**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**. The supplied quantitative evidence expressly identifies it as the Subject and shows its sold price as **REDACTED**; no transaction outcome has been used or attempted to be recovered. The supplied reconciled quantitative evidence is readable and states that it was derived exclusively from the Decision Surface Snapshot. No separate Engineering Guidance beyond the supplied experimental specification and reconciled evidence table is apparent; none is assumed.

**Stage 1 — Subject Property Understanding**

The Subject is a **1995-built, one-story detached single-family residence** containing approximately **2,000 square feet**, with **3 bedrooms, 2 full baths, a two-car garage, private pool, and waterfront/pond position**. It was offered at **$749,900** and entered contract after only **3 days on market**, with no list-price reduction.

The MLS and photographic evidence portray a property whose value proposition is stronger than its 2,000-square-foot size alone suggests. The Subject has a screened/private outdoor pool environment immediately adjoining the pond, with open water views from the rear living areas and primary bedroom. The photographs on pages 3–10 show the pool, substantial paved pool deck, pond frontage, landscaped outdoor space, and the relationship between the house, pool, and water. They also document the community pool, tennis/pickleball facilities and broader Seaside setting.

Interior presentation is materially positive. The photographic record shows a bright, open living/dining configuration, extensive wood flooring in principal living areas, vaulted architectural forms, substantial glazing toward the rear, and a functional kitchen with granite-type counters, wood cabinetry, stainless appliances and gas cooking. The primary suite is comparatively substantial, with vaulted ceiling, water/pool outlook, dual-vanity bath, jetted tub, separate shower and fireplace/wall feature. The secondary bedrooms and guest bath are more ordinary and one bedroom is visibly less upgraded in presentation.

Accordingly, the Subject is best represented not as an average 2,000-square-foot Seaside residence, but as a relatively compact **waterfront + private-pool** property with strong rear amenity orientation and good overall presentation. Its principal limitations are its smaller living area and 3/2 configuration relative to several higher-priced pool/waterfront comparables, together with some interior elements that are attractive but not uniformly current or luxury-grade.

**Stage 2 — Neighborhood and Comparative Market Analysis**

The supplied population consists of **11 completed sales during the 12 months preceding the Subject's April 3, 2026 close date**, plus the outcome-redacted Subject. The completed sales range from **$518,700 to $910,000**, reflecting substantial differences in size, condition, waterfront status and private-pool status.

The most informative comparative evidence is concentrated in several properties rather than distributed equally across all 11 sales.

**140 Crosscove Circle** is particularly important because it shares the Subject's street, 1995 vintage, waterfront position and private pool. At **2,423 square feet, 4 bedrooms and 2 baths**, it is materially larger than the Subject and sold for **$845,000** after 24 days, or 96.57% of its $875,000 list price. Its photographs show a screened pool directly overlooking water and a broadly comparable Seaside amenity/location package, but substantially greater interior area. Its interior presentation is attractive yet somewhat eclectic and not obviously superior to the Subject throughout. This sale establishes strong support above the Subject but requires a meaningful downward placement for the Subject's approximately 423-square-foot size deficit and one fewer bedroom.

**213 Seamist Court** is another highly relevant pool-and-waterfront sale: **2,336 square feet, 4 bedrooms, 3 baths**, sold for **$790,000** after a long 237-day exposure and an $885,000-to-$810,000 price reduction. Its larger size and additional bedroom/bath argue superiority to the Subject in functional utility, but the extended marketing history indicates that its initial market positioning was not supported. Its $790,000 transaction provides an important upper comparative reference rather than a direct subject-equivalent indication.

**252 Seamist Court** is nearly identical to the Subject in gross living area at **2,006 square feet**, with the same 3-bedroom/2-bath configuration and waterfront position, but **without a private pool**. It sold for **$670,000** after only 9 days at a $689,000 asking price. Its photographs and MLS presentation show an attractive residence with large backyard, water view and screened lanai, but the absence of a private pool creates a material amenity disadvantage relative to the Subject. This is therefore a strong lower anchor.

