

Table 1. Comparison of TY2018 Values to TY2017 Values				
	TY2017 Use Values	TY2018 Use Values	\$	%
	Type III Land w/out Risk	Type III Land w/out Risk	Change	Change
Counties:				
Accomack	2,420	2,590	170	7%
Albemarle	120	130	10	8%
Alleghany	0	10	10	100%
Amelia	840	820	-20	-2%
Amherst	20	30	10	50%
Appomattox	100	130	30	30%
Augusta	400	620	220	55%
Bath	30	40	10	33%
Bedford	60	90	30	50%
Bland	220	390	170	77%
Botetourt	120	160	40	33%
Campbell	130	160	30	23%
Caroline	1,530	1,820	290	19%
Carroll	160	270	110	69%
Chesterfield <Amelia	780	750	-30	-4%
Clarke	190	190	0	0%
Culpeper	610	710	100	16%
Cumberland	290	290	0	0%
Dinwiddie, Coastal <Sussex	910	1,120	210	23%
Dinwiddie, Piedmont <Brunswick	1,230	1,340	110	9%
Essex	1,980	2,160	180	9%
Fairfax <Loudoun	280	340	60	21%
Fauquier	440	530	90	20%
Floyd	150	240	90	60%
Fluvanna	190	250	60	32%
Franklin	390	500	110	28%
Frederick	90	130	40	44%
Giles	170	280	110	65%
Gloucester	1,810	1,990	180	10%
Goochland	690	800	110	16%
Greene	40	10	-30	-75%
Greensville	1,050	1,310	260	25%
Halifax	210	270	60	29%
Hanover, Coastal <King William	1,330	1,610	280	21%
Hanover, Piedmont <Louisa	1,100	1,470	370	34%
Henrico, Coastal <King William	1,920	2,170	250	13%
Henrico, Piedmont <Louisa	1,600	1,970	370	23%
Henry	10	10	0	0%
Isle Of Wight	1,640	1,970	330	20%
James City <New Kent	590	770	180	31%
King George	510	660	150	29%
King William	2,020	2,330	310	15%
Lancaster	1,770	2,050	280	16%
Loudoun	270	340	70	26%
Louisa	310	370	60	19%
Madison	660	750	90	14%
Middlesex	1,790	2,040	250	14%
Montgomery	120	180	60	50%
Nelson	60	100	40	67%
New Kent	1,300	1,430	130	10%
Northampton	2,290	2,440	150	7%
Northumberland	2,160	2,440	280	13%
Nottoway	510	540	30	6%
Orange	520	630	110	21%

Table 1. Comparison of TY2018 Values to TY2017 Values				
	TY2017 Use Values	TY2018 Use Values	\$	%
cont.	Type III Land w/out Risk	Type III Land w/out Risk	Change	Change
Page	260	320	60	23%
Pittsylvania	340	500	160	47%
Powhatan	490	480	-10	-2%
Prince Edward	100	120	20	20%
Prince George	1,280	1,370	90	7%
Prince William	350	380	30	9%
Pulaski	90	170	80	89%
Rappahannock	10	10	0	0%
Richmond	1,880	2,160	280	15%
Roanoke	10	10	0	0%
Rockbridge	150	230	80	53%
Rockingham	980	1,220	240	24%
Russell	70	110	40	57%
Shenandoah	450	600	150	33%
Smyth	230	380	150	65%
Southampton	1,660	1,900	240	14%
Spotsylvania	430	580	150	35%
Stafford	360	440	80	22%
Tazewell	120	270	150	125%
Warren	30	40	10	33%
Washington	310	430	120	39%
Westmoreland	1,780	2,070	290	16%
Wise	30	60	30	100%
Wythe	200	280	80	40%
York <New Kent	600	770	170	28%
Cities:				
Buena Vista <Rockbridge	150	210	60	40%
Chesapeake	2,550	2,670	120	5%
Danville <Pittsylvania	330	490	160	48%
Franklin City <Isle of Wight	1,580	1,900	320	20%
Fredericksburg <Spotsylvania	430	580	150	35%
Hampton <New Kent	560	730	170	30%
Harrisonburg <Rockingham	970	1,210	240	25%
Lynchburg <Bedford	50	80	30	60%
Newport News <New Kent	570	730	160	28%
Petersburg <Prince George	1,180	1,270	90	8%
Radford <Pulaski	80	160	80	100%
Roanoke City <Roanoke	10	10	0	0%
Staunton <Augusta	380	580	200	53%
Suffolk	1,240	1,350	110	9%
Virginia Beach	2,010	2,360	350	17%
Waynesboro <Augusta	390	600	210	54%
Winchester <Frederick	90	120	30	33%
AVERAGES	\$676	\$799	\$123	

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.

