DFE Listed Property Sale Price Decision Node

Frozen Experimental Record — Outcome-Redacted Decision Function Reconstruction

Laboratory Subject: 144 Crosscove Circle, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082
Decision Objective: Estimate the Subject Property's eventual sale price without access to its actual transaction outcome.

The supplied Decision Surface Snapshot is readable and sufficient to begin the laboratory. The Subject Property is identifiable as **144 Crosscove Circle**. Its eventual sold price is expressly redacted in the supplied quantitative evidence, while its listing, contract, physical-property, photographic, and comparative-sale evidence remain available. The supplied supplemental structured quantitative evidence is readable and states that it is derived exclusively from the Decision Surface Snapshot, with the underlying snapshot controlling in the event of discrepancy. It also identifies the population as 11 completed sales within the 12 months preceding the Subject's stated close date, plus the outcome-redacted Subject. No Subject transaction outcome has been sought, inferred from an outside source, or otherwise admitted into this laboratory.

Stage 1 — Subject Property Understanding

The Subject is a **1995 single-family residence in Seaside at Ponte Vedra**, containing approximately **2,000 square feet**, with **3 bedrooms, 2 full bathrooms, a two-car garage, private pool, and pond/lake frontage**. The listing was offered at **$749,900**. The structured record shows no list-price reduction, 3 days on market, a 02/21/2026 listing date, and a 03/01/2026 purchase-contract date; its sale outcome remains redacted.

The Subject's photographs materially strengthen the physical description. Pages 3–10 show an unusually strong outdoor package for a roughly 2,000-square-foot home: an in-ground pool immediately adjoining the water, substantial hardscape, fenced/walled separation at the lake edge, outdoor sitting space, and direct open-water views. The same photographs show an attractive single-story exterior and an interior with vaulted/open living areas, extensive wood flooring, a granite-centered kitchen with stainless appliances and gas cooking, and a primary suite overlooking the pool/water. The primary bath has a jetted tub, fireplace, large shower and substantial vanity treatment. The second bath and some secondary spaces are more conventional, so the house does not present as uniformly new construction or a complete contemporary rebuild.

Functionally, the Subject's principal limitation relative to the upper end of the supplied market is **size and bedroom/bath count**. At 2,000 square feet and 3/2, it lacks the 2,200–2,600+ square feet and 4–5 bedroom configurations found in several of the highest-priced sales. Its principal offsets are unusually marketable: **private pool + waterfront position + attractive presentation + established community amenities and beach-oriented location**. The photographic evidence on pages 8–10 additionally depicts community pool, tennis/pickleball facilities and the broader lake-oriented neighborhood setting.

Overall, I place the Subject in the **upper portion of the supplied 3-bedroom market and competitively within the pool/waterfront subset**, but below the strongest larger, renovated pool/waterfront properties on absolute value.

Stage 2 — Neighborhood and Comparative Market Analysis

The supplied population contains 11 completed sales. Their sold prices span **$518,700 to $910,000**, with substantial variation in size, condition, water orientation, private-pool status and market exposure. This wide range makes the amenity and presentation relationships more informative than a simple unadjusted average.

The strongest comparative anchors are:

140 Crosscove Circle is the most compelling same-street physical analogue. It is a 1995 home with approximately 2,423 square feet, four bedrooms, two baths, waterfront and a private pool. It sold for **$845,000** after 24 DOM from an $875,000 final asking price. Its photographs show a screened pool overlooking the water and a generally attractive but stylistically mixed interior. Because it has about 423 additional square feet and a fourth bedroom, its $845,000 result establishes a strong upper comparative reference rather than a direct Subject value.

161 Crossroad Lakes Drive is a higher-quality ceiling reference: 2,204 square feet, four bedrooms, three baths, waterfront and private pool, selling for **$910,000** after only 5 DOM. Its photographs show a substantially updated, cohesive light contemporary interior, remodeled kitchen/baths and screened pool/water setting. That superior renovation level, extra bedroom/bath and additional size materially distinguish it from the Subject and explain why its $910,000 result should not be transferred directly.

