DFE Listed Property Sale Price Decision Node

Frozen Experimental Record — Outcome-Redacted Decision Function Reconstruction

Execution Confirmation

The supplied Decision Surface Snapshot is readable and appears sufficient to begin the laboratory. The Subject Property is identifiable as **144 Crosscove Circle, Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida 32082 (P4A)**. The Subject Property's eventual sale price is properly redacted: the reconciled quantitative table identifies the Subject as a 1995-built, 2,000-square-foot, 3-bedroom, 2-bath property with a $749,900 original/current list price, while expressly reporting the sold price as "REDACTED."

The Decision Surface Snapshot supplies 11 completed sales from the 12 months preceding the Subject's stated close date, together with the Subject, and states that the underlying DSS controls if any discrepancy is identified. No outside information has been used.

No separate authorized Engineering Guidance containing substantive valuation instructions was identified beyond the supplied reconciled quantitative evidence table. That table is treated as supplied experimental material, not as evidence of the Subject's redacted outcome.

Stage 1 — Subject Property Understanding

The Subject is **144 Crosscove Circle**, a detached single-family residence in Seaside at Ponte Vedra Beach. The supplied MLS sheet identifies a **1995** build, approximately **2,000 square feet**, **3 bedrooms**, **2 full baths**, a **2-car garage**, one-story configuration, and approximately **0.20 acre** lot. The property is **waterfront** and has a **private pool**, two characteristics that materially distinguish it from much of the supplied sale population. The quantitative reconciliation confirms those core attributes and the $749,900 asking price.

The photographs on DSS pages 3–12 show a visually attractive, well-presented residence with a light exterior, paver driveway, vaulted/open living spaces, extensive wood flooring, a substantial kitchen with granite/stone surfaces and stainless appliances, and a primary suite overlooking the rear outdoor environment. The house appears maintained and immediately usable rather than renovation-dependent.

The strongest Subject-specific amenity is the rear environment. The photography shows a screened/private pool and hardscape entertaining area immediately adjoining a pond/lake, with an open water view beyond the rear fence. The water orientation is therefore not merely a nominal MLS waterfront designation; it materially contributes to the property's outdoor experience. Community imagery also shows pool, tennis/pickleball facilities and the broader Seaside setting.

There are nevertheless limits to the Subject's physical positioning. At 2,000 square feet and three bedrooms/two baths, it is smaller and less functionally extensive than several upper-tier supplied sales. Its kitchen and portions of its interior, while attractive and serviceable, do not visually present as comprehensively redesigned to the standard of the strongest renovated comparables. The Subject's value proposition is therefore best characterized as a relatively compact, well-presented waterfront/pool home whose rear amenity package compensates substantially for its more moderate interior scale.

Stage 2 — Neighborhood and Comparative Market Analysis

The supplied population contains **11 completed sales**. Prices span **$518,700 to $910,000**, demonstrating that this neighborhood evidence set has substantial internal dispersion driven by size, waterfront/pool status, renovation/presentation, bedroom/bath count, and individual property configuration.

The most probative comparisons are not necessarily the properties closest to the Subject in square footage. The combination of **waterfront plus private pool** is scarce and economically important.

140 Crosscove Circle is the strongest upper reference. It is extremely close geographically and shares the Subject's 1995 vintage, waterfront status and private pool. It is materially larger at **2,423 square feet**, has four bedrooms, and sold for **$845,000** after being listed at $875,000. The DSS photography confirms a screened pool directly on the water and a substantial interior, making this a particularly informative same-street amenity match. The Subject should sit below it because of the roughly 423-square-foot size deficit, one fewer bedroom, and lesser overall functional scale.

213 Seamist Court is another waterfront/private-pool sale, at **2,336 square feet, 4 bedrooms and 3 baths**, which ultimately sold for **$790,000** after a long 237-day exposure and reduction from $885,000 to $810,000. Its larger size and extra bedroom/bath argue above the Subject intrinsically, while its unusually long marketing period makes its transaction price less clean as a simple direct anchor.

