

Exhibit 9

CANDIDATE ANSWERS QUESTIONS ON VOTING, PENSION CONCERNS

September 15, 2019 at 5:00 am | By PRESS STAFF

It's campaign season. Yes, even for those seeking office in 2021.

No local race is drawing more interest than that of Kootenai County sheriff. The Republican primary election is next May, with the general election in November 2020 and the winner taking office in January 2021.

In July, The Press disclosed information about Republican candidate Richard Whitehead's 2005 bankruptcy in Texas. Whitehead declined to answer some of the questions posed to him via email.

Today, The Press is sharing a question-and-answer exchanged via email with Republican candidate Bob Norris. Norris answered every question.

This Q&A has been edited for length and clarity.

...

PRESS: You registered to vote here less than a year ago and that may seem odd to some because you moved here and applied for a homeowner's exemption in January 2014. Further, you kept your home in California (where you had your homeowner's exemption until you sold the home in 2017). Some people may have concerns with this scenario as possible property tax fraud, so please clarify/and explain.

NORRIS: When I purchased my home in Idaho and applied for a homeowner's exemption it was because I decided to begin the next phase of my life in Kootenai County. My intention at the time was to begin my move over the next several months and then sell the house I lived in since 1998. Shortly after purchasing my Idaho home, my son's mother (my ex-wife) passed suddenly and the move that was supposed to happen over three to six months turned into a significantly longer process. Subsequently, I spent some time in Los Angeles to support my son during this difficult time, while going back and forth to Idaho. It took significantly longer than I anticipated.

Removing my homestead exemption in LA was an oversight on my part, largely because I didn't sell my home as quickly as I expected to due to my ex-wife's passing and being closer to my son. The tax savings in LA is insignificant (about \$70/year). The total tax savings from not removing my California homestead exemption was \$210 (2015, 2016 and 2017). I've since mailed a check to the LA Treasurer's office to correct for this oversight.

PRESS: You were voting in California through November 2016 despite having moved here in 2014, so one

may allege you were committing voting fraud in California. Explain.

NORRIS: If you're not registered and voting in two states, then it's not voting fraud. Further, voter fraud is a stretch as a Republican in a deeply blue state. In 2016 I was still spending a lot of time in Los Angeles to remain close to my son. The 2016 presidential election was extremely important to me and I wanted to vote for President Trump.

PRESS: According to a Transparent California internet search, you receive \$19,515.96 in benefits and \$138,837.72 for disability per year from the state of California from your experience of working for the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office. Is this correct and, if not, can you clarify the numbers?

NORRIS: Your understanding of the numbers is not correct. My pension is \$138,837.72, which I earned for my 30 years of service as a Deputy. The \$19,515.96 is considered the value for life insurance, health insurance and other types of insurance the county provides. It's not money paid to me. Most people do not understand what the term "disability" means when it comes to law enforcement, fire fighters and the military. It's a term used to determine what percentage of retirement income is received and not considered taxable income. In short, it's a taxation status, not a physical mobility issue.

When I retired, I completed a form that asked if I was ever injured on the job. I was as a result of an arrest I made back in the 1990s. As a result of providing truthful information, I was examined by a doctor who provided his report to a board. The independent board later made a ruling on my injury. Transparent California does not identify what percentage of my retirement income is subject to taxation. Instead, it only presents whether you are in the Disability column or Pension column. It's a misleading presentation of how retirees are paid and under what circumstances.

I am not disabled like how most people view a person who is disabled. In my case an independent board determined to give me a partial disability tax status over a year after I retired, based upon an injury that I incurred during an arrest back in the mid-1990s. After the injury and subsequent surgery, I went on to complete a full 30-year career no different than a football player returns to his team after recovering from an injury.

The disability does not mean that I'm disabled. It does not mean that I cannot perform everyday duties or am impaired like how a disabled person is typically viewed. In fact, if I went into a DMV today, I would be denied a Disabled Person's Parking Permit.

Instead, my disability ruling means that part of my taxable retirement income is not affected by some taxes. It does not mean I receive more gross income than if I had not been given a disability rating. I worked until the day I retired from the Sheriff's Office, completing a 30-year career.

PRESS: Since you are receiving the [California pension] and hoping to be the Kootenai County sheriff (so there would be two government payments), some may argue you would be "double dipping" if you are elected. What are your thoughts about this concern?

NORRIS: I have no concerns.

Nowhere does it say that you cannot earn a second paycheck — government or private sector — after you leave one organization. It's quite common for people to work a full career of 20 or 30 years only to embark on another career. It's been said that one's greatest accomplishments occur between the ages of 65 and 75. I'm 56 years old and have a lot of good years ahead of me. Being able to apply my experience and leadership here in Kootenai County is an opportunity to make our community safer during a rapid growth phase and improve the Sheriff's Office for the future. I want to do this.

PRESS: Since you are receiving a rather large [pension], why are you still running for sheriff? (It wouldn't seem you need the money and wouldn't it be easier to simply retire to "enjoy life"?)

NORRIS: I'm assuming you're referring to how my pension is classified. Sadly, the Transparent California website does not provide the percentage of my pension that is not subject to certain kinds of taxes. The money I receive is what a retired Lieutenant with my total years of service would receive.

What does "enjoy life" mean?

For me I enjoyed what I did every day as a Deputy for 30 years. I've also enjoyed the last several years focusing on my family. I feel that I'm too young and have too much more to offer in my life to do nothing.

My pension is simply the result that I joined a great organization, put forth significant effort throughout my career and was rewarded with a handsome pension income. I am fortunate and grateful, but it should never be looked at as a liability as a candidate for Sheriff.

My income from investments and pension are mutually exclusive of my running to become the Sheriff. In fact, it should be looked at favorably by voters, because they can be assured that money will not be a factor in my leadership approach as the Sheriff. Most politicians it seems nowadays enter politics with little and leave with a lot. I believe that if one is financially successful prior to politics, then he or she is less swayed by money when in politics. That is a good thing for Kootenai County voters with me as their Sheriff.

I am not running for financial gain. Instead, I am running to serve our community (not to gain from it) and the men and women of the Sheriff's Office. I see crime going up with rapid growth. I am the only candidate who has the experience of managing law enforcement assets in a growing community. I know what needs to be done as our Sheriff.

PRESS: While in California, did you donate \$600 (or some other amount) to a mayoral campaign to someone who promoted you and went to prison due to a pay/promotions scandal? Please elaborate on what that was about, clarify and if you understand why some voters here may have a concern about that why or why not?

NORRIS: First, that candidate was not convicted of a "pay-to-play" scandal. Instead, it was obstruction of justice related to an event that occurred in the jail. Further, the Sheriff promoted me, not the mayoral candidate.

Second, I do not remember ever giving any candidate a \$600 donation. I recently contacted the treasurer of the campaign at the time and he could not find a single donation from me at any time. I've seen the article and have no idea why my name is on that donor list. The article does not appear credible because it states the donation was made in July of 2002, but I was not promoted to Lieutenant until December of 2009, more than seven years later.

The dates of donations don't correlate to when a lot of Deputies received promotions. It aims to insinuate there is a "pay-to-play" scheme but instead the data within the article exonerates a lot of Deputies, including myself.