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Executive Summary

Samuel Rosales Rios came to the United States from Mexico as a temporary worker under the H-2B guest-worker program only to be treated by his employer not as a guest, but as a near-slave. Samuel was permitted to enter the U.S. and work legally on a temporary seasonal basis for the employer who had sponsored his work visa, the operator of a Greek food stand at a state fair. Samuel and his coworkers were forced to work between 16 and 17 hours per day for many days in a row in temperatures that sometimes reached over 90 degrees Fahrenheit (over 30 degrees Celsius). The workers lived in poor housing and sometimes earned as little as $1 USD (approximately 13 MXN) per hour, despite being promised an hourly rate of $10 to $12 USD (approximately 129 to 154 MXN) and decent living conditions. Samuel received so little pay that he could not afford to buy additional food to supplement the single meal his employer provided, leading him to suffer dehydration and hunger during his long shifts. After several days of sleeping in an overcrowded, bedbug and flea-infested trailer, and without an adequate place to bathe, Samuel eventually sought treatment in an emergency room for dehydration and infections from bug bites.

Samuel and his coworkers’ experiences are illustrative of the appalling work conditions H-2B workers in the fair and carnival industry often face. These workers are vulnerable to unfair employment and labor practices in part because their visas only authorize them to work for the employer who sponsored them, and also because they often arrive in the U.S. with a debilitating pre-employment debt. Recent attempts to enhance H-2B worker protections, while a step in the right direction, are currently stalled due to employer-driven litigation. As a result of inadequate government oversight and enforcement of existing laws, coupled with workers’ limited access to exercise their rights by filing complaints regarding employment and health and safety violations, employers continue to bring workers to the U.S. and place them in deplorable work and living conditions with almost absolute impunity. While Samuel’s employer faced legal consequences, many more violations of fair and carnival workers’ basic rights are never reported or enforced. Too many workers like Samuel are taken for a ride.

Based on interviews with H-2B workers in Maryland, Virginia, and Mexico, this report sheds light on the abuses that fair and carnival workers face. Such abuses include deceptive recruitment practices and high pre-employment fees and costs; wage theft; lack of access to legal and medical assistance; substandard housing; and unsafe work conditions. The fair and carnival industry epitomizes what is currently most problematic with the H-2B temporary worker program, as employers are often able to mistreat their workers and claim exemption from basic worker protection laws with very little scrutiny. This report provides recommendations that would rectify H-2B worker mistreatment through means such as comprehensive immigration reform, agency rulemaking, and enforcement of existing laws. Fixing the H-2B program would not only help foreign temporary workers: all workers in the U.S. benefit when the rights of a specific group of workers are enhanced and enforced.
**Major Themes**

This report highlights H-2B worker abuse in the fair and carnival industry, including:

- **Unfair recruitment processes.** Many fair and carnival workers are recruited from communities with high unemployment, poverty, and weak economies, resulting in a plethora of workers eager for opportunities to migrate for work. In a process driven by the employer and recruiter, H-2B workers have no real means to effectively counter being blacklisted or discriminated against by an employer or labor recruiter. Additionally, the recruitment process often requires workers to incur substantial pre-employment and/or pre-departure costs, sometimes including unlawful recruitment fees. Furthermore, recruiters often provide workers with little or no information about the type of work they will perform or the actual conditions of their employment. The little information that is provided is frequently very different from the work conditions and jobs that workers encounter when they arrive.
• **Retaliation.** Workers risk retaliation from their employers if they complain about conditions or report abuses. H-2B workers in the fair industry specifically face blacklisting, threats, and employment termination. H-2B workers generally lose the right to remain in the United States when their employment ends because H-2B workers are only permitted to work for the employer listed on their visa. Once the employment relationship ends, H-2B workers are no longer authorized to work or remain in the U.S., which discourages them from complaining about unlawful or hazardous working conditions and from leaving unscrupulous employers, especially if they have incurred pre-employment debt. H-2B workers find themselves in an imbalanced employment relationship in which the employer holds much power over a temporary and vulnerable labor force.

• **Wage and hour abuses.** Low wages and long, arduous hours are the norm for most H-2B workers employed in the fair and carnival industry. The majority of workers interviewed for this report were employed as ride operators whose employers paid them in weekly lump sums regardless of how many hours they were made to work or the minimum wage in the state in which they were working. These workers often worked more than 80 hours a week for a flat weekly rate of approximately $300 USD (approximately 3,855 MXN). As a result of this practice, many workers did not receive even the federal minimum wage of $7.25 USD (approximately 93 MXN) per hour; much less the overtime rate, the occupation’s prevailing wage, or the wage promised at recruitment. This means that those traveling fair workers earn at least $400 USD (5,140 MXN) less per week than they are owed for an 80-hour workweek based on federal wage laws. In addition to being cheated out of their wages, workers are often denied rest and meal breaks during the day.

• **Serious health and safety risks.** The long work hours and lack of breaks result in physical and mental exhaustion. Ride operators lift and assemble heavy equipment, often without training or protective gear and sometimes in inclement weather. Workers frequently report working from significant heights to set up amusement rides without harnesses or helmets, and on-the-job injuries are not uncommon. When workers become sick or injured, many are unable to access proper medical care due to limited time off and a lack of access to transportation.

• **Lack of access to workers’ compensation.** When H-2B workers are injured on the job, they are often deprived of workers’ compensation because federal law regulating H-2B workers does not require employers to provide insurance coverage. Rather, state law determines whether an employer is required to cover workers injured in a given state. As a result, workers, especially those who cross through many states during a regular fair and carnival season, often face complications in obtaining workers’ compensation for work-related injuries. Additionally, some injuries from repeated strenuous lifting may not fully present until workers have returned home, creating additional barriers to accessing the necessary medical examinations or being physically present for workers’ compensation hearings. When a worker dies from work-related injuries, family members located outside of the U.S. face significant barriers in collecting benefits.

• **Isolated and substandard living conditions.** H-2B workers in the fair and carnival industry typically live in trailers next to fairgrounds, which are often in remote areas. Isolated living conditions render H-2B workers largely unable to access assistance from advocacy groups providing education to low-wage workers about their rights. H-2B fair and carnival workers often live in substandard and overcrowded housing prone to insect infestations and the
spread of disease. Housing frequently lacks refrigeration or cooking facilities for workers to prepare their own food, and often lacks adequate bathing and waste facilities.

- **Limited Access to Justice.** Fair and carnival workers travel great distances over the course of the fair season. Consequently, workers who suffer workplace harm such as minimum wage violations or injuries have difficulty seeking redress. Because the governing law varies depending on what state workers are in, it is difficult for H-2B workers to familiarize themselves with their rights or to acquire information about the organizations or entities that might be able to assist them in asserting those rights. Some H-2B workers are not even aware that they have the right to fair pay, safe work environments, and freedom from discrimination, among other rights. Moreover, under current law, recipients of funds from the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) are prohibited from using such funds to provide legal assistance to most H-2B workers, which significantly diminishes the pool of advocates available to help these workers. If H-2B workers in the fair and carnival industry obtain legal representation, their transience often prevents meaningful access. Furthermore, once their certified employment period ends, H-2B workers must leave the U.S., which poses additional barriers to accessing justice, including the inability to return to the U.S. to participate in legal proceedings.

*Necessary protections for H-2B workers will lead to a brighter future.* Photo: Xavier E. Albán
Key Recommendations

Congress Should:

• Enact retaliation protections for workers who report abuse.
• Enact legislation to hold employers strictly liable for all recruitment fees charged to workers.
• Permit H-2B workers to expeditiously request a change of employer.
• Require that employers reimburse H-2B workers for all visa and travel costs.
• Extend federally funded legal services to all H-2B workers.
• Remove any exemptions from minimum wage, overtime, and recordkeeping provisions for amusement industry employers from federal labor laws.
• Enact legislation to hold employers, recruiters, and their agents jointly and severally liable.
• Amend federal anti-discrimination laws to clearly articulate the available protections for migrant workers, both during the recruitment process and while employed in the U.S.
• Require that job orders be treated as enforceable contracts.

The Department of Labor Should:

• Enforce employers’ reimbursement of all pre-employment expenses within the first workweek to the extent that they reduce workers’ pay below the highest applicable minimum wage.
• Ensure that anti-retaliation provisions are enforced.
• Forbid the charging of recruitment fees by U.S. employers, their agents or associates, and subcontractors of the employer’s agents and investigate the charging of illegal fees.
• Issue a memorandum reminding all fair and carnival employers that they must keep payroll records, pay overtime wages, and pay the highest of the federal minimum wage, prevailing wage, or state minimum wage. The memorandum should remind fair and carnival employers that it is their burden to prove any exemption to these laws.
• Conduct inspections of H-2B fair employers’ payroll and average receipts records to ensure compliance with applicable minimum wage and prevailing wage standards.
• Issue rules related to training, breaks, and safety equipment to protect the health and safety of fair and carnival workers.
Many H-2B workers leave their hometowns and families behind, sometimes for most of the year, in search of employment. Photo: Rachel Nathanson
Profile of an H-2B Worker in the Traveling Fair Industry

In his home country of Mexico, Nicolas owns and operates a small storefront where he sells soap, toilet paper, tomatoes, and other everyday items. But from 2008 to 2010, Nicolas spent most of the year in the U.S. on an H-2B visa working for a prominent traveling fair company. In this capacity, Nicolas was responsible for operating, assembling, and disassembling a roller coaster ride. Every time the fair company left one fair site and arrived at a new one, Nicolas had to climb up the side of the approximately 130-foot-tall ride in order to deconstruct and construct it again. Nicolas’ employer did not give him any formal training or protective gear for this task. Once, his boss cursed at him and made him disassemble the ride in the rain, despite Nicolas’ protests that it was too dangerous. His employer also never formally instructed him on how to operate the roller coaster safely. Because Nicolas was one of the only workers who knew how to operate the ride, he was allowed only infrequent breaks. Whenever he was hungry, he had to purchase expensive food from a nearby fair stand and eat while he took tickets and operated the ride.

After working a 12- or 13-hour day, Nicolas returned to a trailer he shared with six other workers. The trailer had electricity and one bathroom, but no kitchen or hot water. Nicolas did not even have a bed to look forward to at the end of his long workdays. Rather, his small room included a bedframe with wooden slats, no mattress, and no sheets. On one occasion, the trailer broke down, so Nicolas and his coworkers were forced to sleep under the rides for several days until the trailer was repaired.

In addition to enduring deplorable employment and housing conditions, Nicolas and his H-2B coworkers also suffered poor treatment from their boss. Their employer withheld their passports for approximately two weeks upon their arrival in the U.S., Nicolas believes as a means of preventing them from fleeing. Additionally, Nicolas and his H-2B coworkers were forbidden from leaving the fairgrounds during the first month of their employment. Their employer berated and called them derogatory names if they did not meet the employer’s expectations. Nicolas and his coworkers did not feel like they could complain about their work or living conditions because their ability to remain and work in the U.S. hinged on their H-2B visas and therefore, their employer.

Nicolas was paid a flat rate of $275 USD (approximately 3,534 MXN) per week, regardless of the number of hours he worked. As a result, his hourly rate amounted to a little over $3 USD (approximately 38 MXN) per hour. He earned less on days when he worked longer hours in preparation for the company’s departure to a new location, packing up the rides after a full day of work. On one occasion, Nicolas was not paid for an entire week’s worth of work when the owner blamed Nicolas and his coworkers for having to undergo a site inspection by the city inspector. Nicolas’ weekly pay was not documented by a pay stub, fell far short of the minimum wage, and did not include overtime compensation. Nicolas was never reimbursed any of the 4,500 MXN (approximately $350 USD) in fees he had paid the recruiter in Mexico.
Introduction

Each year, migrant workers, primarily from small towns in Mexico, are recruited by a small number of labor agents to work at fairs and carnivals during the fair season, which often lasts up to nine months a year. These workers typically come to the U.S. with H-2B visas. The H-2B visa program, a descendant of the exploitative and highly criticized “Bracero” program, allows for the temporary admission of workers to the U.S. to complete non-agricultural work when U.S. workers are unavailable or unwilling to fill those jobs. Each year, thousands of workers travel to the U.S. on H-2B visas to fill a need for a “stable and reliable workforce,” with approximately 5,000 of those working in the fair and carnival industry. Fair and carnival companies book dozens of fairs in a given season, traveling throughout the continental U.S. with their equipment and workers in tow. These fair and carnival industry companies, who boast significant political clout and successful lobbying efforts in Washington, D.C., often rely primarily on migrant workers to engage in the physically demanding, dangerous, and time-intensive work that enables their fairs to run smoothly and profitably.

In theory, the H-2B program creates a mutually beneficial relationship that allows employers to supplement a shortage of available domestic labor with workers eager to work at U.S. wages. In practice, however, H-2B workers often find themselves in an imbalanced relationship in which the employer holds much of the power, leaving workers vulnerable to workplace abuses with little recourse for enforcing even their most basic workers’ rights. Some of these fundamental rights include safe work environments, adequate job training to ensure workplace safety, access to medical care and workers’ compensation, livable housing conditions, just compensation, reasonable work hours, and fair treatment under existing laws. H-2B workers are particularly vulnerable to retaliation and threats of retaliation because their visas bind them to the employer who sponsored them.

Compounding the issues facing H-2B workers is the Department of Labor’s inadequate monitoring of the H-2B program and sporadic enforcement of existing wage and hour laws. Recognizing the challenges and weaknesses of the H-2B program, in 2012, the Department of Labor (DOL) issued new regulations (2012 H-2B Regulations) in an attempt to strengthen worker protections. H-2B employers, who have generally resisted efforts to enhance worker protections, have been part of the opposition to the new regulations, which are currently stalled from going into effect by ongoing federal litigation initiated by employer associations.

In order to shed light on the abuses facing H-2B workers in the fair and carnival industry, American University Washington College of Law’s Immigrant Justice Clinic and Centro de los Derechos del Migrante (CDM) collaborated on this project. Over the past years, CDM has received complaints through its Migrant Defense Committee from H-2B workers describing abuses of employment rights in the fair and carnival industry. Using interviews with H-2B workers in Maryland, Virginia, and Mexico, Taken for a Ride: Migrant Workers in the U.S. Fair and Carnival Industry describes the conditions H-2B workers often endure in the traveling fair and carnival industry and reveals violations of the workplace rights of these temporary workers.

Part I of this report examines the H-2B temporary worker program and reveals how the fair and carnival industry relies on H-2B workers. Unlike many U.S. workers, H-2B workers are willing to travel with the fair for the entire season and are more likely to remain with their employers given that the terms of their visas only allow them to remain with the employer listed on their visa or to return home. Part I also highlights the size and political influence of the fair and carnival industry, focusing on the major employers and their well-organized lobbying efforts. Part II of this report...
describes the high rates of unemployment and poverty prevalent in the small cities and towns in the largely agricultural areas of Mexico, where most fair and carnival H-2B workers are recruited. This economic pressure facing H-2B workers, when coupled with the current laws and practices of the H-2B worker recruitment and visa application processes, places these workers’ fates in the hands of a small number of recruiting agents.

Part III addresses wage and hour abuses often experienced by H-2B workers, including failure to pay at the wage rate promised during recruitment, minimum wage and overtime pay violations, and barriers to justice for H-2B workers. Part III also discusses how the lack of government oversight and enforcement of existing laws allows employers to mistreat their workers with virtual impunity. Part IV of the report explores common workplace health and safety violations in the fair and carnival industry, as well as the discrimination and poor housing conditions these H-2B workers face. Part IV also discusses employers’ failure to provide H-2B workers with adequate training and sufficient access to medical assistance and treatment of injuries, as well as the obstacles injured H-2B workers face in receiving workers’ compensation. Part V examines the role that employer retaliation and threats of retaliation serve to further control an already vulnerable population. The report concludes by making specific federal and state policy recommendations to improve the lives and working conditions of H-2B workers in the fair and carnival industry.

Behind the smiles and fun at the fair, carnival and fair companies require their employees to work long, arduous hours. Photo: Carson Osberg
The Traveling Fair Industry and H-2B Workers

“They treat us like dogs.”
—H-2B Worker Jordan

“This is the first time I’ve come to work in the fairs. I came to the U.S. and worked in construction for the last five years. Here [in the fairs], the work is very hard, and they don’t pay us enough. I’ve been here for a month, and I’m definitely not coming back next year to work in the fairs. I’m going to try to go back to working in construction or a factory job next year. We have to work very hard setting up and taking down the rides. Sometimes we work 20-hour days, and even if it’s raining...there’s no time to rest doing this kind of work.”
—H-2B Worker Tomas

Annual fairs and carnivals typically conjure up happy memories for communities across the U.S. Traditionally operated by small, family-run businesses, they are often a source of local pride and entertainment. But times have changed, and larger national corporations have replaced mom-and-pop businesses in the traveling fair and carnival industry. These changes in fair company operations appear to coincide with fair industry reliance on H-2B workers, who are willing to travel along with the fairs for many months on end. Since the 1970s, the traveling fair and carnival industry has employed internationally recruited temporary workers for up to nine or 10 months per year in what are supposed to be seasonal positions. The H-2B visa program allows the fair industry to fill grueling, low-paid positions that require constant travel with temporary workers. This labor-intensive industry requires thousands of workers to assemble, operate, and disassemble carnival rides and concession stands. As of the latest 2012 data, amusement park workers, some of whom are employed by traveling fair and carnival operators, constitute the third largest H-2B visa-holder occupation, after positions in landscaping and forestry.
Inadequate oversight of the H-2B program and enforcement of wage and hour laws is a significant problem for H-2B workers, who are vulnerable to employment-related abuses. Additionally, the fair industry often invests significant resources to lobby lawmakers to keep minimum wages in the industry low and to increase the number of workers authorized to come to the U.S. under the H-2B program. The fair industry has even formed a national trade association, the Outdoor Amusement Business Association (OABA), which represents amusement operators by lobbying for policies affecting the industry as a whole. Recently, OABA supported efforts to stall the implementation of new DOL H-2B regulations that would improve aspects of the H-2B program that leave workers vulnerable to employer misconduct. In doing so, OABA claimed that the H-2B program was “under attack” by the Obama Administration, DOL, labor unions, and the agenda of “pseudo worker’s [sic] rights’ groups.”
**H-2B Worker Program**

*Governor Andrew Cuomo, former New York Attorney General, on the $325,000 settlement agreement resulting from an investigation into a carnival operator’s wage abuse of, substandard living conditions for, and discrimination against its H-2B workers:*

“This company not only denied its employees the pay they had earned—but abused and manipulated a system in place to help foreign-born workers build lives for themselves and their families…[t]hey [the company] consistently violated this state’s civil and labor rights and exploited the most vulnerable in their workforce. Today’s agreement will deliver welcome restitution to the workers who were cheated, as well as send a message to other employers statewide that abuses of their employees come with a price tag.”

