Appendix B. What Is Reported?

Each year, final use-value income approach¹ and rental rate approach estimates are provided to the Virginia Department of Taxation. Using an **income approach**, use-value estimates are provided for agricultural and horticultural lands for jurisdictions participating in the Land Use-Value Assessment Program. Using a rental rate approach, use-value estimates are provided for all counties and three cities (Chesapeake, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach).

All jurisdictions that participate in the Land Use-Value Assessment Program receive a brochure with their income-based and rental-rate-based estimated use-values. Included in the brochure are contacts with addresses and phone numbers, as well as the URL for the Land Use-Value Assessment Program website.

Table B-1a lists the estimated use-values of agricultural land for jurisdictions participating in the Land Use-Value Assessment Program. Use-value estimates are shown for each of eight Soil Conservation Service land capability classifications², as well as averages for classes I-IV (average cropland), V-VII (average pastureland), and I-VII (average agricultural land). Class VIII land is not included in any of the averages because it is considered to have practically no agricultural value. As an example, table B-1a (selected jurisdictions) is provided in this section.

Using estimates by soil classification can help improve equity in the tax system when data are available on land composition of individual land tracts within a jurisdiction. However, when capability classification acreage data are not available, the average estimates for cropland, pastureland, or total land should be used. At the discretion of the assessing officer, the pastureland use-value may be applied to land in any class that is strictly used for grazing.

Separate use-value estimates are reported for land not at risk of flooding (without risk) and land at risk of flooding (with risk). The with-risk values should only be employed when an individual land tract is known to have poor drainage that cannot be corrected by tiling or drainage ditches.

¹ In tables B-1a and B-1b, the use-value income approach estimates are dollars per acre and have been rounded to the nearest \$10.

² See Calculating Use-values in section 1 of this document for an explanation of capability classifications.

| Jurisdiction | Risk Factor | I | II | III | IV | Avg cropland ¹ I-IV |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|-----------------------------------|
| County of | | | | | | |
| Chesterfield < ² | w/out risk ³ | \$1,080 | \$970 | \$720 | \$570 | \$870 |
| Amelia | w/risk⁴ | \$1,030 | \$920 | \$680 | \$550 | \$830 |
| Dinwiddie, Coastal < ² | w/out risk | \$1,840 | \$1,650 | \$1,230 | \$980 | \$1,450 |
| Sussex | w/risk | \$1,750 | \$1,580 | \$1,170 | \$930 | \$1,390 |
| Dinwiddie, Piedmont < ² | w/out risk | \$1,890 | \$1,700 | \$1,260 | \$1,010 | \$1,530 |
| Brunswick | w/risk | \$1,180 | \$1,620 | \$1,200 | \$960 | \$1,460 |
| Prince Edward | w/out risk | \$450 | \$400 | \$300 | \$240 | \$350 |
| | w/risk | \$430 | \$380 | \$280 | \$230 | \$330 |
| City of | | • | • | | | |
| Buena Vista < ² | w/out risk | \$410 | \$370 | \$270 | \$220 | \$280 |
| Rockbridge | w/risk | \$390 | \$350 | \$260 | \$210 | \$270 |
| | | • • | • | | · | л |
| | | | | Pastureland | d | |

| Table B-1a. Estimated use-values of ag | jricultural land by jurisdiction (sele | cted jurisdictions) for tax year 2020. |
|--|--|--|
|--|--|--|

| | | Pastureland | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|--|---------------------------------|-------|
| Jurisdiction | Risk Factor | v | VI | VII | Avg pastureland ¹ V-VII | Avg agricultural land¹ I-VII | VIII |
| County of | | | | | | | |
| Chesterfield < ² | w/out risk ³ | \$430 | \$360 | \$220 | \$360 | \$860 | \$70 |
| Amelia | w/risk ⁴ | 4\$10 | \$340 | \$210 | \$340 | \$820 | \$70 |
| Dinwiddie, Coastal < ² | w/out risk | \$740 | \$610 | \$370 | \$390 | \$1,430 | \$120 |
| Sussex | w/risk | \$700 | \$580 | \$350 | \$370 | \$1,360 | \$120 |
| Dinwiddie, Piedmont < ² | w/out risk | \$750 | \$630 | \$380 | \$480 | \$1,510 | \$130 |
| Brunswick | w/risk | \$720 | \$600 | \$360 | \$460 | \$1,440 | \$120 |
| Prince Edward | w/out risk | \$180 | \$150 | \$90 | \$120 | \$310 | \$30 |
| | w/risk | \$170 | \$140 | \$90 | \$120 | \$290 | \$30 |
| City of | | | | | | | |
| Buena Vista < ² | w/out risk | \$160 | \$140 | \$80 | \$130 | \$240 | \$30 |
| Rockbridge | w/risk | \$160 | \$130 | \$80 | \$120 | \$230 | \$30 |

