Questions regarding any statutorily related issues surrounding use-value assessment should be directed to Theresa Born 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 Jennifer Friedel 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 Brian Fuller at the Department of Conservation and Recreation in Richmond.

Table 1: Income Approach – Estimated use value of agricultural land in **Northampton** (\$ / Acre).

Land Classs	Use Value Without	Use Value With
	Risk	Risk
I	4,230	4,030
II	3,810	3,630
III	2,820	2,690
IV	2,260	2,150
Avg. I-IV	4,010	3,820
V	1,690	1,610
VI	1,410	1,340
VII	850	810
Avg. V-VII	920	880
Avg. I-VII	3,950	3,760
VIII	280	270

Table 2: Income Approach – Estimated use value of orchards in **Northampton** (\$ / Acre).

Land Classs	Use Value of	Use Value of Other
	Apple Orchard	Orchard
I	2,990	2,990
II	2,260	2,260
III	1,280	1,280
IV	710	710
V	530	530
VI	480	480
VII	230	230
VIII	280	280

Table 3: Rental Rate Approach ⁵ – Cropland and pastureland values based on NASS capitalized rental rates in **Northampton or district value**. (\$ /Acre).

Cropland	1519
Irrigated Cropland	2477
Pastureland	619 ^{ep}

^{ep}Eastern District Pasture

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

	Site Productivity(\$/acre)			
	Fair	Good	Excellent	Non- Productive Land
Forest Land	271	398	536	100

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

Golf Course	7	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: Data used to estimate agricultural use values for a jurisdiction (counties/cities) may not be published or is insufficient.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 Northampton

Estimates apply to 2020



State Land Evaluation and Advisory Council (SLEAC)

Contacts

Virginia Department of Taxation

Theresa Born, Property Tax Unit, Virginia Dept. of Taxation, Richmond, VA 23218-0565 (804) 786-4091 Theresa Born@tax.virginia.gov

Agricultural/Horticultural Estimates

Patrick Kayser, Virginia Land Use Analyst, Dept. of Agricultural and Applied Economics, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061 (540) 231-4441 patrickk@vt.edu

Jennifer Friedel, Director Virginia Land Use-Value Assessment Program Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061 (540) 231-4178 <u>ifriedel@vt.edu</u>

Forest Estimates

Dean Cumbia, Dept. of Forestry, 900 Natural Resources Drive, #800, Charlottesville, VA 22903 (434) 220-9024 Dean.Cumbia@dof.virginia.gov

Open Space Estimates

Brian Fuller, Real Property Specialist, Dept. of Conservation and Recreation 600 E Main St., Richmond, VA 23219 (804) 225-3034 brian.fuller@dcr.virginia.gov

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

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.

For explanation of soil classifications see Procedures the value Manual use 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 land capability classifications. "Other" NRCS 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 nondisclosure

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 Tech · Virginia State University

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,

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.

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 usevalue 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.

⁷Table 2: The composite farm and average net returns in Northampton.

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 2020.

Number of Farms: 1422

Commodity	Total Acreage ³	Composite Farm(Acres)1	Estimated Net Return (\$/acre)
Alfalfa			
Barley	(D)		
Cabbage			
Corn ⁴	7,621	54	\$129.50
Cotton	(D)		
Cucumbers	(D)		· ~ ~
Hay ⁵			-
Lima Beans	(D)		
Pasture			
Peanuts			
Potatoes	2,008	14	\$1,253.63
Pumpkins	(D)	4	
Snap Beans	417	3	\$0.02
Sorghum	1,083	3	\$2.73
Soybeans	16,913	119	\$155.22
Sweet Corn	(D)	X'0'-	
Tobacco		<u></u>	
Tomatoes	(D)	0.9 -	
Watermelons	(D)	- U	
Wheat	8,976	63	\$63.77
Double-Cropped ⁶	8,976	63	3
Total CropLand Harvested	28,042	198	3
	.07,	Net Return	s239.10 ⁷

Notes

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

(Z) = Less than half of the unit shown.

-- = Represents 0 or not reported/calculated.

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.

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

²Data taken from the 2017 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 in lines 2-9 to arrive at the total cropland harvest acreage. Weighted average of crop estimated net returns by composite farm 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 Northampton.

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 2020.

1. Estimated Net Return:	\$239.10
2. Capitalization Rates	
a. Interest Rate Component ¹	0.0531
b. Property Tax Component ²	0.0075
c. Rate Without Risk	0.0606
d. Risk Component	0.0030
e. Rate With Risk ³	0.0636

	Without Risk ⁴	With Risk ⁵
3. Unadjusted Use Value	\$3,948.20	\$3,760.19

4. Soil Index	Land Class	Crop Acreage (No Pasture) ⁶	Productivity Index	Weighted Acreage
	1	33,787	1.50	50,680.93
	II	11,667	1.35	15,751.10
	III	92	1.00	91.85
	IV	2,904	0.80	2,323.04
	V		0.60	
	VI	123	0.50	61.38
	VII	835	0.30	250.59
	Total	49,408		69,158.90
	Soil Index	1.40		
	Factor: ⁷			