The H-2B program, a descendant of the “Bracero” program, allows for the temporary admission of workers to the U.S. to complete seasonal, non-agricultural work when U.S. workers are unavailable or unwilling to fill those jobs. The H-2B worker program was created in 1986 with Congress’ passage of the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA). IRCA amended the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) to divide the existing H-2 nonimmigrant visa category in two, creating the H-2A temporary agricultural and H-2B temporary non-agricultural visa programs. Over the years, the program has changed and evolved to meet the growing demand for temporary foreign national workers. To qualify for H-2B workers, the employer’s labor need must typically not last longer than ten months, and employers must reapply for the visas each year. Each worker’s visa is tied to the requesting employer, and the worker may not initiate a visa application or use the visa to work for any other employer. The INA limits to 66,000 the number of H-2B visas that can be issued each fiscal year. The H-2B visa application process is described in detail in Appendix A.

Each year, thousands of H-2B workers, primarily from small Mexican towns with few economic and employment opportunities, are recruited by a small number of labor agents to work at fairs and carnivals during the fair season, which often lasts up to nine months a year. While the H-2B program enables U.S. businesses to meet their seasonal labor needs with a “stable and reliable workforce,” a lack of oversight and enforcement of H-2B regulations and wage and
hour laws allows employers virtually unchecked ability to take advantage of and abuse workers. In 2009, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) delegated enforcement of compliance with H-2B petition and temporary labor certification requirements to DOL. Both the DOL Employment and Training Division (ETA) and the DOL Wage and Hour Division (WHD) play a role in overseeing and administering the H-2B program. The lack of adequate monitoring of the H-2B program is particularly concerning given documented instances of forced labor and human trafficking of H-2B workers. Recognizing the challenges and weaknesses of the H-2B program, in 2012, DOL issued new regulations in an attempt to strengthen worker protections. The implementation of these regulations is currently stalled by ongoing federal litigation initiated by employer associations. If implemented, the new regulations would extend basic protections to the workers that many of America’s industries rely on.

**DOL’s 2012 H-2B Regulations & Federal Litigation**

On February 21, 2012, DOL issued new H-2B program regulations that provide enhanced worker protections. The implementation of the 2012 H-2B Regulations was stalled by a lawsuit in federal district court the day before they were to go into effect.

The 2012 H-2B Regulations provide modest, though much needed, worker protections that address the types of problems plaguing the H-2B program by promoting transparency in the recruitment process and increasing employer accountability and worker protections. The 2012 H-2B Regulations would prohibit the imposition on H-2B workers of pre-employment costs such as recruitment fees and visa and travel expenses that often cause workers to go into considerable debt. Such pre-employment debt effectively forces H-2B workers to accept unlawful working conditions. Moreover, the 2012 H-2B Regulations would require H-2B employers to provide each worker with the job order in a language the worker understands and to pay workers at least three-fourths of the hours promised for each 12-week period. The 2012 H-2B Regulations also require H-2B employers to keep accurate records of wages paid, hours worked, and where the work was performed; to provide workers with an earnings statement on or before payday; and to pay H-2B workers at least every two weeks. Finally, the 2012 H-2B Regulations strengthen workers’ ability to voice concerns about workplace abuses and exercise their rights without the fear of employer retaliation. Specifically, the 2012 H-2B Regulations prohibit employers from intimidating, threatening, restraining, coercing, blacklisting, discharging, or discriminating against H-2B workers.

Violations of the 2012 H-2B Regulations could result in civil monetary penalties equal to back wages, prohibited fees, and improper deductions or $10,000 USD (approximately 128,500 MXN), whichever is less.

There had been no earlier controversy with regard to DOL’s rulemaking authority over the H-2B program, including the H-2B regulations published during the Bush Administration (2009 H-2B Regulations). Yet, in the litigation surrounding the 2012 H-2B Regulations, the employer organizations and U.S. Chamber of Commerce question DOL’s rulemaking authority with regard to the H-2B program. They specifically object to the three-fourths wage guarantee, the tracking of the hours worked and wages paid, and the reimbursement requirement for visa and travel expenses.

The district court’s decision is currently on appeal before the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. If reversed, the injunction will be lifted.
Reliance on H-2B Worker Labor in the Fair Industry

The nostalgic “mom n’ pop,” family-owned and operated carnivals of the past have mostly given way to larger companies operating in multiple states or regions. North American Midway Entertainment (NAME), Ray Cammack Shows, Butler Amusements, Wade Shows, Reithoffer Shows, Mid-America Shows Delaware, and Astro Amusement Co. are among the largest H-2B traveling fair and carnival employers (see Table 1). In the 1970s, these operators began to rely heavily on H-2B workers to enable them to operate on a national scale. In fiscal year 2011 alone, the amusement industry (comprised of more than just traveling fair and carnival employers) obtained certification to bring more than 5,000 workers to the U.S. via the H-2B program. In fact, NAME was the fifth largest H-2B employer during most of fiscal year 2012. In fiscal year 2011, the top seven fair and carnival companies requested H-2B visas for an average of more than 266 workers each (see Table 1). These seven operators employed more than a third of the total H-2B workers in the amusement industry.

Larger fair companies, like the ones employing H-2B workers, compete for lucrative contracts with state fair boards around the country. An example of such a contract was negotiated in 2011 between NAME and the Kansas State Fair Board. The contract appeared to have provided that NAME contribute $10,000 to the fair for “mutually agreed-upon projects,” on top of an annual flat fee of $40,000. This “pay-to-play” contract system makes it harder for smaller companies to compete with larger corporations that can afford to pay large flat fees. NAME travels over two million miles every year, providing its services to fairs and carnivals in more than 145 communities in 20 states and four regions. The states and regions are:

- **California**
- **Colorado**
- **Florida**
- **Georgia**
- **Kentucky**
- **Louisiana**
- **Maryland**
- **Massachusetts**
- **Michigan**
- **Mississippi**
- **Missouri**
- **Montana**
- **Nebraska**
- **New Hampshire**
- **New Jersey**
- **New Mexico**
- **New York**
- **North Carolina**
- **Ohio**
- **Pennsylvania**
- **Rhode Island**
- **South Carolina**
- **South Dakota**
- **Tennessee**
- **Texas**
- **Utah**
- **Virginia**
- **Washington**
- **West Virginia**
- **Wisconsin**
- **Wyoming**

Employers rely on H-2B workers to operate the various rides providing amusement to families at fairs.

*Photo: Carson Osberg*
“Basically, the carnivals took people nobody would...[w]e had to employ the unemployable.”

— Butler Amusements Manager Kurt Vomberg, describing the typical fair and carnival employee before labor recruitment from Mexico.65

Worker Story: Domingo66

Domingo reported that he typically worked 12 to 16 hours a day, and 16 to 24 hours on days they had to tear down and reconstruct the rides. He typically received only one half-day off per week. Domingo assembled and disassembled rides, strung electric cables, cleaned the fairgrounds, picked up garbage, changed light bulbs, painted rides, washed company trucks, and cleaned the owner’s trailers and the surrounding area. For this, Domingo was paid a flat weekly rate of $300 USD (approximately 3,855 MXN). Sometimes, when there was no fair work, Domingo and the other workers were sent to the owner’s ranch to work. Each week, the workers got a half-day off to rest.

NAME’s current corporate structure illustrates the demise of “mom n’ pop” carnival companies of the past.
Interstate Routes

During a single season, fair companies travel interstate circuits through dozens of communities in multiple states. Employers often participate in a wide range of fairs and carnivals from large state fairs to small town carnivals. Often, workers do not know where they are and do not have connections in the communities where they work. In addition, they are dependent on their employers for transportation and receive limited time off from work.

Table 1: H-2B Worker Certifications of the Largest Traveling Fair and Carnival Operators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>H-2B Workers Certified by Department of Labor (Fiscal Year 2010)</th>
<th>H-2B Workers Certified by Department of Labor (Fiscal Year 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North American Midway Entertainment (NAME)</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Cammack Shows</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler Amusements</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade Shows</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reithoffer Shows</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-America Shows Delaware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astro Amusement Co.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only is the constant travel grueling for fair workers, it also makes fair and carnival vendors a moving target for state and federal investigators. The transient nature of the fair industry is largely incompatible with the monitoring mechanisms set up by DOL to ensure compliance with the H-2B program’s requirements. For example, DOL requires that employers requesting H-2B workers list on their labor certification applications the areas where workers will perform the temporary labor. Yet fair and carnival workers are constantly moving from one state to the next throughout their time in the U.S., and these states are often not listed on the labor certification application (see Appendix B). For example, Ray Cammack Shows operates in states from California to Nebraska, while Reithoffer travels up the East Coast from Florida to Vermont. NAME operates from Florida to Massachusetts, and sometimes as far west as Kansas. Based on DOL Office of Foreign Labor Certification (OFLC) data, it appears that fair
Fair companies travel from state to state and city to city offering family fun and requiring much from their workers, who are the backbone of these operations. Photo: Carson Osberg

companies sometimes do not request certification for workers in each state where they operate.87

The transient nature of traveling fairs makes it difficult for state agencies to monitor and enforce employment-based protections. Additionally, H-2B workers’ unfamiliarity with the U.S. legal system and specific state laws further complicates the grievance process. Importantly, employment law differs from state to state, and a violation in one state may not be a violation in another state.
Labor Recruitment for Traveling Fairs and Carnivals: Country Conditions and Industry Practices that Disadvantage H-2B Workers

“It’s hard because if you want to build something, your own house or whatever, you have to go to USA. Without work there [in Mexico],…[w]e can’t even build our own houses.”

— Pablo Juarez Mendoza, a potential H-2B worker

The combination of high recruitment fees, visa and travel costs, and the difficulty of earning a living in Mexico makes workers more willing to endure the abuses of the fair industry.
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Workers who protest or complain about working conditions can easily be targeted for retaliation, including denial of employment opportunities in future seasons.

Fair and carnival workers are mostly recruited from communities in Mexico where unemployment, poverty, and weak economies susceptible to volatile agrarian seasons create a vulnerable workforce. Worker recruitment for fair and carnival employers is carried out by a small number of agents, and generally, a single recruiter determines which individuals in a particular community will be hired for H-2B jobs. Because the recruiter and employer control the visa petitioning and recruitment processes, workers and their families tend to suffer great uncertainty regarding their prospective employment. Workers who protest or complain about working conditions can easily be targeted for retaliation, including denial of employment opportunities in future seasons. Additionally, the recruitment process often requires workers to incur substantial pre-employment costs that often go unreimbursed by employers. Nonetheless, the economic circumstances in which potential workers live compel them to vie for fair and carnival jobs available through the H-2B program.

Economic Conditions in Mexico

Many fair and carnival workers are recruited from small cities and towns in largely rural and agricultural areas of Mexico. The Mexican states of Veracruz, Zacatecas, Nuevo Leon, Puebla, and Durango are some of the largest worker recruitment centers. Although these states span central Mexico, they are linked by high rates of migration, unemployment, poverty, and economies dominated by agriculture.

Unemployment and under-employment are the primary reasons for migration from rural Mexico. Mexico’s extremely low minimum wage contributes to this pressure to migrate. In 2011, the minimum daily wage, determined by geographic zone, was 59.82 MXN (approximately $4.37 USD) in Baja California, Mexico City, the State of Mexico, and large cities; 58.13 MXN (approximately $4.24 USD) in Sonora, Nuevo Leon, Tamaulipas, Veracruz, and Jalisco; and 56.70 MXN (approximately $4.14 USD) in all other municipalities. As a result of low wages and a scarcity of jobs, 60 percent of Mexicans living in rural areas, where most

“We all need to work…[w]e all have families.”

— Mexican traveling fair worker Antonio Mendez, explaining the pressure facing him and other workers hoping to obtain H-2B visas to work in the U.S.
H-2B workers are recruited, lived below the national poverty line in 2008, and 51.3 percent of all Mexicans lived below the national poverty line in 2010.

For example, one small sending community in the Mexican state of Veracruz has been a key recruitment center for fair and carnival workers for more than a decade. The city’s municipal government reports that 80 percent of its economy is agricultural, with 50 percent of the workforce engaged in the city’s production of its primary agricultural products, citrus fruits, coffee, and bananas. The competition for agricultural jobs is stiff, however, so workers are unable to generate income sufficient to support their families. The coffee industry provides some manual labor jobs during the harvest season, but workers often earn as little as $70 USD (approximately 900 MXN) for a week of work. Therefore, incentives to migrate are especially high.

Fair and carnival workers also travel to the U.S. from other Mexican states such as Zacatecas and Durango. In Zacatecas, the major industries are agriculture and animal husbandry. Agriculture and livestock are also important industries in Durango, and there is an active silver and gold mining industry as well. Employment in these largely manual labor industries is susceptible to the country’s often-volatile economic state. In 2011, the states of Durango and Zacatecas experienced some of the highest unemployment rates in Mexico. Given the limitations in educational and income-generating opportunities for individuals in these Mexican states, workers are eager to find employment in the U.S., especially when it involves lawful admission into the country and work authorization. Workers often send, or intend to send, their earnings home to family in Mexico.
Worker Story: Fabricio

Fabricio’s uncles told him of their work with the fairs in the U.S. and then connected him with their recruiter. However, they left out the exploitation that often accompanies work in the fairs. When Fabricio contacted the recruiter, the recruiter asked him if he was ready to work. Two days later, he was told to go to the U.S. consulate for an interview with enough money for his trip. Fabricio remembers seeing signs at the consulate stating that H-2B workers are supposed to earn $8 USD (approximately 102 MXN) per hour. However, he actually earned approximately half that amount.

Worker story: Pablo

H-2B worker Pablo’s one season working with the traveling fairs was miserable. Pablo had been recruited for the job opportunity through a Mexican government agency. Having previously received a good job working for a city government in the southwestern U.S. through this agency, Pablo accepted the traveling fair job. After receiving their first paycheck of about $140 USD (approximately 1,624 MXN) for two weeks of work at about 11 hours per day and no days off, Pablo and his coworkers unsuccessfully attempted to negotiate higher pay with their employer. When Pablo talked to his wife on the phone, he told her that it was a good thing she could not see him and the way he had to live. After approximately 25 days of work, Pablo and about five other workers left when they realized that the poor work and living conditions were not going to change. Pablo and his coworkers had to threaten to call the police in order to get their passports back from their employer, who had held them since their arrival to the U.S.
Most internationally recruited workers in the fair and carnival industry, as well as the vast majority of all H-2B visa holders, are Mexican. U.S. employers often contract labor recruiters to identify workers in their home countries, obtain the labor certifications, and file the visa petitions. Recruitment from Mexico begins when employers, not workers, initiate the process by requesting permission to bring workers into the U.S. As described in Appendix A, the labor certification and visa application processes, which often coincide with worker recruitment, are complex and involve multiple federal government agencies and actors on both sides of the border. The labor certification process, which is administered by DOL, entails ascertaining the prevailing wage (the average wage paid to workers in the same position as the H-2B worker) for the job in the state where the worker will be working. The labor certification process also requires that the employer take steps demonstrating that there are no qualified and available U.S. workers for the position offered. Once DOL has issued a labor certification, the employer or its agent can then submit a visa petition with DHS’ Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). Finally, after USCIS has approved the H-2B petition, the worker...
may apply for a visa at a U.S. consular post abroad. If the consular officer approves the worker’s visa, the consulate will typically issue the visa and return the passport with the visa affixed to it within a few days. Workers generally travel directly from the city where the interview takes place to the U.S. worksite.

The recruitment and application process is employer- and labor agent-driven, involving little input from the workers themselves, and often is the beginning of an imbalanced power dynamic that creates a situation ripe for abuse. Recruitment of H-2B fair workers in Mexico usually follows this basic sequence: the recruiter identifies interested workers months in advance; the recruiter obtains personal information and sometimes personal documents from the workers; the workers are informed that they have been selected to continue with the process and must attend a visa interview; and the workers must often travel to the U.S. to work shortly after receiving the news that they have been selected. Often, workers bear substantial pre-employment costs associated with this recruitment process. Additionally, the authors have received anecdotal information from workers who have paid up to 10,280 MXN (approximately $800 USD) in fees to individuals claiming to be recruiters, only to discover that the opportunity was a scam and there were no jobs available.

Recruiters usually identify interested workers through social and family networks and word-of-mouth from previous workers. Less frequently, workers are recruited through a formal application. In past years, some workers have applied for H-2B positions through a government-run workforce agency, the Servicio Nacional de Empleo (National Employment Service, or SNE), in a particular Mexican state or municipality. Workers may anticipate being hired when they express interest in the job and provide personal information to a recruiter, but sometimes find out much later that they have not been selected by the employer to move forward in the process or that the recruiter fraudulently offered a job he or she could not provide. The recruiter notifies selected workers of their consular interview appointments and the workers then travel, typically for at least 12 hours, to the U.S. Consulate in Monterrey in the Mexican state of Nuevo Leon (or to another U.S. consulate if the appointment so requires) for the interview. The visa interview, conducted by a consular official, usually takes place within one week of the job start date.
Although prohibited under current H-2B regulations, the workers are often asked to pay recruitment fees to recruiters.

Prospective Fair and Carnival Workers Pay High Pre-Employment Costs

H-2B workers in the fair and carnival industry incur substantial pre-employment costs that often go unreimbursed by their future employers. Workers regularly pay most or all of the following costs: passport fees; visa fees; travel costs from their home to the interview location; food and lodging while waiting to be interviewed; border crossing fees; and sometimes, food and transportation costs incurred during the journey to the U.S. worksite. In addition, although prohibited under current H-2B regulations, the workers are often asked to pay recruitment fees to recruiters. Workers recruited via the SNE alleged that they were also required to pay for drug testing and criminal background checks. These out-of-pocket expenses are a significant burden for prospective workers, forcing many to borrow money to cover them and leading many to tolerate substandard working conditions when faced with them in the U.S.