161 Crossroad Lakes Drive represents the upper end: **2,204 square feet, 4 bedrooms/3 baths, waterfront and private pool**, sold for **$910,000** against a $915,000 list price after only five days. Its photographs show a substantially updated, bright contemporary interior plus screened pool and lake frontage. This is a superior-quality/utility benchmark rather than a direct price prediction for the Subject.

At the other end of the waterfront spectrum, **144 Crosstide Circle** was a **1,969-square-foot, 3-bedroom/2-bath waterfront home without a pool** and sold for **$580,000** after reduction to $629,900. Its photography shows materially dated finishes and a less compelling interior presentation, despite the lakefront rear yard. It provides a useful lower reference: the Subject's pool, stronger presentation and outdoor environment justify a substantial premium.

104 Seaside Circle, at **2,426 square feet, waterfront but no private pool**, sold for **$610,000** after substantial price reductions. Its larger size did not translate into a high transaction price, reinforcing that square footage alone is an inadequate representation of this evidence set.

Among non-waterfront properties, **252 Seamist Court** is especially useful as a scale reference: **2,006 square feet, 3 bedrooms/2 baths**, almost exactly matching the Subject's gross living area and basic room count, but without a private pool; it sold for **$670,000**. Its large rear yard/lake-view context is attractive, but the absence of the Subject's private pool supports placing the Subject above that transaction.

Other non-waterfront sales—$650,000 at 132 Patrick Mill, $620,000 at 149 Seaside, $675,000 at 265 Patrick Mill, and $518,700 at 109 Patrick Mill—help establish the lower/middle market but are weaker direct matches because they lack the Subject's combined waterfront/private-pool package.

Collectively, the evidence indicates that the Subject belongs above the ordinary non-waterfront 3/2 segment and above dated waterfront/no-pool inventory, but below the larger and/or substantially superior waterfront-pool houses represented by 140 Crosscove, 213 Seamist and especially 161 Crossroad Lakes.

Stage 3 — Comparative Placement and Valuation Synthesis

Intrinsic Comparative Low Estimate: $700,000

Intrinsic Comparative Point Estimate: $735,000

Intrinsic Comparative High Estimate: $770,000

The central comparative problem is bounded particularly well by the approximately **$670,000** sale of the nearly same-size 252 Seamist property without a private pool and the **$790,000–$845,000** transactions of larger waterfront/private-pool homes. The Subject's combination of waterfront, pool, attractive rear presentation and good overall condition warrants a meaningful premium to the $670,000 scale-matched sale. Conversely, its 2,000-square-foot/3-bedroom/2-bath configuration does not support parity with the materially larger 213 Seamist or 140 Crosscove transactions.

The $735,000 intrinsic point estimate therefore places the Subject toward the upper-middle portion of the supplied evidence rather than treating its $749,900 asking price as intrinsic value by assumption. It represents approximately $368 per square foot, but price per square foot is used only as a reasonableness check rather than the primary valuation mechanism because the supplied sales demonstrate substantial variation in amenity and condition.

The low side reflects the possibility that the market assigns less incremental value to the Subject's pool/water combination than the visual evidence suggests, or discounts its smaller room count and less extensively renovated interior. The high side reflects the opposite interpretation: scarcity and same-street evidence could support a buyer valuing the private pool/waterfront package strongly enough to approach the Subject's asking price or modestly exceed the intrinsic point estimate.

Stage 4 — Market Behavior and Transaction Context Analysis

The Subject was offered at **$749,900**, received a contract after **3 DOM**, and had **no list-price reduction** before contract. This is materially stronger market-exposure evidence than a listing that required months of exposure or repeated reductions.

The supplied completed-sale population shows that closing below the final asking price was common. Calculating directly from the 11 supplied completed-sale rows produces an across-property mean sale/final-list ratio of approximately **95.5%**. The individual outcomes are heterogeneous, however: several properties sold around 96–99% of final ask, while weaker transactions fell near 90–92%. Applying the population mean mechanically to the Subject's

$749,900 ask would imply roughly $716,000, but such a mechanical treatment would underweight the Subject's exceptionally short exposure and zero-reduction history.

The better behavioral analogs are the sales that contracted quickly without prior reductions. Those transactions generally demonstrate that properly positioned properties could retain a high proportion of asking price. The Subject's **3-day contract timing** is especially strong evidence that the $749,900 asking price was not obviously rejected by the market.