5. Agricultural Use Value Adjusted By Land Class

Class	Land Index	Without Risk	Reported ⁸	With Risk	Reported ⁸
I	1.50	\$4,231.00	\$4,230	\$4,029.53	\$4,030
II	1.35	\$3,807.90	\$3,810	\$3,626.58	\$3,630
III	1.00	\$2,820.67	\$2,820	\$2,686.35	\$2,690
IV	0.80	\$2,256.54	\$2,260	\$2,149.08	\$2,150
V	0.60	\$1,692.40	\$1,690	\$1,611.81	\$1,610
VI	0.50	\$1,410.33	\$1,410	\$1,343.18	\$1,340
VII	0.30	\$846.20	\$850	\$805.91	\$810
VIII	0.10	\$282.07	\$280	\$268.64	\$270

¹The 7-year average of the long-term interest rates charged by the various Agriculture Credit Associations serving the state.

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.

²The 7-year average of the effective true tax rates reported by the Virginia Department of Taxation.

³Rate 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.

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

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

⁶Data provided by National Resources Conservation Service, Untited States Department of Agriculture. https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/

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

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

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

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 2020

1. Estimated Net Returns (Loss) Per Acre

Age	of Trees	Processed Fruit	Fresh Fruit	
1-3 ye	ears	-\$3,303.34	-\$3,376.09	
4-6 ye	ears	-\$668.73	\$574.61	
7-15 y	/ears	-\$1,211.45	-\$1,729.29	
16-20	years	-\$1,213.69	\$405.17	
Dscou	inted (20Yr Cycle)	-\$18,694.76	-\$17,191.66	
Utiliza	tion of Sales (10Yr AVG %)	66%	34%	
Apple	Insurance (Annual AVG/acre)	\$775.95		
ghted A	verage Net Return Values			
a)	TY2020 ¹	-\$17,402.52		
b)	TY2019	-\$18,617.27		
c)	TY2018	-\$19,377.40		
d)	TY2017	-\$18,616.25		
e)	TY2016	-\$19,677.43		45
f)	TY2015	-\$3,403.09		
g)	TY2014	-\$7,533.62		U
Return	S		V ()	
a) Net r	eturn to "trees and land" (Olympic av	verage of 2a thru 2g) ²	\$0.00	
b) Net r	eturn attributable to "land only" (Clas	ss III) ³	\$170.82	
c) Net r	eturn attributable to "trees only"		-\$170.82	
italizati	on Rate			
a) Intere	est Rate ⁴	0.0531		
b) Prop	erty Tax ⁵	0.0075	0	
c) Depr	eciation of Apple Trees ⁶	0.0500		
d) Depr	eciation of "Other" Trees ⁷	0.0500		
e) Apple	e Orchard Capitalization Rate	0.1106		

2. Weighted Average Net Return Values

a)	TY2020 ¹	-\$17,402.52
b)	TY2019	-\$18,617.27
c)	TY2018	-\$19,377.40
d)	TY2017	-\$18,616.25
e)	TY2016	-\$19,677.43
f)	TY2015	-\$3,403.09
g)	TY2014	-\$7,533.62

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	\$170.82
c) Net return attributable to "trees only"	-\$170.82

4. Capitalization Rate

a) Interest Rate ⁴	0.0531
b) Property Tax ⁵	0.0075
c) Depreciation of Apple Trees ⁶	0.0500
d) Depreciation of "Other" Trees ⁷	0.0500
e) Apple Orchard Capitalization Rate	0.1106
f) "Other" Orchard Capitalization Rate	0.1106

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

Clas	S Orchard Index ⁸	Apple Trees	Apple Trees and Land ⁹	Other Trees ⁹	Other Trees and Land9
1	0.8	-\$1,236.02	\$2,994.98	-\$1,236.02	\$2,994.98
II	1.0	-\$1,545.03	\$2,262.88	-\$1,545.03	\$2,262.88
III	1.0	-\$1,545.03	\$1,275.64	-\$1,545.03	\$1,275.64
IV	1.0	-\$1,545.03	\$711.51	-\$1,545.03	\$711.51
V	0.8	-\$1,158.77	\$533.63	-\$1,158.77	\$533.63
VI	0.6	-\$927.02	\$483.32	-\$927.02	\$483.32
VII	0.4	-\$618.01	\$228.19	-\$618.01	\$228.19
VIII	0.0	\$0.00	\$282.07	\$0.00	\$282.07
VIII	0.0	\$0.00	\$282.07	\$0.00	\$282.07

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.

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.

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

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

⁴The 7-year average of long-term interest rates charged by the various Agriculture Credit Associations serving the state.

⁵The 7-year average of the effective true tax rates charged by the Virginia Department of Taxation.

⁶The depreciation rate applicable to apple trees assumes that trees are replaced on a 20-year rotation.

^{7&}quot;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.

⁸The orchard index is applicable only in determining the value of the trees. The land index (Table3, Section 5) is applied to land.

⁹The 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.