In some cases, workers give recruiters the deeds to their homes or other property as collateral for the recruitment fees and in lieu of a cash payment. Furthermore, prospective workers assume substantial risk that the pre-employment costs they must incur simply to be considered for a position or to travel to a consular interview may not result in a job if a visa is not available or if the recruiter decides not to hire the worker. DOL and the courts have found that travel and visa-related expenses are “for the primary benefit of the employer,” and that therefore, employers should reimburse their employees for these expenses should the total amount reduce their first workweek’s wages to below minimum wage. However, despite this DOL guidance, these expenses are rarely reimbursed.

H-2B workers interviewed for this report reported paying anywhere from the cost of their passport to the cost of their passport, visa fees, and travel, including transportation and lodging, plus a recruitment fee. These expenses usually total at least $100 USD (approximately 1,285 MXN) and sometimes, as much as $762 USD (approximately 9,792 MXN) or more. In a petition to the Mexican National Administrative Office under the North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation (NAALC), workers in the traveling fair and carnival industry reported paying between $330 USD (approximately 4,241 MXN) and $950 USD (approximately 12,208 MXN) in pre-employment costs in 2007 and 2008. In a Georgia case, another group of Mexican workers reported paying a $100 USD (approximately 1,285 MXN) recruitment fee, a $100 USD visa fee, and $173 USD (approximately 2,224 MXN) in transportation, food, and lodging costs, as well as substantial passport and background check fees in 2007.
Concentrated Power in the Hands of Few Recruiters

The majority of fair and carnival employers contract with the same small group of interconnected labor contracting agents to complete the labor certification and visa applications. In fiscal year 2011, DOL issued approximately 5,100 certifications for “amusement park worker” positions. Over 60 percent of those certifications were filed by one labor contracting agent, James Kendrick Judkins of JKJ Workforce Agency, Inc. The second largest agent, Florida attorney Joe Angel Nichols, filed approximately 22 percent of the amusement park worker certifications that year.

In 2008, Nichols signed, as corporate counsel for JKJ Workforce Agency, public comments to DHS on proposed changes to H-2B regulations. The fourth largest H-2B recruiting agent in fiscal year 2011 was Alex Trevino of Harlingen, Texas, who filed applications for 100 amusement park workers. Combined, Nichols, Judkins, and Trevino obtained certifications for approximately 86 percent of the H-2B fair and carnival workers authorized by DOL in fiscal year 2011. Additionally, Trevino and Judkins are listed as agents for two Texas corporations registered on the same day with the same Rio Hondo, Texas address. The third largest agent is Maryland attorney Robert Wayne Pierce, who, along with Judkins, is a member of the small group of labor contracting agents. Despite the long hours H-2B workers spend at work operating, assembling, and disassembling midway rides, most report being paid a weekly flat rate of approximately $300 USD (approximately 3,855 MXN).
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of OABA. This small number of labor recruitment agents for fair and carnival employers may result in their substantial control over hiring decisions.

The fair and carnival companies’ labor contracting agents, in turn, frequently hire local recruiters in Mexico, or travel there themselves to hire workers for U.S. clients. Most worker recruitment for fair and carnival employers is carried out by a small number of recruiters. These same recruiters also typically shepherd workers through the visa interview process in Mexico. Recruiters identify workers through formal and informal channels, some exclusively through word of mouth and personal recommendations. Often, a family member who has successfully completed a season in the U.S. will recommend a relative to the local recruiter. In communities where workers have traveled to work in the fairs for decades, some younger workers describe “inherning” jobs from their older relatives who are no longer able to do the physically demanding work. In past years, the SNE has also played a role in connecting workers with H-2B fair and carnival employers in certain states and municipalities. While recruitment through the SNE may be somewhat more regulated, workers have reported that the information provided to them via the agency in the past has included inaccurate representations of the actual working conditions, pay, and hours.

In an interview with the authors, Maria described her experience with a recruiter in Veracruz who promised her work in the fairs for the entire duration of her visa. She paid the recruiter 5,000 MXN (approximately $389 USD) to make her journey to the U.S. Only when she was already in the U.S. did she find out that she would not be paid for days that she was not given work. She spent her first 20 days in the U.S. without work or any source of income. Therefore, Maria was essentially left with no means of recourse and without the ability to seek work elsewhere due to the fact that her visa tied her to that employer, and burdened by the knowledge that she had to earn enough to repay her pre-employment debt.

Because most H-2B fair workers are hired by the same small group of agents and their recruiters in Mexico, individual recruiters on the ground in Mexico wield nearly unchecked power to determine who gets work and who does not. Workers justifiably fear that protesting or complaining about working conditions will lead them to be targeted for retaliation and loss of employment opportunities in future seasons. Because word of mouth is so important to recruitment, workers often fear speaking up in any way that may interfere with their relationship with the recruiter, as it could also impact the ability of their family and friends to obtain H-2B employment.
Some of the most significant problems for H-2B workers in the fair industry are issues related to payment of wages and the number of hours worked. These problems stem from conditions specific to H-2B workers such as temporary legal immigration status, constant interstate travel, ineligibility for LSC-funded legal assistance, employment tied to a single employer, the nature of the jobs in which workers are typically engaged, and also a lack of adequate DOL monitoring and enforcement efforts. Both the DOL Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) have documented the prevalence of wage and hour abuses throughout the H-2B program and have cited the need for systemic reforms of the program.157

The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), administered and enforced by the DOL Wage and Hour Division (WHD), protects workers by establishing minimum wage, overtime pay, recordkeeping, and child labor standards.158 The current federal minimum wage for covered, nonexempt employees is $7.25 USD (approximately 93 MXN) per hour,159 and the overtime rate is one-and-a-half times the regular pay rate beyond 40 hours in a workweek.160 FLSA provides remedies for minimum wage and overtime violations in the form of back pay, liquidated damages, and civil monetary penalties.161 The statute of limitations for filing a complaint to recover wages begins at the point of an employer’s failure to pay the proper wages.162 FLSA covers workers regardless of immigration status.163 However, some employers and types of industries are exempt from FLSA safeguards. For example, employees of certain amusement establishments are exempt from FLSA minimum wage and overtime pay requirements.164 Many amusement companies attempt to avoid federally-mandated minimum wage and overtime requirements by claiming that they qualify for the FLSA “seasonal amusement” exemption.165

To fall under the FLSA “seasonal amusement” exemption, an amusement company must show that it either operates for no more than seven months in any calendar year, or that its average receipts for a six-month period did not exceed 33.3 percent of its average receipts for the other six months of the year.166 Therefore, some fair companies claiming this exemption may not actually qualify either because they operate for longer than seven months, or because they do not pass the “average receipts” test. For example, José Luis Carmona reported that he worked for Dreamland Amusements, a traveling carnival, for a period of eight months in 2007.167 Unless Dreamland met the ‘average receipts’ test, he would have been entitled to the then federal minimum pay rate of over $5.00 USD (approximately 64 MXN) an hour,168 instead
H-2B workers report that it is common industry practice to pay employees in cash without providing pay stubs or similar documentation.

Fair companies have the burden of proving that they are exempt under FLSA. However, proving the exemption may be hard for many fair companies due to poor maintenance of employment records. Additionally, H-2B workers report that it is common industry practice to pay employees in cash without providing pay stubs or similar documentation. For employers of non-exempt employees, failure to maintain payroll records is a violation of federal law, and also prevents employees from being able to verify their hours worked and the corresponding wages they are owed.

In addition to federal minimum wage laws, many states also have their own minimum wage laws. When an employee is subject to a state minimum wage law that is higher than federal law, that employee is entitled to the higher rate because federal law only sets the floor. In fact, even an employee exempt from FLSA’s federal minimum wage and overtime provisions may be covered by state minimum wage laws that do not provide a parallel exemption for seasonal amusement employers. For example, Montana’s minimum wage law does not provide a parallel FLSA amusement exemption, meaning that employers have to pay workers there the current federal minimum wage of $7.25 USD (approximately 93 MXN), which the state has also adopted as its minimum wage. In Maryland, a state in which many of the workers interviewed for this report had worked, employers must pay all workers at least the federal minimum wage, but exempts amusement park workers from the overtime rate.

DOL provides the following example of an application of the ‘average receipts’ test:

An amusement or recreational establishment operated for nine months in the preceding calendar year. The establishment was closed during December, January and February. The total receipts for May, June, July, August, September and October (the six months in which the receipts were largest) totaled $260,000, a monthly average of $43,333; the total receipts for the other six months totaled $75,000, a monthly average of $12,500. Because the average receipts of the latter six months were not more than one-third percent of the average receipts for the other six months of the year, the Section 13(a)(3) exemption would apply.
Underpaid & Overworked

“I had to work at least 11 hours per day, but on the days that we assembled or disassembled the rides, we worked until 2 a.m. and barely slept. I worked 98 hours a week, and earned $2 USD (approximately 26 MXN) per hour. I could take a brief break during the day, but only to go to the bathroom or eat. I was tired almost all the time.”

— H-2B Worker Juan

“We couldn’t even support ourselves, let alone send money home, which is why we came.”

— H-2B Worker Pablo

Almost all workers interviewed for this report had complaints about their wages or hours and often, both. Approximately one-third of the workers interviewed had been provided an estimated number of weekly work hours prior to arriving in the U.S. Of these workers, most had been told they would be working 40 to 50 hours per week. In reality, however, many traveling fair workers work double that number, including those interviewed for this report. In fact, only one worker stated that he had worked approximately 50 hours per week. At the extreme, typically when fairs move locales, the workers put in 17 to 27 hours in a row. On average, H-2B fair workers interviewed for this report worked approximately 14 hours a day, seven days a week, frequently with no days off. On days when the workers worked through the night, often their only opportunity to rest or sleep was during travel to the next fair.

Despite the long hours, fair and carnival H-2B workers are paid an average of $300 USD (approximately 3,855 MXN) per week. At 50 hours per week, which is the number of hours most of the H-2B workers interviewed for this report had been told they would be working, their hourly pay amounts to $6 USD (approximately 77 MXN), which is below the federal minimum hourly wage of $7.25 USD (approximately 93 MXN). A week’s pay, of course, amounts to less per hour the more hours a worker is made to work. However, if a fair company claims the FLSA “seasonal amusement” exemption, DOL’s labor certification application does not require that an employer indicate how it qualifies for the minimum wage exemption. This is a weakness in the employer attestation-based certification process and shows potential for a lack of employer accountability from the outset. Moreover, many employers also fail to pay H-2B workers the prevailing wage, or average wage, of workers in the fair industry. Per DOL’s Bureau of Labor Statistics, the national mean hourly wage for amusement and recreation attendants was $9.60 USD (approximately 124 MXN) as of May 2011.
On average, H-2B fair workers interviewed for this report worked approximately 14 hours a day, seven days a week, frequently with no days off.

*H-2B traveling fair and carnival workers typically work in concessions or as ride operators.* Photo: Carson Osberg
Another problem that some H-2B fair and carnival workers face is “benching,” which is when employers do not actually have work for the H-2B workers they have brought to the U.S. and do not pay them for the hours lost.193 Two workers interviewed for this report discussed periods when their employer had no work for them and did not pay them for approximately two months. As a result, the workers had no money for food or other necessities.194 The 2012 H-2B Regulations address this issue with the “three-fourths guarantee” rule, which requires employers to pay workers at least three-quarters of the hours promised in their labor contracts.195

Traveling fair companies frequently cross state lines and laws change accordingly. Therefore, a company that does not take into account varying state minimum wage laws and instead continues paying the same lump sum at the end of the week, regardless of where they are operating, may be in violation of state laws. No matter what state they worked in, as stated previously, most of the H-2B workers interviewed for this report earned approximately $300 USD (approximately 3,855 MXN) a week.196 For example, Jaime asserted that he and his co-workers are paid the same regardless of the state they are in, which he said affected them because the cost of living is higher in some states, such as New York, New Jersey, or Pennsylvania, than in others, such as Maryland.197

José de Lira, a Dreamland Amusements employee, recounts his company’s pay practice: “I was paid in cash enclosed in an envelope with the amount of money handwritten on it. I was never provided with any pay stubs, tax forms, or any documentation or receipts in connection with my Dreamland wages.”198 H-2B worker Jordan, interviewed for this report, was paid $275 USD (approximately 3,534 MXN) in cash weekly, usually on the Monday of each week.199 He had to sign a piece of paper stating that he had received the money, but he was never given a pay stub. From his earnings, Jordan often had to pay for part of the required employee uniform, such as an extra t-shirt at $20 USD (approximately 257 MXN) each or warmer gear if he needed it, such as a rain jacket for $80 USD (approximately 1,028 MXN), a long-sleeved jersey for $60 USD (approximately 771 MXN), or a baseball cap for $15 USD (approximately 193 MXN). These amounts were deducted from his pay but never documented by any type of pay stub.200 These alleged deductions violate DOL regulations because uniforms are considered “for the primary benefit of the employer”201 and therefore, should not be deducted from an employee’s wages.

H-2B worker Fabricio reported that his employer deducted $50 USD (approximately 642 MXN) from weekly wages for “insurance,” which is a type of withholding not uncommon with H-2B employers to ensure that the worker completes the work season with them. At least Fabricio’s withholding was returned to him at the end of the season.202 Another employer deducted $25 USD weekly from an H-2B worker’s pay for “social security,” but never provided the H-2B worker an earnings statement or verification of the deduction.203

Although Jaime was paid in cash, he was among the few fair workers interviewed who received an earnings statement with his weekly pay. Many workers are simply given cash and have no record of how much they are, or in some cases, are not being paid for their hard work and long workdays.204 Photo: Anne Schaufele
Limited Access to Justice

Worker Story: José Luis Carmona

José Luis Carmona was recruited to work for Dreamland Amusements through SNE in the state of Veracruz. José Luis recounts SNE representatives telling him that “the job would pay $400 USD [approximately 5,140 MXN] per week for 48 hours of work, plus overtime, and that the costs of [his] transportation from Veracruz to the U.S. would be paid by [his] employer.”205 However, once José Luis arrived in the U.S., he earned a flat weekly salary of $300 USD (approximately 3,855 MXN), worked an average of 80 hours a week, and never received minimum wage or overtime pay.206 José Luis had little choice but to continue the fair season with Dreamland, despite the company’s failure to honor its initial offer.

José Luis recounts that workers were typically unable to leave the worksite unaccompanied during rest periods. “As a practical matter, the other Mexican workers and I were not permitted to leave the site during our hours of rest…[t]he Dreamland managers usually took us to a Walmart store, and would allow us to shop for a maximum of two hours.”207 This two-hour, employer-organized trip to Walmart was typically the only opportunity for José Luis and his coworkers to leave the fairgrounds.

José Luis’ case is not unique. Recruiters in Mexico are known to promise prospective H-2B workers higher wages than the companies that employ them actually pay.208 Once the workers arrive in the U.S., fair and carnival employers frequently cheat them out of salaries promised not only at the time of recruitment, but also fail to pay the wage required by wage and hour laws. H-2B workers have little leverage with exploitative employers because the terms of their visas only allow them to work for that specific employer. Fearful of employer retaliation,209 most H-2B workers suffer poor work conditions and wage theft silently. The difficult economic conditions in Mexico and the financial and personal costs of obtaining a visa and traveling to the U.S. tend to make most H-2B workers who, like José Luis, find themselves overworked and underpaid, feel they have little choice but to accept exploitative work conditions.

Barriers to justice extend beyond visa-related employment restrictions and fear of retaliation. Often, migrant workers are unfamiliar with the laws of the country or state in which they are working, such that they do not know that employers are in violation of labor and employment laws. Additionally, even when H-2B workers do recognize their rights, they often do not have access to legal representation and therefore, the justice system, to be able to enforce those rights. Constant interstate travel contributes to workers’ isolation and limited access to non-work-related transportation, making it difficult for H-2B workers to find local organizations that can help them with their claims.210 The nature of their work requires that workers in the fair and carnival industry travel to different states and often, to small towns or suburbs where public transportation is limited or nonexistent. Without a means of transportation or time to acclimate to their environment, it is difficult for H-2B workers to leave fair sites in search of legal assistance.211
Apart from the difficulties associated with the transient nature of the work, another major barrier to justice is the dearth of low-cost legal services for H-2B workers. The Legal Services Corporation (LSC) is the largest source of funding for civil legal aid to indigent persons. However, LSC-funded organizations are statutorily prohibited from assisting most H-2B workers, including fair and carnival workers. LSC prohibits its funds from being used to represent non-U.S. citizens, with the limited exception of representing lawful permanent residents, H-2A agricultural workers, H-2B forestry workers, and victims of domestic violence, extreme cruelty, sexual assault, or trafficking.

Additionally, many legal services programs that do not receive restricted LSC funds operate on a state level and are unable to provide services to workers who may have only worked in that state for a brief time. Private plaintiffs’ lawyers similarly find it challenging to represent migrant workers because of the complexities of transnational representation, a lack of interpreters who speak the workers’ languages, and the high cost of litigation. Private attorneys rarely represent low-wage workers in private actions due to small recovery amounts. With significantly limited access to legal services in the U.S., often the only recourse these workers have is to attempt to recuperate unpaid wages once they have returned to their home countries, which has proven difficult.

Even if H-2B workers in the traveling fair and carnival industry are successful in obtaining legal representation, they often work in rural locations and sometimes lack cellular phones, which limits their ability to seek legal assistance or to maintain communication with an attorney. Once their certified employment period ends, H-2B workers must leave the U.S., which poses additional barriers to accessing justice. Upon return to their home countries, communication is even more difficult, and workers are often confronted with the additional challenge of physical presence requirements during litigation against their former employers. Such requirements necessitate obtaining a visa to return to the U.S. to participate in legal proceedings, which can be difficult or impossible to obtain, not to mention costly.

