



A Caucus Committee Member's Account

Phillip Arouca

What happened inside the Caucus after the Annual Meeting 'No' vote?

Democracy can be a messy process, and preferred candidates don't always win.

When citizens are invited to participate in a vote it's incumbent upon us to respect the 'will' of the majority who participate and accept the outcome. It's now clear that after the Annual Meeting vote Caucus leadership implemented a coordinated campaign focused on one thing, making Randy Tack its endorsed candidate.

The Caucus met the night after the Annual Meeting to determine a path forward after Randy Tack didn't garner the majority 'Yes' vote threshold as prescribed by the Caucus bylaws.

Prior to the meeting, Caucus committee members were told by leadership that Prue Beidler had sent out an email blast encouraging residents to vote 'No' on Randy Tack. We, the committee members, accepted the information as factual, but now know this was not true.

Mrs. Beidler did, in fact, send an email to 27 people. Her email pointed out that no women were nominated for City Council. Caucus leadership blamed Mrs. Beidler for manipulating the Annual Meeting vote, another fabrication. Randy Tack received a 'No' vote from over 300 people and Mrs. Beidler's email was sent to 27 people. I'm not great at math but 27 does not equal 300+.

Our first order of business at the emergency meeting was a vote not to consider Mrs. Beidler for endorsement. Relying on misinformation that she deliberately interfered with the vote by sending out an email, the committee voted unanimously to not consider Mrs. Beidler. We were then told the third place finisher was not interested in being the Caucus endorsed candidate and we would not be considering the fourth place finisher either.

What happened next? Unbeknownst to most Caucus committee members, Caucus leadership had invited Randy Tack to address the committee. Mr. Tack launched into lecturing the

Lake Forest for Transparency

committee that the Caucus shouldn't let agenda driven interests manipulate our voting process and we should ignore

the 2/3 'No' vote and re-endorse his candidacy.

Manipulate the voting process? Ignore the will of the majority? In this Caucus committee member's opinion, Randy Tack should not have been given the opportunity to address the committee after he just lost the affirmation vote.

When Randy Tack left the room, the Caucus committee moved to deliberate for over an hour. During this deliberation Caucus leadership informed committee members that a legal opinion had been obtained that allowed the Caucus to invalidate the vote and say

the result was "advisory and non-binding." We now know this was not true because there was no legal opinion and, therefore, no justification to ignore the Annual Meeting vote.

I advocated for the Caucus to remain neutral in the Mayoral race and not to ignore the will of the 2/3 majority 'No' voters from the Annual Meeting. The institution of the Caucus is greater than any one candidate, campaign, or issue and it would've been sensible for the Caucus to stay out of the Mayoral race after conflicting vote results.

At the end of our deliberations, Caucus leadership called for a new vote to either re-endorse Randy Tack or endorse no one for the Mayoral election. By a vote of 27-7, the Caucus committee chose to re-endorse Randy Tack, opting to disenfranchise more than 300 people who had voted 'No'

on Randy Tack's candidacy just 24 hours earlier.

Overruling its bylaws, disenfranchising the will of the majority, misrepresenting the existence of a legal opinion, and blaming others rather than owning up to a vote that failed to affirm its mayoral candidate is what happened inside of the emergency Caucus committee meeting on Thursday, November 10, 2022.

And for what purpose...so that Randy Tack could be the Caucus' Mayoral candidate in 2023. Why would the Caucus leadership go to such great lengths to keep Randy Tack as its candidate?

[View Caucus Minutes From November 10, 2022](#)