Accordingly, transaction context pulls the expected sale outcome modestly **above the $735,000 intrinsic comparative point estimate**, rather than downward toward the population-wide list-to-sale average. At the same time, a rapid contract does not establish that the buyer paid full asking price: inspection, financing, appraisal, concessions, or ordinary negotiation can still produce a below-list closing.

The final estimated sale price is therefore **$745,000**. This represents only a small discount to the $749,900 final asking price and a $10,000 upward transaction-context adjustment from the intrinsic comparative point estimate. The difference reflects the unusually rapid market acceptance of an unreduced asking price while preserving a modest allowance for ordinary contract-to-close negotiation.

Stage 5 — Challenge, Critical Review, and Qualification Analysis

The most important challenge is the small number of truly close matches. Only a limited subset of the 11 sales combines waterfront and private pool, and those properties differ materially from the Subject in size, bedroom/bath count, renovation level, and/or market exposure. The valuation therefore depends on comparative synthesis rather than replication of a near-identical transaction.

A second challenge is the width of the observed waterfront/pool price spectrum. The supplied evidence includes strong outcomes such as $845,000 at 140 Crosscove and $910,000 at 161 Crossroad Lakes, but these are clearly superior in scale and/or renovation. Using them without sufficient downward comparative allowance would overvalue the Subject. Conversely, emphasizing the $580,000 waterfront/no-pool 144 Crosstide transaction or lower non-waterfront sales would understate the Subject's pool, presentation and immediate water-oriented outdoor experience.

A third challenge concerns condition. Photographs allow meaningful visual comparison, but they cannot establish hidden mechanical condition, roof/HVAC quality beyond disclosed MLS information, inspection findings, workmanship quality, or deferred maintenance not visible in the supplied materials. No unsupported adjustment for such matters has been made.

A fourth challenge concerns the Subject's three-day contract. This is powerful transaction-behavior evidence but is not equivalent to observing the negotiated contract price. A fast contract could represent full-price acceptance, multiple-offer pressure, or simply a negotiated offer below list that the seller found acceptable. The final estimate therefore does not equate three DOM with a full-price transaction.

A fifth challenge is temporal heterogeneity. The supplied sales span the 12 months preceding the Subject close date, and the record does not provide sufficient independent evidence to impose a

precise time-adjustment curve. No formal appreciation/depreciation adjustment has therefore been imposed.

The alternative interpretation with the greatest potential effect would be to treat the Subject's short DOM as dominant evidence and estimate essentially full list, around $750,000. Another defensible interpretation would place greater weight on the approximately 95.5% aggregate sale/final-list behavior and produce an estimate nearer the low-$720,000s. Neither extreme is preferred: the former gives insufficient allowance for ordinary negotiation, while the latter inadequately conditions on the Subject's exceptionally rapid, unreduced market acceptance.

These challenges materially affect **confidence and range width**, but they do not overturn the central comparative conclusion. Evidence is sufficient to produce the requested point estimate, although not sufficient for High confidence.

Stage 6 — Frozen Record

Intrinsic Comparative Low Estimate: $700,000

Intrinsic Comparative Point Estimate: $735,000

Intrinsic Comparative High Estimate: $770,000

Final Estimated Sale Price: $745,000

Confidence: Moderate

Evidence Sufficiency: Sufficient

Frozen Output Production Date and Time: September 2, 2026, 3:13 PM EDT (UTC−04:00)

Valuation Qualifications: The estimate is restricted exclusively to the supplied experimental materials and preserves the Subject's actual sale outcome as unknown/redacted. The principal qualifications are the limited number of closely matched waterfront/private-pool transactions; material differences in size, room count and renovation among the strongest comparables; inability to observe latent physical/inspection conditions from MLS materials; absence of a sufficiently supported formal time-adjustment model; and uncertainty regarding the economic terms embedded in the Subject's rapid three-day contract. No outside information, recovered outcome information, or post-outcome evidence was used. The supplied quantitative control expressly states that the Subject sold price remains redacted and that the DSS is the controlling underlying source.