Finally, as discussed in the following section, Inadequate Enforcement and Oversight, the current H-2B regulations make it very difficult for H-2B workers in the fair industry to bring legal claims against their employers. As such, H-2B workers face legal, financial, and practical barriers to justice.
Inadequate Enforcement and Oversight

Laws regulating H-2B workers’ wages fail to protect workers’ rights to fair wages. The law requires that hiring foreign national workers not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of U.S. workers who are similarly employed. Therefore, fair and carnival companies must pay H-2B workers a wage similar to that paid to American workers. However, the prevailing wage regulations involve complex calculations that make it difficult for government agencies to enforce and have been the subject of much debate and litigation. Additionally, some fair operators may not even obtain DOL labor certifications for each state where their H-2B workers work in a given season. This could allow an employer to commit wage violations while escaping detection since the DOL labor certification is approved based on comparing the offered wage with the prevailing wage in a given state or geographic region. If a certification fails to list a state and the corresponding prevailing wage in that state, then the offered wage would not be in compliance with H-2B regulations. Furthermore, filing private lawsuits to enforce wage and hour violations in the fair industry is challenging because fair employers claim an exemption from federal and state requirements to keep records of workers’ hours and payments. Unfortunately, reforms necessary to address these issues have been slow, in part due to strong resistance from industry insiders. For many years, the H-2B program was regulated only minimally through DOL administrative opinion letters. In 2008, DOL and DHS implemented major changes to the H-2B program that had the effect of significantly reducing worker protections. Specifically, the new regulations that went into effect in 2009 (2009 H-2B Regulations) reduced oversight of the H-2B program and reverted to employer self-attestation in the temporary labor certification process. Bureaucratic hurdles have delayed the new methodology that should be used to determine the prevailing wage for H-2B workers. A new wage rule that would have raised the required wages in many industries was issued in 2011, but is currently unfunded due to an appropriations rider that bars DOL from extending funds to implement it. The 2012 H-2B Regulations that are currently stalled by employer-initiated litigation would enhance DOL’s ability to enforce the H-2B program requirements by allowing for employer debarment from the program based on failure to pay required wages or to provide adequate working conditions.

The H-2B program also suffers from a lack of monitoring. Both the DOL Employment and Training Division (ETA) and the DOL Wage and Hour Division (WHD) play a role in overseeing and administering the H-2B program. WHD, created by the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) to enforce employment laws, also enforces the attestations made by H-2B employers in their temporary labor certification applications. WHD’s enforcement actions may take the form of a comprehensive investigation, a simple remediation of a single violation, or referral for litigation to DOL’s Office of the Solicitor. Unfortunately, WHD appears to investigate very few cases involving H-2B workers. Between 2007 and 2011, WHD only investigated complaints involving 22 H-2B workers.

The U.S. government has concluded that WHD’s wage enforcement is “ineffective…leaving thousands of low wage workers vulnerable to wage theft.”
The U.S. government has concluded that WHD’s wage enforcement is “ineffective…leaving thousands of low wage workers vulnerable to wage theft.” Despite a growing workforce, between fiscal years 1997 and 2007, the number of WHD enforcement actions decreased by more than a third. Also during that time, almost three-quarters of these enforcement actions were initiated as a result of worker complaints. The remaining enforcement actions were DOL-initiated, typically targeting low-wage industries. GAO found that even when WHD does investigate complaints, the investigations are often delayed for months or years, which causes workers to miss important deadlines, preventing them from recovering the money they are owed. Between 1975 and 2004, the number of WHD investigators decreased approximately 14%. In 2009, Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis announced the WHD’s increase in wage and hour investigators and an information campaign to raise worker awareness of their rights.

The DOL Employment and Training Division (ETA) adjudicates employer applications for temporary labor certification, which are required for employers to petition DHS for H-2B visas. The temporary labor certification process is currently an attestation-based process, meaning that employers must only attest that they have the requirements for bringing in H-2B labor and that they will abide by the terms of the H-2B program, rather than prove compliance in order to be certified. Specifically, employers are required to attest that there are no qualified and available U.S. workers for the position, that they have a temporary need for labor, and that hiring foreign national workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed U.S. workers. Employers must also attest that they will pay at least the prevailing wage for the occupation, that they will abide by all federal, state, and local employment laws, and that neither the employer nor its agents have received any type of recruitment or other fee related to attainment of the labor certification. As long as the labor certification application appears to be error-free and in compliance with certification criteria, DOL will generally approve the application based on the employer’s word.

The DOL Office of the Inspector General found, after auditing ETA’s H-2B application process, that the employer attestation-based model “does not permit meaningful validation before the [H-2B certification] application is approved.” DOL has documented many instances in which employers attest to compliance with H-2B program rules, though they are actually not in compliance. In one audit, DOL found that over 50 percent of H-2B employers were not in compliance with their obligations under the H-2B program. In another audit, DOL found that 27 of 33 H-2B employers could not support the attestations made in their H-2B labor certification applications. DOL found instances of improper payment to H-2B workers in almost two-thirds of the employers audited, and also instances of employers requiring employees to work outside of the approved work area.

As authorized by DOL’s 2009 H-2B Regulations, ETA began conducting post-adjudication audits in October 2009 to “verify the accuracy of the applications and ensure integrity within the H-2B program.” Though the initiation of DOL audits to validate H-2B employers self-attestations is an improvement, the post-adjudication audit method still presents challenges in enforcing H-2B employer compliance with H-2B regulations. These audits usually occur at least six months after the end of the approved period of employment, meaning that any opportunity to take corrective action while the worker is still on-site is lost. Additionally, audits are infrequent, and at the sole discretion of the DOL Office of Foreign Labor Certification (OFLC). Deferring assessment of employer compliance with H-2B program obligations until after ETA has adjudicated the application for labor certification does not adequately protect workers.
Worker Story: Tomas

H-2B worker Tomas reported that he sometimes worked from 11 a.m. to 9 a.m. the following day, a 22-hour shift, when they were constructing or deconstructing the rides. He and the other workers sometimes had to assemble or disassemble the rides in the rain, and there was often no time for rest during the days the fair was en route to a new location. Tomas had worked in the U.S. construction industry for the past five years, and he reported that he would rather go back to a construction or factory job the next year to avoid the unsafe and inequitable working conditions at the fair.

Worker Story: Juan José

H-2B worker Juan José reports that during his 16- to 18-hour days, he and his coworkers were not provided rest breaks or meal periods. They also had to sneak in quick fifteen-minute breaks to eat. Juan José, who lived in a trailer with 10 others, described the trailer as very dirty with cockroach and mold infestations. There were mattresses to sleep on, but no blankets. While he was working, Juan José fell and hurt his hip, but was unable to seek medical assistance. The injury still bothers him at times. Juan José left after one week of work because of the poor pay and dangerous working conditions, and because he could not sleep well in the cramped trailer.

Officially termed amusement and recreation attendants by DOL, fair and carnival workers’ job descriptions include operating, driving, or explaining the use of mechanical riding devices or other automatic equipment in amusement parks or carnivals, and selling and serving refreshments. Once the fair is open, usually around noon, these workers operate the rides until closing time, usually around midnight. These arduous shifts are even longer on days when the fair is scheduled to move locations. Ride operators report that they are required to quickly set up the rides and break them down before the fair or carnival moves on to a new location, which involves heavy lifting and dangerous assembling duties including working at great heights and for long hours. The days before and after a fair moves to a new location are especially long, and often, workers are only allowed “rest” during the travel between fair sites.

The amusement industry is fraught with working conditions that pose serious—sometimes fatal—threats to health and safety. H-2B workers in the traveling fair industry report frequent illness due to long work hours, sometimes in the rain and cold, unsanitary living conditions, and insufficient rest time. The Department of State has recognized the significant health and safety concerns associated with the “nomadic lifestyle” of the traveling fair and carnival industry, leading to the 2012 elimination of traveling fair and itinerant concessions employment placements for J-1 Summer.
The amusement industry is fraught with working conditions that pose serious—sometimes fatal—threats to health and safety.

Work and Travel program participants. OSHA, which administers the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 requiring employers to comply with safety and health standards, warn of potential hazards, and provide appropriate safety equipment, has documented 92 worker fatalities or catastrophes related to amusement rides since 1984. H-2B fair workers’ long work hours, physically demanding work with large machinery and equipment, and lack of protective gear or formal training contribute to the already dangerous working conditions.
Inadequate Training and Safety Equipment Yield Frequent Injury

A primary activity of many fair and carnival workers is assembling and disassembling midway amusement rides. The work involves loading and unloading heavy equipment and climbing towering rides such as Ferris wheels. Employers frequently require that workers perform these jobs without formal training or proper equipment, and sometimes even in the rain and at night. Given the incredibly long work hours, the lack of training and proper safety equipment makes amusement workers even more vulnerable to accidents that could otherwise be avoided. Susceptibility to injury tends to be heightened among H-2B workers, who often lack clear communication with their employers due to language barriers and reluctance to be seen as unsatisfactory workers.

Many H-2B workers interviewed for this report recounted not having proper foot and hand protection when engaged in heavy lifting, and not having helmets, harnesses, or other fall protection when working from great heights. Nicolas, profiled in the Introduction, was responsible for setting up and tearing down a roller coaster every time it arrived at and left a fair site. Setting up and tearing down the ride required him to climb up the side of the ride, over 130 feet high, without any type of harness or net after working 12-hour shifts without breaks, Monday through Sunday. Nicolas was never given any protective gear or formal training on how to safely set up or operate the ride.
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Employers’ failure to provide safety equipment and training puts workers at risk for injuries ranging from small cuts and abrasions to permanent brain injury or death.

Employers’ failure to provide safety equipment and training puts workers at risk for injuries ranging from small cuts and abrasions to permanent brain injury or death. Approximately a quarter of the H-2B workers surveyed for this report had suffered an on-the-job accident or injury while working for a traveling fair company, and several of them had witnessed coworkers’ accidents. H-2B worker Juan José, whose employer failed to provide him with protective equipment and also made the workers move the rides at night, sustained a fall while working. As a result of this fall, Juan José injured his hip, which still bothers him occasionally.

An investigation of Dreamland Amusements by the New York Attorney General revealed lacerations and inflammation of joints among workers forced to perform their jobs in inclement weather without rainproof clothing. In 2011, a carnival worker in North Carolina died from injuries he sustained after falling from a Ferris wheel.

The prevalence of carnival injuries and death, both among workers and fairgoers, makes this lack of training and proper safety equipment especially disconcerting. Industry analysts suspect that these stories documenting horrific accidents have prompted OSHA to exact a heightened examination of the safety practices of amusement businesses. In 2007, after a worker had fallen from the top of a carnival ride, OSHA cited the employer and carnival operator, Reithoffer Shows, and proposed a fine of $62,000 USD for “serious violations” of safety regulations. The violations, found during two separate inspections, included Reithoffer’s failure to provide adequate fall protection. In 2011, the same employer was again under OSHA investigation after a ride operator was struck in the face by a ride while operating it, leaving him in critical condition in a coma that lasted three weeks.

These incidents illustrate a pattern of employers failing to comply with basic safety rules to protect fair and carnival workers’ safety. Not surprisingly, the work conditions of ride operators have also captured the attention of consumer rights advocates, who are concerned with potential harm to the general public visiting the fairs. Investigations by the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the federal agency that oversees the safety of mobile amusement rides, have shown that some of the most common causes of ride-related injuries for carnival customers include improper ride assembly and maintenance.

According to industry statistics, most amusement park accidents are attributed to rider and operator errors, the latter frequently arising out of long working hours, inadequate training, and lack of proper equipment.
“Almost everyone got sick because of the conditions...this sounds bad, but it was worse to live through. It is hard for me to even think about the experience because it brings me sadness to remember how difficult it was.”

— H-2B Worker Pablo

Worker Story: Jordan

Jordan, an H-2B fair worker from South Africa, asked his employer for medical attention when he was very sick. The employer refused to call or take him to a doctor, even though Jordan had a very high fever and was bed-ridden for several days. His employer told him they were going to dock his pay for the days he was sick. Finally, Jordan’s mother in South Africa called the recruiter to complain, and the employer’s response was to send a golf cart to his trailer, offering to drop him off at the end of the driveway so that Jordan could walk to a doctor. However, Jordan felt too sick to move and could not walk. Eventually, another employee gave him antibiotics, which helped him recover.

Fair workers routinely work 80 to 100 hours per week.

Though less publicized than accidents within the amusement industry, severe illness and death amongst fair workers is not uncommon due to long, strenuous workdays, little rest, unsanitary living conditions, and a lack of access to prompt medical care. H-2B worker Pablo commented that “almost everyone got sick because of the conditions,” and at least one H-2B worker stated during his interview that he was currently sick from having to work for many hours outside in the rain. Worker fatigue, while potentially avoidable, can lead to “operator error” accidents and likely plays a role in illness amongst fair workers. Fair workers routinely work 80 to 100 hours per week. Workdays are even longer on days before and after the fair has changed locations. Carnival rides are dismantled at the completion of the last day of a fair at a given location, which typically requires ride operators to work through the night disassembling rides in addition to their regular 12- to 14-hour workdays. Once they reach the next destination, workers often assemble rides to prepare the fair for business on the day of arrival or the following day.
The transient nature of fairs exacerbates H-2B workers’ reliance on employers. Unfamiliar with their constantly changing surroundings, H-2B workers rely on their employers for even their most basic needs such as transportation to grocery stores and laundry facilities. Several H-2B workers interviewed for this report stated that despite suffering illness or injury while living on or near the fairgrounds and having no access to transportation, their employers still did not help them receive timely medical attention, if any at all. For example, in 2006, H-2B worker Domingo fell and sustained an injury to his tailbone, but kept working after his supervisor instructed him to do so and refused to take him to the doctor. Domingo reports that the injury still bothers him and that past workers now advise future H-2B workers to bring pain medication with them from Mexico since they will likely have to continue working in the event of an illness or injury. A Dreamland Amusements worker reported that when he went to his employer to request treatment for a four-week-long flu, his employer refused to take him to a doctor, denied him a rest period to recuperate, and only provided him with over-the-counter pain relievers.

Even when medical care is provided to H-2B workers in the fair industry, it is often not timely enough to prevent unnecessary harm or death. In a publicized New York case, workers were living and working in such appalling conditions for such long hours that an H-2B worker had to be treated in an emergency room for infected bug bites and dehydration. When interviewed for this report, H-2B worker Sebastian discussed the death of a coworker who had fallen from a ride but was not provided prompt medical attention, despite vomiting and having informed supervisors of his fall.

Many H-2B workers never even report injuries and illness to their employers out of fear of retaliation or being blacklisted from subsequent seasons, such as Miguel, who was not invited back after receiving treatment in the U.S. the previous year for an eye injury. H-2B worker Guillermo was injured when part of a ride fell and struck him in the collarbone, but he knew not to ask to go to the doctor, since the cost would be deducted from his wages and he could not afford it.

The failure to provide access to medical care can lead to more serious medical conditions, increased risk of serious infection, and compromised safety from working while injured or ill.
Difficulties in Obtaining Workers’ Compensation

Rides involve heights not just for H-2B workers who build them, but also for the riders whose safety depends on those rides being properly built. Workers are frequently expected to build and take down rides quickly, sometimes throughout the night or in the rain, after working all day. Photo: CDM, Inc.

Worker Story: Leonardo

In 2011, a Mexican migrant worker from Veracruz named Leonardo Espinabarro Telles died when he was entangled in the fan of a generator while setting up a carnival ride in Vermont for Castlerock Shows. Only after his death did officials discover that he was not covered by valid workers’ compensation insurance. Despite Vermont state law requiring employers to purchase workers’ compensation coverage for all workers in the state, officials discovered that Leonardo and his coworkers were likely not covered because Castlerock had workers’ compensation insurance through a policy from a New York state insurance provider not licensed to operate in Vermont. In response to Castlerock’s failure to comply with Vermont law, the Vermont Department of Labor issued a stop-work order, prompting Castlerock Shows to purchase a second insurance policy.
Workplace injuries can render workers unable to continue their duties due to a lack of prompt medical assistance or necessary follow-up care. For workers in most industries, workers’ compensation is a reliable way to ensure that they continue receiving at least a portion of their pay, even when their workplace injuries prevent them from working.\(^{311}\) Although most workers’ compensation statutes cover foreign national workers,\(^{312}\) accessing workers’ compensation is less than straightforward for H-2B workers in the traveling fair and carnival industry. Procedural difficulties, limited access to legal assistance, variances in workers’ compensation by state, and a lack of clear national regulations guaranteeing workers’ compensation benefits for H-2B workers pose significant challenges for these workers.\(^{313}\)

Beginning with recruitment, a discriminatory and employer-dominated environment sets the foundation for employers avoiding possible workers’ compensation liability.\(^{314}\) Since the number and size of claims can increase the premium for an employer’s workers’ compensation insurance plan, employers are incentivized to limit their employees’ workers’ compensation claims. Of those H-2B workers who are hired and sustain injuries on the job, many are routinely discouraged by their employers from filing workers’ compensation claims.\(^{315}\) Additionally, H-2B workers in the fair industry are generally isolated from legal services providers and other community advocates and as such, may not have access to legal assistance or even basic information to be able to navigate the workers’ compensation system in the U.S.\(^{316}\) In this context, the lack of uniformity in state workers’ compensation laws presents an even greater barrier to H-2B workers who may consider seeking compensation.\(^{317}\) Some states require that non-resident workers be covered by employers’ insurance policies, while others do not.\(^{318}\) Sometimes, a worker will not even be covered by workers’ compensation insurance in every state in which his or her fair operates.\(^{319}\) Even when required by law in one state, states are not always able to oversee compliance by out-of-state companies.\(^{320}\) Some states mandate that the examining physician be located in the state in which the injury occurred.\(^{321}\) Because H-2B workers are often too fearful to report an injury until it becomes almost unbearable, they are, in many cases, precluded from obtaining compensation after they have traveled on to a new state or when they leave the U.S. for their home countries.\(^{322}\) Finally, some states even prohibit nonresident, non-U.S. citizen beneficiaries of workers killed on the job from receiving complete death benefits awards.\(^{323}\)

Procedural challenges also pose significant barriers to injured H-2B workers seeking workers’ compensation. Rules regarding appearances for hearings and before state workers’ compensation boards are not always clear as to whether a worker can appear via telephone or whether claimants must attend hearings in person to qualify.\(^{324}\) If the claimants have returned to their countries of origin, it is difficult, and often nearly impossible, for them to present the required testimony in-person. These barriers mean that even a worker who has found medical and legal assistance and filed a workers’ compensation claim may still be prevented from pursuing compensation.