**144 Crosstide Circle** provides another close-size waterfront reference: **1,969 square feet, 3 bedrooms and 2 baths**, waterfront but no private pool, sold for **$580,000** after 59 days and a price reduction. The photographic record shows a considerably more dated interior, including older cabinetry, finishes and baths, despite the good lakefront yard. It therefore supports a substantial Subject premium for both private pool and superior presentation.

At the high end, **161 Crossroad Lakes Drive**—waterfront with private pool, 2,204 square feet, 4 bedrooms and 3 baths—sold for **$910,000**, essentially at its $915,000 asking price after only 5 days. Its larger functional program and very strong transaction make it an upper-bound indicator rather than a direct price target.

Conversely, non-pool/non-waterfront sales provide a useful floor structure. For example, 149 Seaside sold for $620,000, 265 Patrick Mill for $675,000, 132 Patrick Mill for $650,000 and 109 Patrick Mill for $518,700. Their amenity profiles make them less intrinsically comparable to the Subject, but collectively they confirm that the combination of water frontage and private pool should place the Subject above the ordinary non-waterfront/non-pool segment.

The evidence also demonstrates that waterfront status by itself does not determine value: 104 Seaside, a larger 2,426-square-foot waterfront residence without a private pool, sold for only

$610,000 after a reduction from $725,000 to $673,000. Its photographic presentation is comparatively dated and the listing evidence shows a materially weaker market response. Thus condition/presentation, pool utility, size, functional configuration and buyer response all materially interact with waterfront status.

**Stage 3 — Comparative Placement and Valuation Synthesis**

**Intrinsic Comparative Low Estimate: $710,000**

**Intrinsic Comparative Point Estimate: $750,000**

**Intrinsic Comparative High Estimate: $790,000**

The intrinsic placement is centered near **$750,000**.

The strongest lower reference is 252 Seamist at $670,000: virtually the same living area and bed/bath count and also waterfront, but without the Subject's private pool. The Subject's pool, rear outdoor environment and presentation warrant a meaningful premium to that transaction.

The strongest same-street upper reference is 140 Crosscove at $845,000. It shares the difficult-to-replicate combination of waterfront and private pool but contains approximately 21% more living area and a fourth bedroom. The Subject should therefore sit materially below that sale despite having competitive presentation.

The $790,000 sale of 213 Seamist supplies another useful ceiling region because it also combines waterfront and private pool but has 336 additional square feet, a fourth bedroom and third bath. Meanwhile, the $910,000 sale at 161 Crossroad Lakes demonstrates the upper reach of the pool/waterfront segment when paired with greater functional utility.

The Subject's intrinsic position therefore appears most coherent in the middle-to-upper $700,000s rather than near the non-pool waterfront transactions or the larger pool/waterfront homes. The uncertainty band of $710,000–$790,000 reflects the absence of a completed sale matching all four critical Subject dimensions simultaneously: approximately 2,000 square feet, 3/2 configuration, waterfront and private pool.

**Stage 4 — Market Behavior and Transaction Context Analysis**

The Subject was listed at **$749,900**, received a purchase contract on **March 1, 2026** after only **3 days on market**, underwent **no price reduction**, and was scheduled to close April 3, 2026. This is unusually strong market-exposure evidence and materially reinforces the intrinsic comparative analysis.

Across the 11 supplied completed sales, sale-to-final-list relationships vary considerably. Calculating directly from the supplied final-list and sold-price observations produces an average sale/final-list ratio of approximately **95.5%**, with a median of approximately **96.6%**. Applying those population-wide relationships mechanically to $749,900 would imply roughly $716,000–$724,000. Such a mechanical application is not adopted because the Subject's three-day contract, zero price reduction, waterfront/private-pool configuration and apparent alignment of its asking

price with the comparative evidence make the full population—including stale and materially over-listed properties—a poor transaction-behavior analogue.

The most relevant quick-contract sales generally performed much closer to asking: 252 Seamist sold at 97.24% of list; 140 Crosscove at 96.57%; 145 Crossroad Lakes at 98.19%; and 161 Crossroad Lakes at 99.45%. The Subject's three-day exposure is at least as strong as these examples in timing, although short exposure alone does not establish that the ultimate sale must have been at or above asking.

The $749,900 list price also falls almost exactly at the center of the independently constructed intrinsic comparative range. Consequently, listing behavior is confirmatory rather than the principal basis of value.

A modest transaction discount from the asking price remains more probable than assuming an exact full-price transaction. Balancing the very rapid contract against the empirical tendency of supplied sales to close somewhat below final asking price produces a final expected transaction estimate slightly below the intrinsic comparative point.

**Final Estimated Sale Price: $742,500.**

The $7,500 difference between intrinsic comparative point value ($750,000) and final expected sale price represents a modest expected negotiation/transaction discount, not a change in the underlying comparative assessment.

**Stage 5 — Challenge, Critical Review, and Qualification Analysis**

The principal challenge is the small and heterogeneous evidence population. Although all 11 completed transactions belong to the supplied relevant population, only a subset simultaneously resembles the Subject in size, water orientation, private-pool utility and condition. Consequently, exact dollar attribution among those interacting features is not strongly identified.

A second challenge is the unusually informative Subject asking price and three-day contract. Those facts legitimately inform expected transaction behavior, but they create a risk of anchoring too closely to $749,900. The intrinsic comparative range was therefore assessed against the completed-sale structure independently enough to test whether the asking price was plausible; it was not simply adopted as value.

A third challenge concerns private-pool and waterfront premiums. The supplied evidence strongly indicates that these characteristics matter, but it does not support a stable universal dollar adjustment. The evidence itself demonstrates interaction effects: waterfront homes without pools range widely, and pool/waterfront homes likewise differ substantially depending on size, condition, functional utility and marketing history. No fixed pool or waterfront adjustment has therefore been imposed.

A fourth challenge is temporal and condition comparability. Some of the most useful completed sales occurred many months before the Subject's contract, while the most recent close, 213 Seamist, had an unusually long 237-day marketing history. The evidence does not independently establish a precise time-adjustment curve, so none has been imposed.

A fifth challenge is that photographs support qualitative judgments about presentation and apparent condition but do not establish hidden physical condition, inspection findings, deferred maintenance, insurability, appraisal issues or post-contract discoveries. No unsupported assumption is made that photographic condition equals verified physical condition.

Finally, concessions are not consistently quantified in the supplied reconciled table, and the transaction outcome itself is intentionally redacted. The final estimate therefore represents an expected nominal sale price from the supplied evidence, not a prediction of net seller proceeds or concession-adjusted economic consideration.

These challenges materially affect **confidence and range width**, but they do not overturn the central comparative conclusion: the Subject belongs materially above similarly sized waterfront homes lacking a pool, materially below the larger and more functionally extensive premium pool/waterfront sales, and close to its $749,900 market positioning.

**Stage 6 — Frozen Record**

**Intrinsic Comparative Low Estimate: $710,000**

**Intrinsic Comparative Point Estimate: $750,000**

**Intrinsic Comparative High Estimate: $790,000**

**Final Estimated Sale Price: $742,500**

**Confidence: Moderate**

**Evidence Sufficiency: Sufficient**

**Frozen Output Production Date and Time: September 3, 2026, 6:32 AM EDT (UTC−04:00)**

**Valuation Qualifications:** The supplied completed-sale population is sufficient for a reasoned estimate but heterogeneous; no completed sale perfectly matches the Subject's approximately 2,000-square-foot, 3-bedroom/2-bath, waterfront/private-pool configuration. Photographic condition is treated as presentation evidence rather than a substitute for physical inspection. No unsupported fixed pool, waterfront, condition or time adjustments were imposed. Unknown inspection findings, financing/appraisal effects, unreported or incompletely reported concessions, and other post-contract factors cannot be incorporated. The Subject's actual transaction outcome remained redacted and was not used, inferred, searched for, or attempted to be recovered. The resulting **$742,500** estimate is frozen and shall not subsequently be revised in response to the actual transaction outcome.