TY2018 Data Comparison Summary

Increase % Change (Top Ones)		Increase \$ Change (Top Ones)	
1 Tazewell	125%	Hanover, Piedmont <Louisa	370
2 Radford <Pulaski	100%	Henrico, Piedmont <Louisa	370
3 Wise	100%	Virginia Beach	350
4 Alleghany	100%	Isle Of Wight	330
5 Pulaski	89%	Franklin City <Isle of Wight	320
6 Bland	77%	King William	310
7 Carroll	69%	Caroline	290
8 Nelson	67%	Westmoreland	290
9 Smyth	65%	Hanover, Coastal <King William	280
10 Giles	65%	Lancaster	280
11 Floyd	60%	Richmond	280
12 Lynchburg <Bedford	60%	Northumberland	280
13 Russell	57%	Greensville	260
14 Augusta	55%	Middlesex	250
15 Waynesboro <Augusta	54%	Henrico, Coastal <King William	250
16 Rockbridge	53%	Harrisonburg <Rockingham	240
17 Staunton <Augusta	53%	Rockingham	240
18 Montgomery	50%	Southampton	240
19 Bedford	50%	Augusta	220
20 Amherst	50%	Waynesboro <Augusta	210
21		Dinwiddie, Coastal <Sussex	210
22		Staunton <Augusta	200
 Decrease % Change		 Decrease \$ Change	
1 Greene	-75%	Greene	-30
2 Chesterfield <Amelia	-4%	Chesterfield <Amelia	-30
3 Amelia	-2%	Amelia	-20
4 Powhatan	-2%	Powhatan	-10

Overall

Average change was **\$123** increase per acre

29% of localities had \$ changes of \$50 or less per acre

52% of localities had \$ changes of \$100 or more per acre

6% of localities had no change

Table 2. Overview: TY2018 Use-Value Assessment Program Values

Type III w/out risk Land Estimate		Number of counties/cities that increased or decreased
Average \$ Decrease	-\$23	4
Average \$ Increase	\$138	86
No change	\$0	6
Average overall change in value from 2017 to 2018		\$123

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.
- For TY2018, Dinwiddie, Piedmont <Brunswick (transfer-in) had a \$1,340 value for Type III land while Dinwiddie, Coastal <Sussex (transfer-in) had a value of \$1,120. Overall, this was because of higher soybean, tobacco, and wheat profits in Brunswick county.

During the last seven years (tax years 2010-2012; corresponds to data years 2006-2008), Brunswick's soybean yields have averaged 34.3 Bu/acre while Sussex yields have averaged 31.4 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): Generally, increases were due to increased profits in grains, and in some cases pasture.

All Counties with \$ Increases of \$200 or more (Type III w/out risk)			
	% Change	\$ Increase	Crops listed are in order of contribution
Augusta	55%	220	Increased profits in pasture, corn, alfalfa & soybeans.
Caroline	19%	290	Increased profits in soybeans, corn, wheat, & barley.
Dinwiddie, Coastal <Sussex	23%	210	Increased profits in soybeans, tobacco, corn & wheat.
Franklin City <Isle of Wight	20%	320	Increased profits in soybeans, peanuts & corn.
Greensville	25%	260	Increased profits in tobacco, soybeans, peanuts & corn.
Hanover, Coastal <King William	21%	280	Increased profits in soybeans, corn, pasture, & wheat.
Hanover, Piedmont <Louisa	34%	370	Increased profits in soybeans, corn, & wheat.
Harrisonburg <Rockingham	24%	240	Increased profits in pasture, corn, alfalfa, & soybeans.
Henrico, Coastal <King William	13%	250	Increased profits in soybeans & some corn.
Henrico, Piedmont <Louisa	23%	370	Increased profits in soybeans & corn.
Isle of Wight	20%	330	Increased profits in soybeans, peanuts, & corn.
King William	15%	310	Increased profits in soybeans, wheat, & corn.
Lancaster	16%	280	Increased profits in soybeans & corn.
Middlesex	14%	250	Increased profits in soybeans & corn
Northumberland	13%	280	Increased profits in soybeans, corn & wheat.
Richmond	15%	280	Increased profits in corn, soybeans, & wheat.
Rockingham	24%	240	Increased profits in pasture, corn, alfalfa, & soybeans.
Southampton	14%	240	Increased profits in soybeans, cotton, corn, peanuts & wheat.
Staunton <Augusta	53%	200	Increased profits in pasture, corn, alfalfa, & soybeans.
Virginia Beach	17%	350	Increased profits in soybeans, wheat, & corn.
Waynesboro <Augusta	54%	210	Increased profits in pasture, corn, alfalfa, & soybeans.
Westmoreland	16%	290	Increased profits in soybeans, corn & wheat.

Decreases (Type III w/out risk):

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

All Counties with \$ Decreases (Type III w/out risk)			
	% Change	\$ Decrease	Crops listed are in order of contribution
Amelia	-2%	-20	Decreased profits in corn and tobacco
Chesterfield <Amelia	-4%	-30	Decreased profits in corn and tobacco
Greene	-75%	-30	Decreased profits in pasture.
Powhatan	-2%	-10	Decreased profits in soybeans, corn and wheat

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 (<).