With an H-2B visa, workers must return to their home countries at the end of their employment contract since their immigration status is tied to the employment relationship.\(^{325}\) Upon their return home, H-2B workers’ difficulty asserting their rights to workers’ compensation is compounded by distance, communication challenges, and a lack of access to the justice system and legal advocates. Workers who must return home are frequently forced to abandon pending insurance claims and will never see remuneration for their lost wages. Additionally, workers may be unable to obtain visitor visas required to return legally to the U.S. for the purpose of attending medical examinations, workers’ compensation hearings, and other hearings. Aside from contributing to a general lack of employer accountability, the difficulty obtaining workers’ compensation for H-2B workers is particularly troubling given that some workers are forced to use their homes and other property as collateral for loans used to pay for visa, recruitment, and travel fees to come and work in the U.S.\(^{326}\) Migrant workers’ families may be at risk of losing their homes when a worker dies and they are unable to repay the loans.
Unsanitary and Substandard Housing Conditions

“The trailers we live in are tiny and disgusting.”

— H-2B Worker Stan

Worker Story: José Luis

H-2B worker José Luis Carmona, who participated in litigation against midway operator Dreamland Amusements, describes his living conditions during two separate carnival seasons with the same employer: “The residential trailers for Mexican workers were overcrowded. Each one typically was occupied by twelve people, grouped into two or three compartments within each trailer. The trailers did not have toilets or air conditioning. I would go to the bathroom in outdoor, portable toilets where they were available…. Also, the trailers leaked when it rained. The trailers’ showers were moldy and the bathrooms smelled strongly of mold, dirty clothes, and dirty feet.”

Worker Story: Jordan

When Jordan first arrived to the U.S. from South Africa, his residential trailer had an infestation of bed bugs, and he and his roommate suffered painful red welts all over their bodies. The workers spent one night in a hotel, but when a supervisor did not like this costly arrangement, Jordan ended up sleeping in an equipment truck for a few days while the trailer was fumigated.

Unsanitary and substandard living conditions also threaten traveling fair workers’ health and safety. Unlike the H-2A temporary agricultural worker program, which regulates worker housing, there are no similar regulations currently governing the housing furnished by employers to H-2B workers. Even when state or local housing laws do exist on the books, in practice they are rendered meaningless to workers who are constantly on the road, traveling from one jurisdiction to the next. Because of their constant mobility and their unfamiliarity with their surroundings, H-2B fair and carnival workers are forced to rely on their employers for housing, no matter how deplorable the living conditions may be. Additionally, states that do have applicable housing standards are unlikely to have the resources to enforce those rules when housing is relocated frequently. Since traveling fair operators move regularly, sometimes staying in a particular state for a matter of days, housing accommodations constitute a moving target for state-level housing authorities.

Most of the H-2B workers interviewed for this report live in residential mobile trailers, usually situated behind the fairgrounds, while working at the fairs in the U.S. The trailers are frequently substandard—dirty, cramped, infested with insects, containing dilapidated and moldy mattresses, and lacking heating and air conditioning, functioning showers and toilets, and appropriate kitchen facilities. Multiple H-2B workers interviewed for this report complained about bed bugs, fleas, and roaches in their housing units.
Because of their constant mobility and their unfamiliarity with their surroundings, H-2B fair and carnival workers are forced to rely on their employers for housing, no matter how deplorable the living conditions may be.
Some H-2B workers also report living in mobile trailers with no toilets, requiring them to use portable toilets and public bathrooms.\(^{335}\) When trailers broke down or were unavailable, H-2B workers were forced to sleep on or under rides, in cars, in dirty trucks storing ride equipment, in tents, or, if they are lucky, in hotel rooms.\(^{336}\) One worker in the Dreamland Amusements case reported that his employer locked him and other workers inside a residential trailer for seven to 12 hours at a time while transporting them between fair locations.\(^{337}\) H-2B workers reported being charged anywhere from $300 USD (approximately 3,855 MXN) per season to $80 USD (approximately 1,028 MXN) per week for housing, even when it was overcrowded and unsanitary.\(^{338}\)
Discrimination

“The owner would yell at us and swear at us. He never treated us well. He called us ‘[f***ing] Mexicans’ or ‘[f***ing] tortillas.’”

— H-2B Worker Domingo

“They called us [f***ing] garbage.”

— H-2B Worker Nicolas

One South African worker commented that, among H-2B workers, the Mexican workers had the worst residential conditions.

— H-2B Worker Stan

Among the New York Attorney General Office’s findings in its investigation of Dreamland Amusements was evidence of disparate treatment in housing provided for H-2B workers and American workers. American workers were consistently provided with full bathrooms and air conditioning, while the H-2B workers were not. Several H-2B workers also believed that the larger residential trailers of U.S. workers were less crowded.

Although there are no explicit federal regulations regarding housing for H-2B workers, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 protects private sector workers from a hostile work environment and differential treatment and housing, regardless of workers’ citizenship status. Section 703(a)(1) of the Act prohibits discriminatory “compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual’s race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.” Most employers are not subject to a Title VII suit unless they have at least 15 employees. If that condition is met, a group of H-2B workers could presumably allege that the substandard housing their employer provides has a discriminatory impact on them because of their race, color, or even national origin. H-2B workers could also allege that their employer created a hostile work environment because of the discriminatory epithets the employer used against them, or disparate wages paid them, based on their national origin.
However, the complicated nature of H-2B fair and carnival workers’ employment makes discrimination claims harder to pursue. Employees who allege discrimination first have to exhaust their administrative remedies by filing a claim with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) or the relevant state agency, which may investigate further or issue a Notice of Right-to-Sue. If the worker receives the notice, he or she is generally required to file a lawsuit within 90 days, with few exceptions. Given the complex process the workers would need to navigate, coupled with their transience and limited time in the U.S., filing an EEOC suit is not an effective remedy for H-2B fair workers who suffer discrimination.

H-2B fair workers interviewed for this report reported sleeping in employer-provided trailers, while U.S. workers generally slept in tents. Photo: Anne Schaafele
“If they think we’re not working hard enough, they tell us they’re going to send us back to Mexico.”

— H-2B Worker Tomas

“We are told that if we don’t work hard enough, or if we complain, we’ll be sent home.”

— H-2B Worker Stan

“[N]othing changes really and we are scared of being fired and sent home.”

— H-2B Worker Felix, when asked if he could express a work or housing-related concern to his boss.

“Worker rights cannot be secured unless there is protection from all forms of intimidation or discrimination resulting from any person’s attempt to report or correct perceived violations of the H-2B provisions.”

— DOL

Worker Story: Fabricio

Fabricio’s shifts were typically 12.5 hours long with a lunch break in the middle of the day. He was usually allowed an evening break, but one day, it was 9 p.m. and he still had not been granted one. He decided on his own to take a 30-minute break, and when he returned to his ride, his boss yelled at him for not seeking permission. For this misstep, Fabricio’s boss told him he would not be able to return to work next year.

Worker Story: Miguel

Miguel, who sustained a serious injury while working at a fair, was promised by his employer that he would bring him back to work the following year so that Miguel could return to the U.S. for follow-up medical care. However, Miguel’s local recruiter later told him that the U.S. employer or labor agent had not put him on the list for the subsequent year and therefore, there was nothing he could do to rehire Miguel. Miguel had loyal and dutifully worked for that company for three years, and in the U.S. fair industry for over five years.
Employer retaliation against workers, and especially the impact of threatened or feared retaliation, is difficult to document but is an important aspect of the vulnerability of H-2B workers. Because H-2B workers’ visas bind them to a single employer who thus essentially controls their right to remain lawfully present in the U.S., many workers fear that if they fail to perform adequately or complain about work conditions or wages, they will be retaliated against. Retaliation is not uncommon and takes the form of fewer hours of work, reduced pay, firing, or deportation. Retaliation may also result in blacklisting, which prevents workers from returning to work for an employer or eliminates them from H-2B recruitment altogether in future seasons. Because worker recruitment for fair and carnival employers is carried out by a small number of recruiters, workers who protest or complain about working conditions can be easily targeted for retaliation and loss of employment opportunities in future seasons.

Workers who are fired in retaliation for complaints or who choose to quit because of substandard conditions must immediately return to their home countries. Employers, playing off workers’ immigration status-related vulnerability, often threaten workers with firing and deportation. Since H-2B employers are required to report the early termination of an H-2B worker or the workers’ abscondment to both DHS and DOL, the deportation threat is even more real for workers, and is a powerful control mechanism for employers. Retaliation affects not only the workers, but also their family members who count on remittances from the family member in the U.S., or who hope to gain future employment in the U.S. via the same recruiters or employers.

Due to the dire economic situation in Mexico and the financial investment many workers have made to obtain employment in the U.S., many workers tolerate substandard and often deplorable working conditions. Additionally, once H-2B workers have undergone the recruitment process and traveled to the U.S. for a job, an expensive process for the workers, they often feel they have little choice but to continue their employment. As a result, H-2B workers are reluctant to voice complaints about their pay or their right to adequate resting hours and housing, and also to report injuries and unsafe working conditions, at least not until their employment has ended. Retaliation and threats of retaliation have a chilling effect on the ability of workers to assert their rights and redress harm they have suffered in the workplace. This reticence to report serves as an additional enforcement barrier given that most WHD investigations into FLSA violations are initiated as a result of worker complaints. If H-2B visa holders were permitted to change employers, the threat of employer retaliation would not coerce workers to endure substandard or exploitative work conditions, and would encourage workers to report rights violations.

GAO collected anecdotes of instances of retaliation and suspected retaliation in its 2010 review of 10 closed civil and criminal cases involving H-2B employers. For example, GAO found an anecdotal report of an H-2B employee who was sent home after reporting to
police a burglary at the worker housing. In another incident, GAO had learned of significant wage abuse allegations against a particular H-2B circus operator. When GAO personnel asked H-2B workers about their pay, the workers denied that any deductions had been taken from their wages and also refused entry into their own housing without the employer’s permission, which GAO found suspicious.

During the course of conducting outreach for this report, the authors noted significant retaliation concerns among H-2B workers. One result of such concerns was workers’ reluctance to discuss their employment conditions with outsiders. The authors were often told that other workers would not want to discuss their employment because they were afraid of losing their jobs. Additionally, during informal discussions with workers, the authors learned of employer-called meetings warning H-2B employees not to speak with outsiders about their employment. For example, H-2B worker Sebastian was threatened with termination and told he would be blacklisted if he talked to any outside groups about his working conditions.

Threats of retaliation are also used to push workers to work even harder. For example, H-2B worker Christian reported that his employer got mad at the workers when the company’s sales were not satisfactory and would then threaten them with deportation. Additionally, many workers never report injuries and illness to their employers out of fear of retaliation or being blacklisted from hire for subsequent seasons. This concern is very valid when workers like Miguel, who sustained a serious eye injury and received treatment in the U.S., are not invited back to work in subsequent years. Similarly, H-2B worker Guillermo was injured when a ride part fell and struck him in the collarbone. He knew not to ask to go to the doctor, since the cost would be deducted from his wage, and he could not afford it.

Some H-2B workers reported that they would raise concerns with management, but only in a group rather than alone. For example, Domingo conveyed that he would only voice his complaints if other workers agreed to go talk to management together; he would never air grievances on his own because he feared retaliation. Domingo relayed that the owner maintained this fear among his employees by constantly carrying a gun, which he said the owner sometimes fired in the presence of workers. The workers, who also knew the owner kept more guns in his trailer, believed this was a scare tactic. Even those who were comfortable voicing complaints often felt that their interests were ignored because they never saw results. As explained by H-2B worker Felix, who has worked with the traveling fairs for three seasons, “nothing changes really and we are scared of being fired and sent home.” Nicolas, a worker from Mexico, states “[e]ven if I had complained, I don’t think she [the employer] would have listened. She thinks that she could buy the world with the money she has. She thinks she can buy people with her money.”

As a result of such employment scenarios and the very real fear of retaliation that regularly face H-2B fair and carnival workers like Sebastian, Miguel, and Domingo, dangerous working or health conditions are often revealed and addressed only after tragedy strikes, and workers frequently fail to recover lawfully earned wages.
Conclusion and Recommendations

As this report documents, H-2B workers in the fair and carnival industry are an extremely vulnerable population in a system that is ripe for fraud and abuse. These workers are frequently subjected to: deceptive recruitment practices and high pre-employment fees and costs; wages that fall far below the minimum wage and overtime pay rates; minimum to no access to legal and medical services; substandard housing; and hazardous and dangerous workplace conditions. This report calls on federal agencies and state governments to address the urgent national issues arising out of inadequate enforcement of H-2B worker protections. Based upon the issues addressed in this report, the authors make the following policy recommendations:

Necessary protections for H-2B workers will lead to a brighter future. Photo: Xavier E. Albán
National Recommendations

Congress Should:

• Enact retaliation protections for workers who report abuse.
• Enact legislation to hold employers strictly liable for all recruitment fees charged to workers.
• Permit H-2B workers to expeditiously request and receive a change of employer. Require DOL to maintain an online database of job openings among H-2B employers in order to facilitate transfers between employers.
• Forbid the charging of recruitment fees by U.S. employers, their agents, or associates and subcontractors of the employer’s agents. Investigate the charging of illegal fees. Prohibit U.S. employers, recruiters, and their agents from charging recruitment fees for H-2B visas.
• Require that employers reimburse H-2B workers for all visa and travel costs.
• Extend federally funded legal services to all H-2B workers.
• Remove any exemptions from minimum wage, overtime, and recordkeeping provisions for amusement industry employers from federal labor laws.
• Enact legislation to hold employers, recruiters, and their agents jointly and severally liable.
• Require that all job orders be treated as enforceable contracts. Require employers, recruiters, or their agents to provide each worker with a copy of his or her job order/contract in the worker’s native language at the time of recruitment.
• Amend applicable anti-discrimination laws to clearly articulate the available protections for migrant workers, both during the recruitment process and while employed in the U.S.
• Require that H-2B employers demonstrate valid workers’ compensation insurance coverage for each state in which the company operates.

The Department of Labor Should:

• Ensure that anti-retaliation provisions are enforced.
• Require through regulations that employers reimburse workers for all visa and travel costs during the first week of work.
• Require that all Temporary Labor Certifications include an hourly rate.
• Forbid the charging of recruitment fees by U.S. employers, their agents or associates, and subcontractors of the employer’s agents and investigate the charging of illegal fees.
• Issue a memorandum reminding all fair and carnival employers that they must keep payroll records, pay overtime wages, and pay the highest of the federal minimum wage, prevailing wage, or state minimum wage. The memorandum should remind fair and carnival employers that it is their burden to prove any exemption to these laws.
• Conduct inspections of H-2B fair employers’ payroll and average receipts records to ensure compliance with applicable minimum wage and prevailing wage standards.
• Issue rules related to training, breaks, and safety equipment to protect the health and safety of fair and carnival workers.
• Limit the number of hours ride operators may work without a break. Enforce all existing break time regulations.
• Require comprehensive OSHA-designed pre-season occupational health and safety training for all fair workers in their native language.
• Require that fair employers provide paid, pre-season training specific to the rides that workers will be assembling and/or operating.
• Require employers to provide safety equipment such as harnesses and nets at no cost to employees.
• Advertise to every H-2B worker a free, anonymous tip line for health and safety violations at fairs.
Inter-Agency Coordination

The Department of Labor, Department of Homeland Security, Department of State, National Labor Relations Board, and Equal Employment Opportunity Commission should coordinate to:

- Inform employers and H-2B workers about anti-retaliation provisions and consequences of their violation.
- Vigorously investigate and litigate claims of abuse and discrimination against H-2B workers, even after workers have returned to their countries of origin at the expiration of their work visas.
- Defer action or grant other immigration relief to H-2B whistleblowers still in the U.S. so that they can stay in the country to aid in the investigation and prosecution of their employers. Issue short-term visas to workers who have already left the U.S. so that they can return to participate.
- Provide pre-departure and post-arrival orientation upon arrival for temporary workers, including written and oral Know-Your-Rights trainings and contact information for available legal services.
- Create an expedited investigation process for H-2B workers to ensure that all witness testimony and evidence is preserved given the temporary nature of their visas.

State and Local Recommendations

State Governments And Bodies Should:

- Remove any exceptions from state minimum wage and overtime provisions for seasonal fair workers.
- Exempt H-2B fair workers from in-person court appearance requirements for workers’ compensation claims, and allow evaluation by out-of-state doctors.
- Eliminate practices precluding noncitizen beneficiaries from collecting on workers’ compensation policies when a worker dies on the job.
- Ensure that the state’s regulating board or department enforces occupational safety and health standards at fairs through inspections, assessments, and complaint mechanisms.
- Enact and/or enforce state housing regulations for fair workers.
- Vigorously pursue claims or complaints filed by H-2B fair workers for violations of state anti-discrimination laws. Where no state anti-discrimination laws exist, states should take measures to ensure that all workers are protected under state law from all forms of discrimination and retaliation.
Methodology

This report is based on qualitative research conducted through interviews in Maryland, Virginia, and Mexico. Students from the Washington College of Law Immigrant Justice Clinic and staff and volunteers from Centro de los Derechos del Migrante, Inc. visited fairs and carnivals in Maryland and Virginia approximately 16 times (with one preliminary visit to a fair in New York) from August 2011 to October 2012. In addition, CDM staff and volunteers visited workers’ home communities in Mexico in June and October 2012.

The authors spoke with many H-2B workers in the traveling fair and carnival industry, collecting 25 formal worker interviews with current and former fair and carnival workers. The workers had been employed by at least 11 different fair and carnival operators, several of which are among the largest H-2B employers in the industry. All of the workers interviewed either had or have H-2B visas to work in the fair and carnival industry. Of the 25 full interviews conducted, 20 workers were Mexican and five were South African. The workers ranged in age from 19 to 53, with an average age of about 32 or 33. In addition, 21 of the H-2B workers interviewed had traveled to the U.S. to work in the traveling fair industry during multiple seasons, anywhere from two to eight times. Before coming to the U.S., the interviewees had worked in a range of industries in Mexico and South Africa, including in the construction, agriculture, and service industries. Most of the workers had learned about the possibility of employment with the traveling fairs through family members, friends, the National Employment Service (Servicio Nacional de Empleo) in Mexico, or through a local recruiter. The majority of H-2B workers traveled to the U.S. with people they knew or had met during past years of fair and carnival work.

By speaking with H-2B workers directly, the authors obtained first-hand accounts of the hardships and issues prevalent in the H-2B recruitment process and during the employment period. The interviews focused on the recruitment, job offers, work conditions, and living conditions of H-2B workers in the traveling fair and carnival industry. The authors hoped to learn more about the forces and conditions that give rise to migration; the process of obtaining documentation and traveling to the U.S.; and the experience of living and working at carnivals and fairs throughout the U.S.

In devising the research methodology for this report, the authors emphasized the importance of maintaining the safety and privacy of the research subjects. The authors anticipated that many H-2B workers would be reluctant to participate in interviews for fear of retaliation from their employers or from other individuals involved in the migrant worker recruitment process. For this reason, the authors devised and utilized a bilingual consent form consistent with the human subjects research protocol of American University. The consent form explained the purpose of the interviews, as well as the risks and benefits of participation. If the worker read the consent form him or herself, the interviewer verbally reiterated the risks section. The form also assured interviewees that no personal identifying information, including name and address, would be disclosed to any third party or used in any publication if they wished to remain anonymous. The authors did not provide participation incentives to any of the H-2B workers interviewed, and all the workers who participated did so voluntarily.
Carnival workers were approached at fairs and carnivals and asked if they were workers under the H-2B or J-1 visa programs. If they were, then the authors explained the research and asked the workers for their consent to interview them about their experiences working in the U.S., usually during work breaks. Workers were advised that all identifying information would remain confidential if they wished, that they could stop the survey at any time, and that the interviews could be conducted anonymously. Interviewers presented and reviewed the consent forms, clarified any questions, and obtained a signature on the form before proceeding to conduct a formal interview. After obtaining the workers’ informed consent, the authors conducted interviews in Spanish or English, depending on the language the worker was most comfortable speaking. All of the interviewers are fluent or highly proficient in Spanish. Additionally, the authors interviewed some former H-2B workers in their hometowns in Mexico.

Personal accounts revealed in this report remain anonymous when requested by the interviewee. Consequently, when referring to the experiences of individual H-2B workers, the authors frequently use pseudonyms. Likewise, each worker interview has been assigned a number for internal reference; interviews are therefore cited by number and interview date. A few workers have given informed consent to disclose their identities along with their stories. The report also occasionally incorporates some of the first-hand observations of the authors. The primary research for this report is supplemented with research from a range of secondary sources.
Sample Interview in English

Interview Questions for Fair Workers
1. Describe your experience as a fair worker (who contracted you, how much are you paid, how long do you work, what do you do).
2. Describe your housing (how much do you pay, where do you live, and who do you live with).
3. Do you have any complaints about your boss (about work conditions, about your pay, or about any other thing)?

General and Demographic Questions
1. What is your name?
2. Male/Female
3. How old are you?
4. What country are you from?
5. Is this your first time in the United States? If not, how many times before have you come here?
6. What sort of work have you had in the United States?
7. Have you worked in a fair or carnival in the past?
8. What sort of work do you do in your country?

Contracting
1. When and how did you come to the United States?
2. How much did your trip cost and who paid the cost of your trip?
3. Do you have a visa? What type of visa do you have and for how many months?
4. What is the name of the company (or person) that sponsored your visa?
   A. Name of recruiter?
   B. Have you worked for more than one company or person during this trip to the U.S., or during previous trips to the U.S.?
5. Do you have a written or oral contract? What does your contract say with respect to your job?
6. Who has possession of your documents (visa, passport, etc.)?
7. Did you arrive by yourself or with other people you know?
8. How did you find out about the job with this company?
9. Who contracted you and what was the arrangement (pay, work days, job description, workplace, work dates, etc.)?

Work Conditions
1. Describe your job (hours, tasks, breaks).
2. Do you have sufficient access to breaks, water, food, bathrooms?
3. How did you learn to do your job?
4. What type of training did you receive before starting work?
5. How are you paid and how much are you paid?
6. If you work more than 40 hours, do you get paid more?
   A. How does your employer track your hours?
7. Is anything discounted from your pay (taxes, cost of uniforms, housing, food)?
8. Describe the relationship between your boss, supervisors, and with the other fair workers.
9. If you have a complaint about the work or your housing, would you express that concern to your boss?
   How?
10. Has your boss threatened you with deportation or have you been harassed in any way?
11. Have you had any type of accident at work? What happens when there is an accident?

Housing Conditions
1. Where are you living during this job? Describe in detail the conditions of your housing.
   A. Do you know if there is other housing for the other workers, and if so, is that housing different?
2. Do you have access to transportation in case you need something?
3. How much do you pay for housing?

Final Questions
1. Are there any problems or complaints with your job that you would like to share with us?
2. Do you know of any other workers who would be willing to speak with us?
3. When is the best time to speak with you or other workers?
Entrevista para trabajadores en las Ferias

1. Describa su experiencia como trabajador de feria (quien lo contrató, cuanto le pagan, cuantas horas trabajas, y que hace).
2. Describa su vivienda (cuanto paga, donde vive, y con quien).
3. ¿Tiene alguna queja en cuanto a su patrón (sobre las condiciones de trabajo, su pago, la vivienda, o cualquier otra cosa)?

Preguntas Generales y Demográficas

1. ¿Cuál es su nombre?
2. Hombre/Mujer
3. ¿Cuántos años tiene?
4. ¿De qué país viene?
5. ¿Es su primera vez en los Estados Unidos? ¿Si no, cuántas veces has llegado?
6. ¿Qué tipo de trabajo ha tenido en los Estados Unidos?
7. ¿Ha trabajado en una feria o carnaval en el pasado?
8. ¿Qué tipo de trabajo tiene en su país?

Contratación

1. ¿Cuándo y cómo llegó a los Estados Unidos?
2. ¿Cuánto costó su viaje y quién pagó el costo de su viaje?
3. ¿Tiene una visa? ¿Cuál tipo de visa tiene y por cuántos meses dura?
4. ¿Cómo se llama la compañía (o la persona) que patrocinó su visa?
   A. ¿Cómo se llama el reclutador?
   B. ¿Ha trabajado para más que una compañía o persona durante este viaje a los EE.UU., o durante los viajes anteriores a los EE.UU.?
5. ¿Tiene un contrato escrito u oral? ¿Qué dice su contrato con respeto a su trabajo?
6. ¿Quién está en posesión de sus documentos (visa, pasaporte, etc.)?
7. ¿Llegó solo o con otras personas que conoce?
8. ¿Cómo se enteró del trabajo con esta compañía?
9. ¿Quién le contrató y cuál fue el arreglo (pago, días de trabajo, descripción de trabajo, lugar del trabajo, fechas de trabajo, etc.)?

Condiciones de Trabajo

1. Describa su trabajo (horas, tareas, descansos).
2. ¿Tiene suficiente acceso a descansos, agua, comida, baños?
3. ¿Cómo aprendió hacer su trabajo?
4. ¿Cuál tipo de capacitación recibió antes de empezar el trabajo?
5. ¿Cómo y cuánto le pagan?
6. ¿Si usted trabaja más de 40 horas, le pagan más?
   A. ¿Cómo registra su patron las horas que trabaja?
7. ¿Le descuentan algo del pago (impuestos, gasto para uniformes, vivienda, comida)?
8. Describa la relación con su patrón, sus jefes, y con los otros trabajadores en la feria.
9. ¿Si usted tiene una queja sobre el trabajo o su vivienda, lo expresaría a su patrón? ¿Cómo?
10. ¿Su patrón le ha amenazado con deportación o ha tenido algún tipo de acoso?
11. ¿Ha tenido algún accidente en el trabajo? ¿Qué pasa cuando hay un accidente?

Condiciones de Vivienda

1. ¿Dónde vive durante este trabajo? Describa en detalle las condiciones de su vivienda.
   A. ¿Sabe si hay otra vivienda para los demás trabajadores, y si es así, ¿es diferente que esa vivienda?
2. ¿Tiene acceso a transporte en caso de que necesite algo?
3. ¿Cuánto paga por su vivienda?

Preguntas Finales

1. ¿Hay alguna queja o problema con su trabajo que quiere compartir con nosotros?
2. ¿Sabe de otros trabajadores que estarían dispuestos a hablar con nosotros?
3. ¿Cuál es la hora mejor para conversar con usted o con otros trabajadores?
Appendix A:

H-2B Labor Certification and Visa Application Process

To begin the H-2B visa application process, an employer or the employer’s agent must first ascertain the prevailing (average) wage for the position offered. Because the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) requires that hiring a foreign national worker will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of U.S. workers, the wages paid to a foreign national worker must at least equal that paid to other workers, regardless of nationality, in a given occupational classification. This is the prevailing wage, which is not the same as a minimum wage; rather, the prevailing wage is the average wage paid to workers in the same position as the H-2B worker (and thus may be greater than the minimum wage). In the immigration context, the prevailing wage becomes the minimum allowable wage an employer must pay foreign nationals employed in the same positions as their U.S. citizen and permanent resident worker counterparts.

Next, employers must begin "pre-filing recruitment" of U.S. workers to fill available positions. Employers must advertise the position at the prevailing wage rate through designated channels, and if qualified U.S. workers respond to the job postings, the employer must consider them, hire those who are qualified and available, and reject only those for whom they have “lawful job-related reasons.” These requirements for recruiting U.S. workers, however, are not onerous, and employers looking to ensure eligibility for H-2B visas generally meet this burden easily with limited advertising in local geographic areas.

After the "pre-filing recruitment" of workers, the employer or labor-contracting agent may submit an H-2B application to request workers. The H-2B application is comprised of the Application for Temporary Employment Certification (ETA Form 9142, also commonly referred to as a “labor certification application”); a recruitment report that includes recruitment efforts, information on any U.S. worker applicants and reasons for not hiring those applicants; and a description of the need for temporary workers. Additionally, the application must describe the job being offered, including the number of hours expected and an hourly work schedule, the rate of pay for regular and overtime hours to be worked, and the geographic area(s) where the work will be performed.

Prospective H-2B employers must also submit Application for Temporary Employment Certification, Appendix B.1 (ETA Form 9142, Appendix B.1), by which the employer certifies that it will abide by the H-2B program’s conditions of employment. The DOL Office of Foreign Labor Certification (OFLC) will review the application and either certify or deny the application, or request additional information. A partial certification will either reduce the period of employment or the number of H-2B workers authorized. Additionally, the employment period and duration must match that requested in the Application for Temporary Employment Certification, and may not begin before the certification date.
After DOL issues certification to the employer for a certain number of workers at the specified prevailing wage rate, the employer or contracting agent then recruits workers in Mexico (or another eligible foreign country).\(^{402}\) The employer or an agent submits a *Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker* (USCIS Form I-129) to the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), along with a copy of the labor certification determination and the required fee.\(^{403}\) The I-129 requests biographical data of the beneficiary and information on the employment and the employer.\(^{404}\) Additionally, the *H Classification Supplement to I-129* requests information on the type of employment need (seasonal, intermittent, etc.), whether the beneficiary has come to the U.S. on an H visa previously and if he or she complied with the terms of his or her status, and whether the beneficiary has paid the employer or agent any form of compensation as a condition of employment (for example, a recruitment fee).\(^{405}\) In the USCIS Form I-129 Instructions, USCIS makes clear that a labor contracting agent may file the petition, but that the agent must "guarantee the wages and other terms and conditions of employment by contractual agreement with the beneficiary or beneficiaries of the petition."\(^{406}\) In its review of the I-129, USCIS ensures that the foreign national meets the U.S. requirements for admissibility. USCIS generally grants H-2B status for the period authorized by the *Temporary Employment Certification*, and the maximum period of H-2B classification that can be granted is three years.\(^{407}\) Once the I-129 is approved, the employer is notified of the approval via USCIS Form I-797.

Lastly, after USCIS approves the H-2B nonimmigrant worker petition, the beneficiary must apply for a visa at a U.S. consulate abroad, if he or she is not already in the U.S.\(^{408}\) To apply, applicants must complete the Department of State online nonimmigrant visa application, DS-160, pay the $190 visa fee,\(^{409}\) and then follow the consulate’s instructions to schedule a visa interview.\(^{410}\) Form DS-160 requests biographical information about each applicant, including the applicant’s prior travel to the U.S.; contact information in the U.S.; family information; work, education and training information; and information about the employer and the place of employment.\(^{411}\) Although an approved I-129 petition constitutes *prima facie* entitlement to H classification,\(^{412}\) the consular interview ultimately determines if a worker is issued a visa, not an approved *I-129 Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker*.\(^{413}\) Using the information submitted via the DS-160 and gathered from a personal interview, the consular officer will determine the applicant’s eligibility for a nonimmigrant visa.\(^{414}\) During the interview, the consular officer is required to ensure that the worker has read and understands the contents of an information pamphlet about the rights of and protections for temporary workers. Otherwise, the consular officer must provide the pamphlet and discuss its contents.\(^{415}\) If the consular officer approves the worker’s visa, the U.S. consulate will typically issue the visa and return the passport with the visa affixed to it within a few days.\(^{416}\)
## Appendix B:
### Fair Employers’ 2012 H-2B Labor Certification States and Their Fair Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amusement Company</th>
<th>State in Which Employer is Certified for H-2B Workers</th>
<th>Fair Route/States Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Amusement Company, Inc.</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates Brothers Amusement Company</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big O Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Florida, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Rock Amusements LLC</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Georgia, Kentucky, Michigan, North Carolina, South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey’s Rides, Inc.</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Kentucky, Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fun Carnival, Inc.</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Arizona, Idaho, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowboy Attractions</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>From New York to Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deggeller Attractions, Inc.</td>
<td>Florida, Virginia</td>
<td>Arkansas, Maryland, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott’s Amusements, LLC</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy Amusement Company, Inc.</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernandez Events, LLC</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd and Baxter Company, Inc.</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Servicing the Midwestern United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Joseph and Sons, Inc. DBA Jolly Shows</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Maryland, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Medal Shows</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Georgia, Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadagno &amp; Sons Amusements</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inners Amusement Company, Inc. DBA Majestic Midway</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.A. Blash Shows, Inc. DBA Swartwood Amusement Co.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissel Entertainment</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Alabama, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement Company</td>
<td>State in Which Employer is Certified for H-2B Workers[^1]</td>
<td>Fair Route/States Served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Brother’s &amp; Son’s, Inc.</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Louisiana, Mississippi[^3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Brothers Inc.</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio[^4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBJ Happee Day Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Arkansas, Illinois, Missouri[^8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peachtree Rides</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Georgia[^9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playworld Unlimited, Inc.</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Florida, Hawaii, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, Wisconsin[^10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reithoffer Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>As far north as Vermont and as far south as Florida[^12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &amp; S Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania[^14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam’s Amusements and Carnivals, Inc.</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas[^15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokey’s Greater Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Maine[^16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Valley Rides, LLC</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Utah[^18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swank’s Steel City Shows</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Pennsylvania, West Virginia[^19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS, Inc. DBA Todd Armstrong Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Southern states and areas of the Midwest[^21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Carnival, Inc.</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Arkansas, Iowa, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas, Utah[^22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Scott Miller DBA Miller Amusements</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>The New England area[^23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Delaware, Florida, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas[^24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner’s Carnival, LLC</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas[^25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Entertainment Company</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>From California to Florida[^26]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C:

**DOL 2011 H-2B Labor Certifications and Associated Labor Agents**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amusement Company</th>
<th># of H-2B Workers Certified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ray Cammack Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reithoffer Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helm &amp; Sons Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown's Amusement, Inc.</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talley Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playworld Unlimited, Inc.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Carnival, Inc.</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernandez Events, Inc.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luehrs' Ideal Rides, Inc.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swyear Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokey's Greater Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusements of America</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WK Events DBA Interstate Amusements of America</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilette Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring &amp; Ring DBA Wright’s Amusements Co.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissel Entertainment, Inc.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire Sows, Inc. DBA Inland Empire-Royal</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey's Rides, Inc.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big O Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Sky Amusements &amp; Entertainment Ltd</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Rides of Utica</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement Company</td>
<td># of H-2B Workers Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamrock Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;S Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Rock Amusements, Inc. DBA Castlerock Shows</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Maurer Shows, LLC</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tas, Inc.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers International Midway</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Amusements, Inc. DBA American Traveling Shows</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadagno and Sons Amusements DBA G&amp;S Shows</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Attractions Amusements, LLC</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman Bros. Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Joseph and Sons, Inc. DBA Jolly Shows</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore’s Greater Shows, LLC</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway West Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Amusements</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot’s Amusements, LLC</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass Ring Amusements, Inc. DBA Midway of Fun</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonagh’s Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peachtree Rides</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doolan Amusement Company</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.G.R. Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Bros. &amp; Sons, Inc.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Valley Rides, LLC</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Cory DBA Heart of American Shows</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Fanelli’s Traveling Amusement Park, Inc.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastl Amusements</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fun Carnival, Inc.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.J. Entertainment, Inc.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar City Amusements DBA Cumberland Valley Shows</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner’s Carnival, LLC</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBJ Happee Day Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement Company</td>
<td># of H-2B Workers Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinsley’s Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Scott Miller DBA Miller Amusements</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Rock Amusements</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson Carnival Company</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett’s Amusement, Inc.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner’s Carnival, LLC</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,717</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labor Agent: Joe A. Nichols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amusement Company</th>
<th># of H-2B Workers Certified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North American Midway Entertainment</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid American Shows Delaware, Inc.</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astro Amusement Co., Inc.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Star Amusement Co., Inc.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.J. Amusements of N.H. Inc.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strates Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,128</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labor Agent: Robert Wayne Pierce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amusement Company</th>
<th># of H-2B Workers Certified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deggeller Attractions, Inc.</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowery Carnival Company, Inc.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A of R Services, Inc.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Amusement Company, Inc.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Star Amusements, Inc.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Entertainment Company, Inc.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottaway Amusement Company, Inc.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showtime Rides, Inc.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas D Thomas Shows, Inc.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd and Baxter Company, Inc.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Labor Agent: Alex Trevino

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amusement Company</th>
<th># of H-2B Workers Certified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg's Crescent City Amusements</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Rides and Concessions</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-American Carnival, LLC</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big C’s Enterprises, LLC DBA Fun Time Shows</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim’s Rides, Inc.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labor Agent: Vincent Martin Martin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amusement Company</th>
<th># of H-2B Workers Certified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy Amusement Company, Inc.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labor Agent: Gregory J. Vartanian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amusement Company</th>
<th># of H-2B Workers Certified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Richards Enterprises, Inc.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labor Agent: Joel Pfeffer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amusement Company</th>
<th># of H-2B Workers Certified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swank’s Steel City Shows</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labor Agent: No Labor Agent Reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amusement Company</th>
<th># of H-2B Workers Certified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rose Isle Inc.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is not intended to be a comprehensive list of all traveling fair and carnival companies.
Appendix D:

Side-By-Side Comparison of 2009 and 2012 H-2B Regulations

This is a reproduction of a chart the Department of Labor had provided to the general public for guidance. The original can be found at WHD H-2B Side-by-Side Comparison of the 2009 and 2012 Rules, Wage and Hour Div., U.S. Dep't of Labor, http://www.dol.gov/whd/immigration/H2BFinalRule/H2BSideBySide.htm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/Provision</th>
<th>2009 Regulations</th>
<th>2012 Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Dates</td>
<td>For Applications for Temporary Employment Certification (Application), ETA Form 9142, filed on or after January 18, 2009 until April 23, 2012.</td>
<td>For Applications for Temporary Employment Certification (Application), ETA Form 9142, filed on or after April 23, 2012. Registration will be implemented at a later date to be announced in the Federal Register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation Location</td>
<td>20 CFR Part 655, subpart A</td>
<td>20 CFR Part 655, subpart A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29 CFR Part 503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms Required to Obtain</td>
<td>Employer submits and receives a prevailing wage determination and then submits an Application, ETA Form 9142, from which ETA determines temporary need and assesses the employer’s test of the labor market.</td>
<td>Employer submits and receives a prevailing wage determination and then submits an H-2B Registration (after the transition period), from which ETA certifies temporary need for up to three years. Each season, employer submits an Application, ETA Form 9142, a copy of the job order, and additional documentation from which ETA assesses the employer’s job opportunity and then orders recruitment to ensure a thorough test of the labor market. The Application, ETA Form 9142, and required documents must be submitted 75–90 calendar days before the employer’s date of need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification from ETA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Situations</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Certifying Officer may waive the normal filing timeframe (i.e., 75-90 calendar days before the employer’s date of need). So long as there is enough time to test the labor market and provided that the employer can demonstrate a good and substantial cause, the employer may simultaneously file the H-2B Registration (if necessary), application, and job order less than 75 calendar days before its start date of need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Need</td>
<td>Except for one-time need, temporary need is limited to 10 months or less.</td>
<td>Except for one-time need, temporary need is limited to 9 months or less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/Provision</td>
<td>2009 Regulations</td>
<td>2012 Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Information, Cont’d.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Contractors</strong></td>
<td>Full participation of job contractors permitted. Beginning April 2011, job contractors and their clients, the end-employers, must declare joint employment on the Application, and both must indicate their agreement to comply with the H-2B terms and conditions by signing Appendix B to the Application.</td>
<td>Participation of job contractors is limited to those with their own genuine temporary need for workers on a temporary seasonal or one-time occurrence basis. The job contractor and its clients, the end-employers, must continue to declare joint employment, and both must continue to sign Appendix B agreeing to comply with the H-2B terms and conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corresponding Employment</strong></td>
<td>No language explicitly defining corresponding workers, although U.S. workers who are hired in response to required H-2B recruitment are granted the same terms and conditions of employment as H-2B workers.</td>
<td>Corresponding workers are generally defined as non-H-2B workers who perform either substantially the same work included in the job order or substantially the same work performed by the H-2B workers, with exclusions for certain long-term incumbent workers and workers with a Collective Bargaining Agreement or individual employment contract. Corresponding workers are entitled to the same rights and benefits as H-2B workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing of Recruitment</strong></td>
<td>Employer attests that it has completed all required recruiting before submitting the Application; also attests it was unable to locate sufficient number of qualified U.S. workers. Employer must submit a recruitment report with the Application at time of filing. State Workforce Agency (SWA) job posting is active for 10 days, before filing the Application with ETA.</td>
<td>Employer completes required recruitment after filing the Application, and must demonstrate – not merely attest – that it was unable to locate sufficient number of U.S. workers. Employer must submit recruitment report to ETA after filing, according to instructions from the Certifying Officer. State Workforce Agency (SWA) job posting and Department’s electronic job registry job posting stay active and employers must continue to accept U.S. applicants until 21 days before the date of need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition of Full-Time</strong></td>
<td>30 hours or more per week</td>
<td>35 hours or more per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosure of Foreign Recruitment</strong></td>
<td>No requirement, although employer must contractually prohibit recruiters from seeking or receiving fees from prospective workers.</td>
<td>When filing an Application, employer and its agents and attorneys must provide copies of any agreements with recruiters engaged in international recruiting. In addition, employer and its agent and attorney must provide the names and locations of sub-contractors hired by the recruiter who will recruit H-2B workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Termination of Job Order</strong></td>
<td>In the event of an unforeseeable, catastrophic man-made event or Act of God, the employer may petition ETA for early termination of job order (employer may not act until Certifying Officer has actually approved the termination of the job order).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Re-Certification</strong></td>
<td>In the event that a U.S. worker does not report for employment or abandons the job before the end of the job order, the employer can request from ETA an expedited re-certification in order to gain approval to hire H-2B workers. The Certifying Officer must first determine that no replacement U.S. workers are available. Additional recruitment of U.S. workers is not required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Withdrawal</strong></td>
<td>An employer may withdraw its application at any time after acceptance but before adjudication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/Provision</td>
<td>2009 Regulations</td>
<td>2012 Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misrepresentation of a Material Fact</strong></td>
<td>Includes misrepresentations made on the Application and to the Department of State during the visa application process.</td>
<td>Includes misrepresentations made on the H-2B Registration with ETA; on the Application; on the DHS Petition (Form I-129); and/or to the Department of State during visa process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantial Failure of a Condition of Employment</strong></td>
<td>Includes substantial failures of conditions of the Application and DHS Petition.</td>
<td>Includes substantial failures of conditions of the Application and DHS Petition, and also includes the H-2B Registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions of Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employers must disclose the job order to all H-2B and corresponding workers; must be in a language understood by the workers, as necessary or reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offered Wage</strong></td>
<td>Offered wage equals or exceeds the highest of the prevailing wage or Federal, State, or local minimum wage, and must be paid for the entire employment period certified in the Application.</td>
<td>Offered wage equals or exceeds the highest of the prevailing wage or Federal, State, or local minimum wage, and must be paid for the entire employment period certified in the Application. Employer must pay at least the offered wage free-and-clear, either in cash or in a negotiable instrument payable at par.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incentive-Based Wages</strong></td>
<td>If earnings are based on commissions, bonuses or other incentives, employer must guarantee to pay at least the offered wage on a weekly, biweekly, or monthly basis.</td>
<td>If earnings are based on commissions, bonuses, or other incentives, employer must guarantee to pay at least the offered wage every workweek. The 2012 regulations also address piece rates. An employer paying a piece rate wage must guarantee to supplement that wage if, at the end of every workweek, the piece rate does not at least equal what the worker would have earned under the hourly offered wage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of Pay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer must pay the more frequent of: every two weeks or according to prevailing practice in the area of intended employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deductions</strong></td>
<td>Employer must make all deductions required by law. Other deductions must be disclosed, reasonable, and consistent with the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) for employers subject to the FLSA.</td>
<td>Employer must make all deductions required by law. Other deductions must be disclosed and reasonable according to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) principles at 29 CFR Part 531. Also explicitly allows worker-authorized voluntary deductions to third parties for the benefit of the worker. Deductions not required by law that are not disclosed in the job order are prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer Provided Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer must provide, without charge or deposit, all tools, supplies, and equipment needed to perform the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three-Fourths Guarantee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer must guarantee to offer employment for a total number of work hours equal to at least three-fourths of the workdays in every 12-week period (or, for job orders less than 120 days, every 6-week period).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earnings Statements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer must keep accurate pay and hours records and supply workers with earnings statement on or before each payday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/Provision</td>
<td>2009 Regulations</td>
<td>2012 Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions of Employment, Cont’d.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job-Opportunity and Full-Time Threshold</strong></td>
<td>Job opportunity is a bona fide, full-time temporary position. Full time defined as 30 or more hours per week.</td>
<td>Job opportunity is a bona fide, full-time temporary position. Full time defined as 35 or more hours per week. Workweek is defined as a regularly recurring period of 168 hours (seven consecutive 24-hour days).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Strike or Lockout</strong></td>
<td>H-2B job may not be vacant because former occupants are on strike or locked out.</td>
<td>There may not be any strike or lockout in any of the employer’s worksites within the area of intended employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Recruiting Activities</strong></td>
<td>Employers must conduct required recruiting. No discrimination in hiring; rejections are only for lawful, job-related reasons; employer must maintain and submit a recruitment report, indicating the source, name, and disposition of each worker, along with the lawful reasons for any rejections. Required recruiting includes: SWA job posting for a 10-day period before the employer files the Application; newspaper ad on 2 days during the 10-day SWA posting; the call-back of, and offer of re-employment to, U.S. workers laid off within 120 before date of need; union referrals where the employer is party to a CBA covering the occupation.</td>
<td>Same. Required recruiting includes: SWA job posting until 21 days before the date of need; newspaper ad on 2 days (one a Sunday); the call-back of; and offer of re-employment to, former U.S. workers (including workers who were laid off) from the previous year; contacting the bargaining representative or (if there is no bargaining representative) posting the job for 15 business days at 2 conspicuous locations at every place of employment; other recruiting activities directed by Certifying Officer. The SWA performs two additional activities: contacts the union, where the occupation or industry is customarily unionized; sends the job order to DOL for posting on the national job registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Layoffs</strong></td>
<td>Employer has not and will not lay off any U.S. worker in the occupation and the area of intended employment during the period 120 days before and after the first date of need.</td>
<td>Employer has not and will not lay off any U.S. worker in the occupation and the area of intended employment during the period from 120 days before the first date of need through the end of the period of employment. Layoffs for lawful, job-related reasons (such as lack of work or the end of a season) are not disqualifying if all H-2Bs are laid off before corresponding U.S. workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Preferential Treatment of H-2B Workers</strong></td>
<td>The offered terms and conditions are not less favorable than those offered to H-2B workers.</td>
<td>The offered terms and conditions are not less favorable than those offered to H-2B workers. Employers may not impose on U.S. workers restrictions or obligations not imposed on H-2Bs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prohibited Fees</strong></td>
<td>Employer and its agent and attorney may not seek or receive payment for any costs associated with the certification, including attorney/agent fees, Application costs, and recruitment fees.</td>
<td>Employer and its agent, attorney, and employees may not seek or receive payment (including, but not limited to, monetary payments, wage concessions, kickbacks, bribes, etc.) for any costs associated with the certification, including attorney/agent fees, Application costs, DHS Petition fees, and recruitment fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contracts with Recruiters</strong></td>
<td>Employer must contractually prohibit recruiters whom the employer engages in international recruitment of H-2B workers from seeking or receiving fees from prospective workers.</td>
<td>Employer must contractually prohibit agents and recruiters (and any employee of those agents and recruiters) whom the employer engages directly or indirectly in international recruitment of H-2B workers from seeking or receiving fees from prospective workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/Provision</td>
<td>2009 Regulations</td>
<td>2012 Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and</strong></td>
<td>Employer is liable under H-2B regulations only for outbound travel and only when</td>
<td>Employer is liable under H-2B regulations for reasonable cost of 1) inbound travel,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsistence Expenses</strong></td>
<td>the worker is dismissed prior to the end of the certified period of employment.</td>
<td>including daily subsistence expenses, for workers who complete 50% of the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel expenses paid by the worker may also be covered under FLSA in the first</td>
<td>order, and 2) outbound travel, including daily subsistence expenses, for workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and last workweeks of employment.</td>
<td>who work until the end of the job order or are dismissed early. In addition, if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>worker is entitled to Federal minimum wage, then the FLSA requires reimbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of inbound costs in the first workweek. All transportation provided by the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>employer must comply with applicable Federal, State, and local laws and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visa and Visa-Related</strong></td>
<td>Not an employer obligation under H-2B. May be covered under FLSA in first work-</td>
<td>Employer is required to pay or reimburse in the first workweek the full cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td>week.</td>
<td>of visa and visa-related expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Employment</strong></td>
<td>Employer may not place H-2B workers outside the area(s) of intended employ-</td>
<td>Same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ment certified on the Application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certified Occupation</strong></td>
<td>Inaccurate statements on the Application regarding the occupation and job duties</td>
<td>Employers may not place H-2B workers in a job opportunity not certified on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>may be pursued as willful misrepresentations of the Application.</td>
<td>Application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy of Statements</strong></td>
<td>The dates of and reasons for temporary need and the number of positions must be</td>
<td>Inaccurate statements may be pursued as willful misrepresentations of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accurately stated on the Form 9142.</td>
<td>Application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workers Rights Posters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer must post a workers’ rights poster in English, provided by WHD, and in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other languages as needed and provided by WHD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Unfair Treatment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The employer has not and will not (and has not and will not cause another person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to) intimidate, threaten, restrain, coerce, blacklist, discharge or in any other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>manner discriminate against any person who, with respect to 8 U.S.C. 1184(c), 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFR Part 655, Subpart A, 29 CFR Part 503, or any other Department regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>promulgated thereunder: has filed a complaint; instituted or caused to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>instituted any proceeding; testified or is about to testify; consulted with a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>workers’ center, community organization, labor union, legal assistance program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or attorney; or exercised or asserted on behalf of himself/herself any right or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions of Employment, Cont’d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DHS/ETA Notification of Early Separation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers must notify USCIS and ETA within two workdays of any H-2B worker who separates before the end of the certified period of employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers must notify USCIS and ETA within two workdays of an H-2B worker who separates before the end of the certified period of employment. Employers must notify ETA within two workdays of any corresponding worker who separates before the end of the period of employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If separation is due to voluntary abandonment by the worker and proper notification is made, the employer will not be responsible for return transportation and the worker will not be entitled to the three-fourths guarantee beyond the last, full 12- or 6-week period before abandonment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If separation is due to dismissal for cause and proper notification is made, the employer will not be liable for the three-fourths guarantee beyond the last, full 12- or 6-week period before termination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance with Other Employment-Related Laws</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the period of employment, employers must comply with all other employment-related laws, including employment-related health and safety laws.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the period of employment, employers must comply with all other employment-related laws, including employment-related health and safety laws. Employers and its agents are prohibited from confiscating or holding immigration documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperation with Investigators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers must at all times cooperate in administrative and enforcement proceedings. An employer being investigated must make available to WHD the records, information, person, and places that WHD deems appropriate. Records must be made available within 72 hours following notice from WHD. No employer or representative or agent of the employer may interfere with any Department official performing an investigation, inspection, or law enforcement function pursuant to the H-2B program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The employer will cooperate with any agent of the Secretary of Labor who is exercising or attempting to exercise the Department’s authority pursuant to the H-2B program. The employer will retain all documents pertaining to the Application and Registration, the recruitment-related documents, the payroll records, and related documents for 3 years, and make them available to WHD within 72 hours after a request from WHD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/Provision</td>
<td>2009 Regulations</td>
<td>2012 Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remedies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>ETA may revoke a labor certification for a variety of reasons, including fraud; willful misrepresentation of a material fact; substantial failure of a term or condition of employment; failure to cooperate with DOL or law enforcement; or failure to comply with DOL remedies, sanctions, or decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Money Penalties (CMPs)</strong></td>
<td>Up to $10,000 per violation. CMPs are equal to back wages and subject to a $10,000 total cap for violations related to H-2B wages, prohibited fees, and improper deductions. Highest penalties are reserved for violations that involve harm to U.S. workers.</td>
<td>Up to $10,000 per violation. What constitutes a single violation: “Each such violation involving the failure to pay an individual worker properly or to honor the terms or conditions of a worker’s employment required by the H-2B Registration, Application for Temporary Employment Certification, or H-2B Petition constitutes a separate violation.” CMPs are equal to back wages subject to the $10,000 cap for violations related to H-2B wages, prohibited fees, and improper deductions. CMPs are equal to wage assessments for U.S. workers who were improperly laid off or not hired or rehired. Highest penalties are reserved for violations that involve harm to U.S. workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debarment</strong></td>
<td>WHD does not have independent debarment authority. WHD may recommend debarment to ETA after a final determination. ETA must debar within 2 years of the occurrence of the violation. ETA debarment authority also extends to agents and attorneys. Debarment period: between 1 and 3 years.</td>
<td>WHD does have independent debarment authority to debar employers, agents, and attorneys. Debarment extends to all other labor certifications (other visa programs) with DOL. Offenses that may be cause for debarment are broader than in 2009 regulations. Debarment period: between 1 and 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Remedies</strong></td>
<td>Include back wages, reinstatement of U.S. workers, and any other appropriate legal or equitable remedy (such as make-whole wages for U.S. workers improperly laid off or not hired/rehired).</td>
<td>Include back wages, enforcement of provisions of the job order, make-whole relief for any person discriminated against, and make-whole relief, including reinstatement/reinstatement for U.S. workers improperly laid off or not hired/rehired, or other actions deemed appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4 See id at ¶ 3; see also Eisenstadt, supra note 2.

5 See Compl. at ¶¶ 31, 40, Vazquez, No. 10-cv-04839; see also Eisenstadt, supra note 2.

6 The rate varied depending on the year of employment, from 2008 to 2010.

7 See Compl. at ¶¶ 18-34, Vazquez, No. 10-cv-04839; see also Eisenstadt, supra note 2.

8 See Eisenstadt, supra note 2.

9 See First Am. Compl. at ¶ 54, Vazquez v. Karageorgis, No. 10-cv-04839 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 24, 2011); see also id.


11 See Interview 1 (June 24, 2012); Interview 2 (June 24, 2012); Interview 3 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 6 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 7 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 8 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 9 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 10 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 11 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 12 (Aug. 29, 2012); Interview 13 (Aug. 31, 2012); Interview 15 (Sept. 9, 2012); Interview 16 (June/July 2012); Interview 17 (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 18 (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012); Interview 21 (Sept. 22, 2012); Interview 22 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 24 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 25a (June/July 2012); Interview 25b (Oct. 25, 2012).


13 See Wages: Overtime Pay, U.S. Dep’t of Labor, http://www.dol.gov/dol/topic/wages/overtimepay.htm (last visited Jan. 13, 2012) (explaining overtime pay is “at least one and one-half times regular rates of pay”). At the minimum wage of $7.25 USD (approximately 93 MXN) per hour, the overtime rate would be $10.88 USD (approximately 140 MXN) per each hour in excess of a 40-hour week.

14 Employers must pay H-2B workers an amount at least equivalent to the prevailing (or average) wage earned by all workers (including U.S. workers) in the occupation in that particular geographic region, which can be determined via O*Net Online. According to O*Net Online, the median wage for an Amusement and Recreation Attendant nationally in 2011 was $8.97 USD (approximately 115 MXN) per hour, and $18,650 USD (approximately 239,653 MXN) annually. This would amount to $358.80 USD (approximately 4,611 MXN) for a 40-hour workweek and $897 USD (approximately 11,527 MXN) for an 80-hour workweek. In Virginia, the median wage for the same occupation was $8.63 USD (approximately 111 MXN) per hour while in Maryland, it was $8.99 USD (approximately 116 MXN) per hour. See Summary Report for: 39-3091.00 – Amusement and Recreation Attendants, O*NET Online, http://www.onetonline.org/link/summary/39-3091.00 (last visited Jan. 15, 2013) (under “State & National” select a state to view its median wage for Amusement and Recreation Attendants).
Based on the federal minimum wage, workers should earn $7.25 USD (approximately 93 MXN) per hour in a 40-hour workweek, with overtime earnings of $10.88 USD (approximately 140 MXN) per hour for each hour worked beyond 40 in a given week. Assuming an 80-hour workweek, workers are being underpaid by approximately $425 USD (approximately 9,316 MXN) weekly, unless the employer is exempt from paying the federal minimum wage. At $300 USD weekly (approximately 3,855 MXN), workers are presumably being paid at an hourly rate of $7.50 USD (approximately 96 MXN) for a 40-hour workweek, and are therefore being underpaid by approximately $450 USD (approximately 5,783 MXN) based on the same federal minimum wage calculation. Either way, H-2B workers should generally be earning over $800 USD (approximately 10,280 MXN) more per pay period (bi-monthly) than they are, unless an employer qualifies for an exception to the federal minimum wage and overtime laws. Since H-2B workers are not being paid overtime and are working very long hours, they are often effectively working for $3 to $4 USD (approximately 39 to 51 MXN) per hour.

Federally-funded legal services organizations are generally only able to provide legal assistance to U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents, with some exceptions. 45 C.F.R. §§ 1626.1, 1626.4-1626.5 (2012). Refugees, foreign national victims of trafficking, and domestic violence survivors may be assisted with LSC funds, but most H-2B workers are ineligible. Although Public Law 110-161 authorized LSC-funded legal services programs to represent temporary forestry workers with H-2B visas, most other H-2B holders are not considered “eligible aliens” under 45 C.F.R. §§ 1626.2-1626.5, meaning that they are unable to receive LSC-funded legal assistance. In fact, 45 C.F.R. § 1626.9 requires a representative who is representing an eligible alien to discontinue representation if changed circumstances renders the alien ineligible. In contrast, however, H-2A workers are allowed to receive legal assistance on provisions of their employment contract if the matter is related to wages, housing, transportation, and “other employment rights as provided in the worker’s specific contract.” 45 C.F.R. § 1626.11 (2012).

The Legal Services Corporation is the largest funder of civil legal aid to indigent persons in the U.S. See Fact Sheet on the Legal Services Corporation, LEGAL SERVICES CORP., http://www.lsc.gov/about/what-is-lsc (last visited Jan. 15, 2013).


Interview 16 (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

USD is the currency abbreviation for the U.S. dollar. MXN is the currency abbreviation for the Mexican peso.

At 12 or 13 hours a day, 7 days a week, Nicolas worked approximately 87.5 hours a week. At $275 USD (approximately 3,534 MXN) weekly, Nicolas was effectively earning approximately $3.14 USD (approximately 40 MXN) per hour.

See S. POVERTY L. CTR., CLOSE TO SLAVERY: GUESTWORKER PROGRAMS IN THE U.S. 2-5 (2007), http://cdnal.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/downloads/Close_to_Slavery.pdf. The “Bracero” program from 1942 to 1964 was the result of an agreement between Mexico and the U.S. to bring farm workers from Mexico to work in the U.S. Though the program theoretically included significant legal protections and regulations, in practice, the workers experienced serious abuses, harassment, and slavery-like conditions. Employers took advantage of workers, many of whom were unfamiliar with the English language and forms of legal recourse, much like what H-2 workers experience today.


H-2B employers have generally resisted efforts to strengthen the H-2B program, including the implementation of greater protections for workers, which they view as contrary to their business interests. See Compl. at ¶ 2, Louisiana Forestry Ass’n, Inc. v. Solis, No. 11-7687, 2012 WL 3562451 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 20, 2012) (Seven different organizations of H-2B employers jointly filed this complaint in federal district court to challenge DOL’s new “wage rules,” which would increase the amount H-2B employers would be required to pay their H-2B employees); see also Mississippi Pep, Senator Cochran moves to block H-2B foreign worker visa regulations, MISSISSIPPI PEP (June 15, 2012, 2:19 PM), http://mississippipep.wordpress.com/2012/06/15/senator-cochran-moves-to-block-h-2b-foreign-worker-visa-regulations/. In fact, fair and carnival employers have been part of the opposition to DOL’s 2012 H-2B Regulations, which were released in February 2012 but are now stalled by federal litigation. See Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment of H-2B Aliens in the U.S., 77 Fed. Reg. 10,038 (Feb. 21, 2012) (to be codified at 29 C.F.R. pt. 503).
operation of rides, games, and cooking and service of food at these events, and few are able to find U.S. workers who are willing to take and stay in these temporary jobs that require travel from locale to locale.


28 Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

29 Interview 6 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).


32 U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services describes an employer with a seasonal need for labor as a need for workers “traditionally tied to a season of the year by an event or pattern.” H-2B Temporary Non-Agricultural Workers, supra note 23 (emphasis added). However, DOL indicates that Applications for Temporary Employment Certification can be approved for periods of up to 10 months. H-2B Certification for Temporary Non-Agricultural Work, EMP’T AND TRAINING ADMIN., U.S. DEP’T OF LABOR, http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/h-2b.cfm (last updated Dec. 19, 2012).


34 Specifically, the top 10 occupations in fiscal year 2012 are, in descending order: laborer (landscape); forest worker; amusement park worker; cleaner, housekeeping; groundskeeper (industrial commercial); housekeeper; waiter/waitress; landscape gardener; construction worker; and cook. EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION, U.S. DEP’T OF LABOR, H-2B TEMPORARY NON-AGRICULTURAL VISa PROGRAM — SELECTED STATISTICS (2012), http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/h_2b_select_stats_oct2011_may_2012.pdf [hereinafter H-2B SELECTED STATISTICS].


For an in-depth discussion on lack of DOL enforcement of compliance with H-2B program rules, see infra Part III, Wage and Hour Abuses, Inadequate Enforcement and Oversight.


41 See S. Poverty L. CTR., supra note 22, at 2-5.


45 H-2B Certification for Temporary Non-Agricultural Work, supra note 32.

For example, in fiscal year 2011, the amusement industry (comprised of more than just traveling fair and carnival employers) obtained labor certifications for more than 5,000 H-2B workers. See OFLC Case Disclosure Data, EMP’T AND TRAINING ADMIN., DEP’T OF LABOR, available at http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/quarterlydata.cfm (last visited Jan. 26, 2013).


See id.


See id.

See id. at 10,079.

See id.

H-2B employers paying piece-rate wages (wages based on unit produced or specific action performed) must guarantee that at the end of the week, the H-2B worker receives the same wage that a worker at an hourly rate would have made. See 29 C.F.R. § 503.16(a)(4) (2012). Workweeks are defined “as a regularly recurring period of 168 hours,” or in other words, seven consecutive 24-hour days. Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment of H-2B Aliens in the U.S., 77 Fed. Reg. at 10,173.


See id. at 10,079.

See id.

The 2012 H-2B Regulations stipulate that during the period of employment, employers are required to comply with all other employment-related laws, including employment-related health and safety laws. See 29 C.F.R. § 503.16(z) (2013). Furthermore, employers are prohibited from confiscating or holding immigration documents. See id.

A single violation is defined as “the failure to pay an individual worker properly or to honor the terms or conditions of a worker’s employment required by the H-2B Registration, Application for Temporary Employment Certification, or H-2B Petition . . . .” See 29 C.F.R. § 503.23 (2013). The highest penalties are reserved for violations involving harm to U.S. workers. Employers would be penalized an amount equal to wage assessments for U.S. workers who were improperly laid off, not hired, or not rehired. See id.


See Compl. at ¶¶ 46-49, Bayou Lawn & Landscape Serv., No. 3:12-cv-00183-MCR-CJK.


See Ruelas, supra note 49.

Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

See Appendix B: Fair Employers’ 2012 H-2B Labor Certification States and Their Fair Routes.

OFLC Case Disclosure Data, supra note 48.

OFLC Case Disclosure Data, supra note 48.

H-2B SELECTED STATISTICS, supra note 34.

OFLC Case Disclosure Data, supra note 48.

See id.

See id.

See id.


See Appendix B: Fair Employers’ 2012 H-2B Labor Certification States and Their Fair Routes; see also Update from the OABA’s DC Lobbyist, supra note 36.


See Appendix B: Fair Employers’ 2012 H-2B Labor Certification States and Their Fair Routes; Fairs and Events, supra note 80.


See Sieff, supra note 69.

See S. POVERTY L. CTR., supra note 22, at 20; see also Ruelas, supra note 49.


See, e.g., Sieff, supra note 69 (describing the work of one recruiter who contracts with a few thousand workers each year from a small community in Mexico).

See infra, Part V, Retaliation.
Fifteen percent of the Mexican population was living in extreme poverty, which the Mexican government defines "as those living on less than $1.50 a day in rural areas and less $2.00 a day in urban areas." M. Angeles Villareal, NAFTA and the Mexican Economy, as those living on less than $1.50 a day in rural areas and less than $2.70 a day in rural areas and $4.00 a day in urban areas. Id.

Forty-seven percent of the population was living in moderate poverty, which "is defined as living on less than $2.70 a day in rural areas and $4.00 a day in urban areas." Id.


Kevin Sieff, Where hope lives: Big Top beckons carnival community; bureaucracy blocks the way, Brownsville Herald (Mar. 6, 2008), http://www.h2workforcecoalition.com/pdf/news/TX-Where_hope_lives_The_Brownsville_Herald.pdf (describing workers waiting for irregular day labor jobs in Tlapacoyan and making as little as $1 USD, or approximately 13 MXN, per hour picking coffee).


117 See Interview 2 (June 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); Interview 15, (Sept. 9, 2012); Interview 16 (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

118 In fact, a recent survey of 220 H-2 workers revealed that approximately one in 10 Mexican workers had paid a recruitment fee for a nonexistent job. See CENTRO DE LOS DERECHOS DEL MIGRANTE, INC., supra note 116, at 4, 20-21.

119 Many labor agents exclusively recruit through word-of-mouth recommendations from “tried and true” workers. See, e.g., Ruelas, supra note 49.

120 See Interview 14 (Aug. 31, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); Interview 15 (Sept. 9, 2012); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012); see also de Lira Aff. ¶ 3, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.; Carmona Aff. ¶ 3, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.


122 See Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); Interview 24 (Oct. 20, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); Interview 25 (Oct. 25, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

123 See Am. Compl. at ¶ 20, Rosales v. Geren Rides, Inc., No. 1:09-cv-01390-CAP (N.D. Ga. Sept. 8, 2009) (‘Before coming to the United States…[workers] would meet at a location in Monterrey, Mexico with representatives of the SNE and, upon information and belief, a representative of defendant GRI. During this meeting, the visa applications of [workers] would be processed and arrangements would be made to transport the [workers] to the United States to commence working for defendant GRI…’); Compl. at ¶¶ 36-45, Vitela v. Richardson, 711 S.E.2d 760 (N.C. Ct. App. 2011) (describing that workers were met in Monterrey by Raul Hoffman, whom they understood to be a representative of the employer and that assisted with the visa interview and travel arrangement process).

124 See Interview 2 (June 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); Interview 16 (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

125 See Interview 2 (June 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); Interview 12 (Aug. 28, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); Interview 15, (Sept. 9, 2012); See Interview 16 (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); see also CENTRO DE LOS DERECHOS DEL MIGRANTE, INC., supra note 116, at 7-13.

126 See Interview 2 (June 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker). It is unclear from worker interviews how much of the workers’ pre-employment costs were to pay recruitment fees. However, worker payment of recruitment fees beyond actual pre-departure expenses has also been documented by organizations working with H-2B workers. See, e.g., CENTRO DE LOS DERECHOS DEL MIGRANTE, INC., supra note 116, at 4 (revealing that out of 220 H-2 workers interviewed, 58% reported paying an average of $590 USD (approximately 7,582 MXN) in recruitment fees); see also S. POVERTY L. CTR., supra note 22, at 9. The charging of a recruitment fee as a condition of employment is prohibited. See U.S. DEP’T OF STATE, FOREIGN AFFAIRS MANUAL, 9 FAM 41.53 Notes, N2.2, http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/87226.pdf (last visited Jan. 19, 2013) [hereinafter FOREIGN AFFAIRS MANUAL]. The prohibition against H-2B applicants and employees paying such fees is strengthened in the 2012 H-2B Regulations, which require employers to contractually prohibit third-party recruiters or labor agents from charging such fees. See Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment of H-2B Aliens in the U.S., 77 Fed. Reg. 10,038, 10,056 (Feb. 21, 2012) (to be codified at 29 C.F.R. pt. 503).

127 Am. Compl. at ¶ 23, Rosales, No. 1:09-cv-01390-CAP.

128 See Interview 7 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); Interview 25a (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); see also CENTRO DE LOS DERECHOS DEL MIGRANTE, INC., supra note 116, at 4; S. POVERTY L. CTR., supra note 22, at 9; NAT’L GUESTWORKER ALLIANCE ET AL., supra note 51, at 15-16.

129 See S. POVERTY L. CTR., supra note 22, at 9; see also U.S. GOV’T ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE, supra note 51.

130 CENTRO DE LOS DERECHOS DEL MIGRANTE, INC., supra note 116, at 18 (stating that “47% of workers surveyed reported having to take out a loan to cover pre employment expenses”).

Workers are typically instructed to apply for Mexican passports during the first stage of recruitment, if they do not already have one. Obtaining a passport financially strains workers, and while it is necessary in order to apply for a visa, there is no guarantee that the worker will ultimately get a visa and a job. The current cost of a Mexican passport is 955 MXN (approximately $74.52 USD) for three years and 1,310 MXN (approximately $101.95 USD) for six years. See Pago de Derechos 2012 [Payment of Fees 2012], Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores (Secretary of Foreign Affairs), http://www.sre.gob.mx/index.php/pago-de-derechos-de-pasaporte (last visited Jan. 27, 2013).

See Interview 8 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); Interview 15, (Sept. 9, 2012); Interview 17, (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 25a (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).


147 For a lengthier discussion of H-2 worker recruitment in Mexico, see Centro de los Derechos del Migrante, Inc., supra note 116.

148 See Interview 2 (June 24, 2012); see also Centro de los Derechos del Migrante, Inc., supra note 150, at 11.

149 See Richard Ruelas, Step Right Up..., Ariz. Republic, E1, Apr. 10, 2011 (“James Judkins] hires only new employees who are recommended by existing ones.”).


151 Sieff, supra note 69.


153 See, e.g., Interview 2 (June 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker). Although current H-2B regulations include a provision governing the number of hours workers must be guaranteed, that provision is enjoined by current litigation. See supra Part I, The Traveling Fair Industry and H-2B Workers, DOL’s 2012 H-2B Regulations & Federal Litigation.

154 See, e.g., Interview 16 (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker) (describing other H-2B workers’ reluctance to come forward about their experiences in the fair and carnival industry because they do not want to jeopardize their chances of being selected for future employment by the local recruiter; see also interview 25a (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker) (explaining his belief that he has not been rehired for the last two fair seasons because he fell out of favor with powerful local recruiter).

155 When one interviewee was asked if his coworkers might wish to be interviewed, he replied that workers are scared to come forward because they depend on the recruiter for work and do not want to jeopardize their relationship with the recruiter. See Interview 16 (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

156 See Interview 16 (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker) (indicating that other workers were afraid to be interviewed for fear of harming their relationship with the recruiter and therefore, future chances of employment); see also Interviewer Outreach Reports, Sept. 16, 2012, Sept. 29, 2012, Oct. 3, 2012 (on file with authors).

157 See Office of Inspector Gen.—Office of Audit, U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Management of H-2B Program Needs To Be Strengthened To Ensure Adequate Protections for U.S. Workers 7 (2012), http://www.oig.dol.gov/public/reports/oa/2012/06-12-001-03-321.pdf (finding that 20 out of 33 H-2B employers audited had failed to pay their employees properly, including failure to pay prevailing and overtime wages); see also U.S. Gov’t Accountability Office, supra note 35 (reporting that H-2B employers had failed to pay the prevailing hourly wage or overtime in six out of 10 cases reviewed).


160 See 29 U.S.C. § 207.


167 Carmona Aff. ¶ 2,16, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.

168 Fair Labor Standards Act Advisor: What is the Minimum Wage?, Office of the Assistant Sec’y for Policy, U.S. Dep’t of Labor, http://www.dol.gov/elaws/faq/esa/flsa/001.htm (last visited Jan. 27, 2013) (providing that the federal minimum wage increased in July 2007, during the period Carmona was employed by Dreamland, from $5.15 to $5.85 USD, approximately 68 to 75 MXN, an hour).


170 Fact Sheet #18, supra note 165.

171 See Corning Glass Works v. Brennan, 417 U.S. 188, 196-97 (1974) (“[T]he application of an exemption under the Fair Labor Standards Act is a matter of affirmative defense on which the employer has the burden of proof.”).

172 This is especially problematic because employers are only required to prove exemption during DOL audits, which are infrequent, or if they are taken to court. See Wages and Hours Worked: Wages under Foreign Labor Certification, U.S. Dep’t of Labor, http://www.dol.gov/compliance/topics/wages-foreign-workers.htm (last visited Jan. 27, 2013). See infra Part III, