Outlook

Registered: Response to EVA Community Update dated 11Sept2024 - regarding electrical grid connection and solar system deficiencies Inbox Tamara Chamberlain via RPost <rmail@r1.rpost.net>

From Tamara Chamberlain via RPost <rmail@r1.rpost.net>

Date Wed 2024-09-25 2:42 PM

To Sebastian.dominguez@ecidevelopment.com <Sebastian.dominguez@ecidevelopment.com>; Valeria.Espinoza@ecidevelopment.com <Valeria.Espinoza@ecidevelopment.com>

Cc trose26@rogers.com <trose26@rogers.com>; derek8221@protonmail.com <derek8221@protonmail.com>; Rknight@kegtrader.com <Rknight@kegtrader.com>; Ecoimpactrei@gmail.com <Ecoimpactrei@gmail.com>; smscott744@yahoo.com <smscott744@yahoo.com>; Ginidumers@gmail.com <Ginidumers@gmail.com>; Palmerzarf@protonmail.com <Palmerzarf@protonmail.com>; p.vilters@protonmail.com <p.vilters@protonmail.com>; mlepore@hotmail.com <mlepore@hotmail.com>; meinolf.klemens@protonmail.com <meinolf.klemens@protonmail.com>; chucker8@rogers.com <chucker8@rogers.com>; realpropertyservices@proton.me <realpropertyservices@proton.me>

4 attachments (3 MB)

003 INVERSOR datasheet-xtender-series_en_v1.0.pdf; FICHA TENICA DE BATERIA WECO 5K3_LV_HV_datasheet_v.1G (1).pdf; Growatt Hope 48L-C1 datasheet_240619_115107.pdf; 001 PANEL SOLAR Peimar_EN_SF420M.pdf;

REGISTERED EMAIL™ | CERTIFIED DELIVERY

This is a Registered Email™ message from **Tamara Chamberlain**. Your reply will be returned as a Registered Email message.

This is a retransmission. The original registered email was sent on Tuesday, September 24, 2024 at 11:12PM EST but was undeliverable to feedback@granpacifica.com (see attached RMail Non-Delivery Notification_24Sept2024.jpg).

Thank you for your recent EVA Community Update correspondence. This response is sent on behalf of the EVA home owners named below in order to fully understand the situation and options being presented by ECI/GP, we request additional information.

To assist with this due diligence, we ask that the following questions be addressed to provide additional information requested below by 12:00pm, September 30, 2024, after which we will need approximately 1-2 weeks time for owners to review the information before making a final decision on which option they feel best suits their needs.

Questions/Information requested

The correspondence sent to EVA owners says the vast majority of renters are accustomed to grid connections and therefore have no concept of saving energy.

1. Why were these off-grid, solar homes marketed and sold to owners as having strong rental potential if the houses cannot be used properly to rental standards? These studies should have been done before marketing and selling the homes as potential rental properties.

2. Please clarify what is meant by the statement that EVA homes "…were designed to be used under certain conditions and to operate efficiently."
i. What are the conditions?
ii. What are the referenced "highest standards of design"?
iii. How did ECI determine the energy usage per home as stated in the communication?
iv. Please provide a detailed and itemized list of devices and power usage demonstrating how ECI came up with the identified numbers.
v. How did ECI come up with battery sizes for each tiny home given each home has different battery capacities and installations?

It is generally accepted that ip20 devices should only be used for interior installations where the temperature and humidity can be controlled. By contrast, devices rated ip65/ip66 are known to be suitable for outdoor use as they are waterproof and dirt and bug protected. As per section 3.4 of the Studer INNOTEC Xtender manual "3.4 INSTALLATION SITE", the installation site for the Xtender is of particular importance and must satisfy the following criteria: Protected from water and dust and in a place with no condensation. These criteria would also apply to the Growatt solar setup as the inverters are rated as ip20.