213 Seamist Court provides another pool/waterfront benchmark: 2,336 square feet, four bedrooms and three baths, selling for **$790,000** after 237 DOM and a reduction from $885,000 to $810,000. Photographs show a screened pool, pond setting and updated kitchen, but a more mixed overall interior presentation. Its lengthy exposure and repeated price positioning make the sale informative but less clean as a direct indication of the Subject's expected market response.

252 Seamist Court is especially useful on size: 2,006 square feet, three bedrooms and two baths—almost identical to the Subject in those dimensions. It sold for **$670,000** after 9 DOM. Critically, however, it had waterfront but **no private pool**. Its photographs show a pleasant, well-presented house and large waterfront yard, making the roughly $670,000 result a meaningful lower anchor before recognizing the Subject's private pool and stronger pool/water outdoor experience.

The non-water/non-pool transactions reinforce the premium associated with the Subject's amenity package. Examples include 132 Patrick Mill at **$650,000**, 149 Seaside at **$620,000**, 265 Patrick Mill at **$675,000**, and 109 Patrick Mill at **$518,700**. Their photographic evidence also demonstrates material condition differences: 132 Patrick Mill, for example, contains a notably renovated 2021 kitchen and attractive interior despite lacking the Subject's waterfront/private-pool combination.

At the other end, waterfront-only **144 Crosstide Circle** sold for **$580,000**, with photographs indicating substantially more dated finishes and no private pool, reinforcing the importance of condition/presentation rather than treating waterfront status as a uniform adjustment.

On a rough price-per-square-foot diagnostic—not used as a mechanical valuation model—the relevant evidence also brackets the Subject broadly: 252 Seamist is approximately $334/sf; 213

Seamist approximately $338/sf; 140 Crosscove approximately $349/sf; and the substantially renovated 161 Crossroad Lakes approximately $413/sf. The Subject's superior amenity package relative to 252 Seamist but smaller size and less comprehensive modernization relative to 161 Crossroad Lakes supports placement above the low-$300s/sf cluster but below the renovated upper extreme.

Stage 3 — Comparative Placement and Valuation Synthesis

Intrinsic Comparative Low Estimate: $740,000
Intrinsic Comparative Point Estimate: $780,000
Intrinsic Comparative High Estimate: $820,000

The intrinsic range reflects two competing forces.

On the upside, the Subject combines attributes that are scarce within the supplied evidence: approximately 2,000 square feet with **both private pool and direct waterfront**, attractive outdoor hardscape, good water views and sufficiently strong interior presentation. The nearly size-matched 252 Seamist sale at $670,000 lacks a private pool, while the same-street 140 Crosscove pool/waterfront sale at $845,000 is materially larger. The Subject logically occupies substantial territory between those two anchors. The $910,000 161 Crossroad Lakes transaction demonstrates the upper value obtainable for a somewhat larger, substantially more renovated pool/waterfront home, but also makes clear why the Subject should remain below that level.

On the downside, the Subject is only a 3/2 and its interior, while appealing, is not uniformly renovated to the standard of the strongest $900,000-range evidence. The $790,000 sale of larger 213 Seamist also cautions against assigning the pool/waterfront combination an unrestricted premium.

The **$780,000 intrinsic point estimate** therefore represents my estimate of comparative market value before giving separate consideration to the Subject's actual listing strategy and rapid contract formation. The $740,000–$820,000 interval acknowledges that the supplied evidence does not isolate the market contribution of pool, waterfront, condition and size with sufficient precision to justify a narrower intrinsic range.

Stage 4 — Market Behavior and Transaction Context Analysis

The Subject entered the market at **$749,900, received no recorded price reduction, and went under contract after only 3 DOM**. That behavior is important. It provides direct evidence that the asking price generated immediate market acceptance, but it does not reveal whether the contract was below, at, or above asking.

Across the 11 completed sales, the final-list-to-sale ratios supplied in the evidence calculate to an unweighted mean of approximately **95.5%**. That statistic should not be mechanically imposed on the Subject because several sales experienced long exposure and/or substantial prior reductions. More relevant are the fast, unreduced transactions: 252 Seamist sold at 97.24% of asking after 9 DOM; 265 Patrick Mill at 96.57% after 11 DOM; 140 Crosscove at 96.57% after 24 DOM; 145 Crossroad Lakes at 98.19% after 32 DOM; and 161 Crossroad Lakes at 99.45% after only 5 DOM.

The supplied evidence also contains faster sales with weaker ratios, confirming that DOM alone cannot determine the contract price.

The Subject's three-day contract materially reduces the probability that its ultimate sale price will fall toward the bottom of the intrinsic range. At the same time, the transaction is anchored by a $749,900 asking price. Even though my comparative analysis places intrinsic value modestly above that figure, there is insufficient evidence to assume a large bidding premium.

I therefore distinguish the **$780,000 intrinsic comparative point estimate** from a **$765,000 final estimated sale price**. The $15,000 downward difference reflects transaction-context anchoring: the Subject was offered below my intrinsic point estimate, and the supplied completed-sale population generally closes below final asking rather than materially above it. The exceptionally short exposure, however, supports estimating a result slightly above the $749,900 asking price rather than applying the population-wide 95.5% ratio, which would conflict with the Subject's particular market behavior and comparative positioning.

Stage 5 — Challenge, Critical Review, and Qualification Analysis

The most important challenge is that **pool, waterfront, size and condition are correlated within a small evidence set**. There is no perfectly matched completed sale at approximately 2,000 square feet with three bedrooms, two baths, comparable interior condition, private pool and comparable waterfront orientation. Consequently, the analysis cannot cleanly identify the separate market contribution of each attribute.

A second challenge is the interpretation of **140 Crosscove Circle**. Its same-street, same-era, pool/waterfront characteristics make it exceptionally relevant, but it is approximately 21% larger than the Subject and has four bedrooms. If the market places unusually high value on smaller homes with the same amenity package, my intrinsic point could be conservative; if buyers strongly prioritize the extra bedroom and living area, the Subject could sit materially farther below its $845,000 result.

A third challenge is condition. The photographs permit meaningful comparative judgments but do not constitute an inspection. Hidden deferred maintenance, roof/HVAC/plumbing issues, pool equipment condition, water-intrusion history, insurance considerations, appraisal constraints or repair negotiations are not established merely by visual presentation. No unsupported assumption that these items are favorable has been embedded in the estimate.

A fourth challenge concerns the Subject's **3-DOM contract**. Rapid contracting can signify strong demand, deliberate underpricing, an unusually motivated buyer, favorable terms, or simply correct pricing. It cannot establish an above-list sale. Conversely, applying the overall 95.5% completed-sale/list ratio mechanically would ignore substantial differences in listing history and exposure. I therefore treated the short exposure as directional transaction evidence rather than a deterministic pricing formula.

Finally, the supplied completed sales span a meaningful range of dates, property configurations and marketing histories. The strongest upper and lower anchors are informative but not interchangeable. The evidence is nevertheless sufficiently rich—11 completed transactions, several

close physical analogues, listing histories and extensive photographs—to support a point estimate. The residual uncertainty warrants **Moderate**, rather than High, confidence.

These challenges materially affected the result by widening the intrinsic range and by causing the final transaction estimate to remain relatively close to the Subject's asking price despite an intrinsic comparative point estimate above it. They do not make the evidence insufficient for the stated experimental objective.

Stage 6 — Frozen Record

Intrinsic Comparative Low Estimate: $740,000

Intrinsic Comparative Point Estimate: $780,000

Intrinsic Comparative High Estimate: $820,000

Final Estimated Sale Price: $765,000

Confidence: Moderate

Evidence Sufficiency: Sufficient

Frozen Output Production Date and Time: September 3, 2026, 8:47 AM EDT (UTC−04:00)

Valuation Qualifications: The estimate is strictly outcome-redacted and limited to the supplied laboratory materials. No outside market information or Subject outcome information has been used. The analysis assumes only that the supplied MLS fields, photographs, listing histories and completed-sale records accurately represent the evidence available to the Decision Function. No independent inspection, title review, appraisal, insurance analysis, property-condition report, financing information, undisclosed concession information, post-contract repair information or other evidence outside the supplied Decision Surface Snapshot has been admitted. The $740,000–$820,000 intrinsic range specifically reflects imperfect matching for the Subject's combination of approximately 2,000 square feet, 3/2 configuration, private pool, waterfront position and observed condition. The **$765,000 Final Estimated Sale Price is frozen as of the production timestamp above and shall not be revised in response to the Subject Property's actual transaction outcome.**