Note: Use-values are estimated for each of the eight Soil Conservation Service land capability classifications. Average values are reported for cropland (classes I-IV), pastureland (classes V-VII), and agricultural land (classes I-VII). Class VIII land is not included in the average use-value of agricultural land because Class VIII land is not considered suitable for agricultural purposes. The with-risk values refer to land that is at risk of flooding. These values should only be used when the soil has poor drainage that is not remedied by tiling or drainage ditches or when the land lies in a floodplain.

¹ Average land values: The use-value of each land class is weighted by the total acreage of agricultural land in that class prior to averaging.

² Transfers (<): The data used for estimating the use-value of agricultural land are not published for all towns and are published 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, the Coastal Plain and Piedmont. When a transfer-in jurisdiction has been used, it appears after an arrow (<).</p>

³ Without risk: These estimates apply to land that is not at risk of flooding.

⁴ With risk: These estimates apply to land with poor drainage that is at risk of flooding. Calculations are based on the assumption that a crop loss occurs once every 20 years due to flooding.

Orchard Use-Values

Table B lists the estimated use-values for orchard land in all jurisdictions participating in the use-value assessment program. Separate use-value estimates are made for apple orchards and other orchards. "Other" refers to orchards dedicated to peach, cherry, plum, and pear production. Differences in these estimates are the result of the lower depreciation rate used for apple orchards than are used for other types of orchard. Use-value estimates are reported for each of eight Soil Conservation Service land capability classifications. This level of information can help improve the equity of the tax system when data are available on the land class composition of each individual land tract in a jurisdiction. When no such data exist, it is recommended that the use-value of Class III orchard land be applied to all orchard operations within the jurisdiction.

Land devoted to horticultural use will rarely be at risk of flooding. For this reason, the SLEAC elected not to consider the risk of excess rainfall in the use-value estimates for horticultural crops.

Table B-1b. Estimated use-values of land in orchard by jurisdiction (selected jurisdictions) for tax year 2020 (income approach).

| | | Land Class | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|------------|---------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Jurisdiction | Crop | I | II | 111 | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| County of | | | | | | | | | |
| Accomack | Apple | \$2,530 | \$1,920 | \$1,090 | \$620 | \$460 | \$420 | \$200 | \$240 |
| | Other | \$2,530 | \$1,920 | \$1,090 | \$620 | \$460 | \$420 | \$200 | \$240 |
| Chesterfield <1 Amelia | Apple | \$760 | \$570 | \$320 | \$180 | \$130 | \$120 | \$60 | \$70 |
| Amena | Other | \$760 | \$570 | \$320 | \$180 | \$130 | \$120 | \$60 | \$70 |
| Dinwiddie, Coastal<1 Sussex Other | Apple | \$1,300 | \$980 | \$550 | \$310 | \$230 | \$210 | \$100 | \$120 |
| | Other | 1,300 | \$980 | \$550 | \$310 | \$230 | \$210 | \$100 | \$120 |
| Prince Edward | Apple | \$320 | \$240 | \$140 | \$80 | \$60 | \$50 | \$30 | \$30 |
| | Other | \$320 | \$240 | \$140 | \$80 | \$60 | \$50 | \$30 | \$30 |
| City of | | | | | | | | | |
| Buena Vista <1 | Apple | \$290 | \$210 | \$120 | \$60 | \$50 | 4\$0 | \$20 | \$30 |
| Rockbridge | Other | \$290 | \$210 | \$120 | \$60 | \$50 | \$40 | \$20 | \$30 |

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, the Coastal Plain and Piedmont. When a transfer-in jurisdiction has been used, it appears after an arrow (<).