3. Given this generally accepted understanding, please advise on the following as it pertains to the EVA tiny homes:
i. Did ECI make the decision to purchase and install a system rated for indoor use only, based on its contracted solar provider's recommendation? If not, did ECI decide to proceed with ip20 devices without a provider recommendation? Was this decision process documented?

ii. Under the initial delivery of the tiny homes, the houses delivered had a variety of different solar devices installed. What criteria were used to determine what device would be installed at which home?
a. For homes delivered with ip20 rated devices, why were these devices placed in an area without controlled and directed airflow (so increasing the likelihood of too much heat)?
b. Why were the devices left unprotected from bug infestations and dirt rather than ensuring their long-term efficiency and effectiveness by installing a fan and tightly fitted screens on doors where the devices were installed?

iii. Through observation and in speaking to other owners who took ownership later in the development/construction timeline, it appears ip65/ip66 devices, which are suitable for outdoor use, were selected and installed. Further, these installations were also protected from dust and bugs through the additional inclusion of screens on bodega doors.
a. Why did ECI decide to only furnish a portion of the EVA tiny homes with a system that is appropriate for exterior use in the Gran Pacifica environment/climate and protect then from dirt and bugs with tightly fitted screens on the bodega doors? In doing so, why didn't ECI retroactively revisit homes with previous installations? It appears that ECI knowingly left other homes with inferior, inappropriate, unprotected and potentially unsafe installations.
b. It is unclear when the decision to move to the ip65/ip66 inverter was made. Did it occur after concerns were raised by an EVA homeowner who then submitted a recommendation proposing this adjustment? Did this decision occur around the same time as a sole owner in the EVA community paid for a grid connection due to the lack of reliability of their installed solar devices? In either case, why did ECI choose not to address these known shortcomings with the previously delivered homes?

4. What percentage of homes have reported problems to GP with the solar devices installed and with what frequency? What is the owner breakdown (i.e. private owner or Gran Pacifica owned)?

The following equipment specifications are provided for your ease of reference. Note that there may be additional specification documents given the various systems, however these were readily available when preparing this letter:

i. 003 INVERSOR datasheet-xtender-series_en_v1.0 (*Note: 10-year warranty on the Xtender inverters from manufacturer for the Studer setup*).

ii. 001 PANEL SOLAR Peimar_EN_SF420M (*Note: 20-year manufacturer warranty for Studer panels*)

iii. FICHA TENICA DE BATERIA WECO 5K3_LV_HV_datasheet_v.1G (1) (https://wecobatteries.com/dual-voltage/)

iv. Growatt Hope 48L-C1 datasheet_240619_115107 (*Note: 5-year manufacturer warranty*)

The correspondence sent to EVA owners on September 11, 2024, sets out 3 potential solutions:

Solution 1. Status Quo - ECI states, "We will provide clear guidelines on usage for owners. …"

i. Why has ECI waited more than 2 years to consider and provide this information?

ii. How does this explain solar issues at homes where AC units have respected the temperature settings and kept temperatures at 26C or higher?

Solution 2. Supplement: ECI states: "…it's recommended to have a minimum of 2 batteries per system, and the suppliers suggest that they would need to be replaced every 5 years."

i. The WECO DUAL VOLTAGE 5K3 data sheet states that these batteries are designed to last around 10-15 years under good design conditions (see below image, which was provided prior to home purchase). Why is the battery life now being reduce to 5 years, which is only 1/3 to 1/2 the life set out in the published data sheet?

Altitude (m)	< 3000
Design life	15 ↑ Years (25°C)
Expecetd Cycle Life @ STC	>8000 ↑, 25°C
Standards	IEC62619/UL1973 / CE / UN38.3
* SEE TERMS AND CONDITIONS	

ii. Owners were not made aware of this extra expense to replace batteries upon purchasing their homes. To add another battery to a home that was delivered with only 2 batteries (for example, the Lora model), rather than a home with 3 batteries (e.g. the Macaw), it would be necessary for the owner to also purchase an additional solar charger because two solar chargers are required for a 3-battery setup.

As a result, the simple act of adding an additional battery will actually cost owners more than the stated $3,120.92 for the Studer brand setups. Presumably this requirement would also apply to each solar installation type.

Solution 3. Conversion

i. How were the anticipated costs calculated? What is the breakdown of the costs (e.g. labour, material, etc.)?

As owners in the EVA Community, we believe there is an additional solution, whereby the builder, ECI, retrofit each home with equipment that is appropriate for the environment (climate, humidity, dirt and

bugs) to allow owners and renters to use the homes as advertised.

We look forward to your timely response.

Kind regards,

EVA owners:
Tamara & Chuck Chamberlain
Derek Sceppacerqua
Ron Knight
Tina McDonald
Sandee Scott
Gini Dumers
Michael Palmer
Peter Vilters
Mark Lepore
Meinolf Klemens
Robert Diaz

RPOST®PATENTED