no change**

**Five localities** that had a **\$0 Type III Land Use Value** for TY2012 are Alleghany, Henry, Roanoke, Roanoke City, and Warren.

**Table 2. Overview: TY2012 Use-Value Assessment Program Values**

		Number of counties/cities that increased or decreased
Average decrease	\$(57)	26
Average increase	\$96	50
No change	\$0	21
Average change in value from 2011 to 2012	\$34	

**General Comments**

- Pasture as a crop needs more than 2.08 tons per ac of hay yield to break even on a per acre pasture budget. There were 5 jurisdictions out of the total with hay yields greater than 2.08 tons (James City, King and Queen, Carroll, Smyth, and Scott), thus the majority of pasture enterprises lost money. This is the major reason for Western Counties’ declining values.
- The format of the Direct and Counter-Cyclical Program (DCP) payments received from USDA-FSA changed for data year 2010. In 2009, DCP payments were only jurisdiction-specific. In previous years DCP payments were crop specific and again for data year 2010.
- Alleghany, Henry, Roanoke Count and City, and Warren all have a \$0 value for Type III Land Use Value for TY2012
- Possible ways to address zero values would be to use rental rates.

**Selected Counties/Cities: Explanatory Notes**

*TY2012 Top Percentage and Total \$ INCREASE*

- Reason - large increase in profits from grains

Goochland – Large increase in net income from corn, wheat, and soybeans

Halifax – Large increase in net income from corn, wheat, tobacco, and soybeans – alfalfa went down

Spotsylvania and City of Fredericksburg - Large increase in net income from corn, barley wheat, and soybeans – alfalfa went down

VA Beach – Large increase in net income from corn, wheat, cotton and soybeans - sweet corn went down

Chesapeake – Large increase in net income from corn, wheat, and soybeans - pasture went down

King George - Large increase in net income from corn, wheat, and soybeans

Fairfax and Loudoun - Large increase in net income from wheat, and soybeans

Caroline - Large increase in net income from corn, barley, wheat, and soybeans

Accomack – Large increase in net income from corn, wheat, and soybeans - potatoes, pasture, and sweet corn went down

Gloucester - Large increase in net income from corn, wheat, and soybeans

Lancaster – Large increase in net income from corn, wheat, barley, and soybeans - pasture went down

Northumberland – Large increase in net income from corn, wheat, barley, and soybeans - pasture went down

Essex – Large increase in net income from corn, wheat, barley, and soybeans - pasture went down

Accomack – Large increase in net income from corn, wheat, cotton, and soybeans - potatoes, pasture, and sweet corn went down

King William - Large increase in net income from corn, barley wheat, and soybeans

### *TY2012 Top Percentages and Total \$ DECREASE*

- Reason – reduced yields and profits from alfalfa hay and pasture

Alleghany – decreased net income from hay and pasture

James City, York, Newport News, Hampton - decreased net income from pasture

Albemarle - decreased net income from alfalfa and pasture

Bland - decreased net income from alfalfa and pasture

Pulaski and Radford City - decreased net income from alfalfa and pasture

Giles - decreased net income from pasture

Floyd - decreased net income from alfalfa

Washington - decreased net income from alfalfa and pasture

Cumberland - decreased net income from pasture

Greene - decreased net income from pasture

Tazewell - decreased net income from alfalfa and pasture

Wythe - decreased net income from alfalfa and pasture