Rental Rate Approach

Table 1c shows the estimated use-values of cropland and pastureland based on capitalized rental rates from the National Agricultural Statistics Service. Rental rates are not provided by NASS for every county. When a rate is not provided, the combined county rate for the NASS district where the county is located is used. Any county where a combined county rental rate is used is identified. Also included in this section is a listing of the counties located within a given NASS reporting district.

Appendix B, Table B-1c. Cropland and pastureland values based on NASS-capitalized rental rates (selected jurisdictions) for tax year 2020 (rental rate approach).

| | | | ropland Irrigate | | cropland | Pastureland | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Jurisdictions (counties) | Capitalization rate ¹ | Rental rate (\$/acre²) | Value (\$/acre) | Rental rate (\$/acre³) | Value (\$/acre³) | Rental rate (\$/acre¹) | Value (\$/acre³) |
| Chesterfield | 0.0623 | 49.00 ^{cc} | 798 | — | — | 17.50 ^{cp} | 281 |
| Dinwiddie | 0.0609 | 38.50 ^{sec} | 632 | — | — | 17.00 | 279 |
| Prince Edward | 0.0592 | 24.00 | 416 | _ | — | 18.50 | 320 |

^{cc} Central District cropland

sec Southeastern District cropland

^{cp} Central District pasture

Appendix B, Table B-1d.

| | Average crop | oland (\$/acre) | Average irriga (\$/a | ated cropland cre) | Average pastureland (\$/acre) | |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------|
| NASS districts | Combined counties | District | Combined counties | District | Combined counties | District |
| Central | 49.00 | 48.00 | 106.00 | 106.00 | 17.50 | 19.00 |
| Eastern | 64.50 | 72.50 | 97.00 | 127.00 | 37.50 | 37.50 |
| Northern | 40.50 | 49.00 | 98.00 | 116.00 | 32.50 | 22.00 |
| Southeastern | 38.50 | 70.00 | 81.00 | 79.00 | 20.00 | 19.50 |
| Southern | — | 33.50 | 59.00 | 59.00 | 16.50 | 17.00 |
| Southwestern | 37.50 | 38.50 | _ | _ | 22.00 | 21.00 |
| Western | 27.50 | 39.50 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 14.00 | 17.50 |

¹ National Agricultural Statistics Service county-level cash rent data (http://quickstats.nass.usda.gov/; accessed 7/20/2019).

² Capitalization rate (without risk) is a sum of the average interest rate component (interest rate component is the seven-year state average [two-year lag; from AgFirst]) and average property tax rate (property tax component is the seven-year jurisdiction average [three-year lag; Department of Taxation]).

³ Values ($\frac{1}{2}$ values ($\frac{1}{2}$ values ($\frac{1}{2}$ values ($\frac{1}{2}$ values va

| Central | Albemarle | Buckingham | Fluvanna | Louisa |
|--------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|
| | Amelia | Campbell | Goochland | Nelson |
| | Amherst | Caroline | Greene | Orange |
| | Appomattox | Chesterfield | Hanover | Powhatan |
| | Bedford | Cumberland | Henrico | Prince Edward |
| | | | | Spotsylvania |
| Eastern | Accomack | James City | Lancaster | Northampton |
| | Charles City | King and Queen | Mathews | Northumberland |
| | Essex | King George | Middlesex | Richmond |
| | Gloucester | King William | New Kent | Westmoreland |
| | | | | York |
| Northern | Arlington | Fauquier | Page | Shenandoah |
| | Brunswick | Frederick | Prince William | Stafford |
| | Clarke | Isle of Wight | Rappahannock | Warren |
| | Culpeper | Loudoun | Rockingham | |
| | Fairfax | Madison | Southampton | |
| Southeastern | Chesapeake City | Southeastern | Suffolk City | Virginia Beach City |
| | Dinwiddie | Mecklenburg | Surry | |
| | Greensville | Prince George | Sussex | |
| Sothern | Charlotte | Halifax | Lunenburg | Patrick |
| | Franklin | Henry | Nottoway | Pittsylvania |
| Southwestern | Bland | Floyd | Montgomery | Smyth |
| | Buchanan | Giles | Pulaski | Tazewell |
| | Carroll | Grayson | Russell | Washington |
| | Dickenson | Lee | Scott | Wise |
| | | | | Wythe |
| Western | Alleghany | Western | Botetourt | Highland |
| | Augusta | Bath | Craig | Roanoke |
| | | | | Rockbridge |

Jurisdictions Within NASS Crop Reporting Districts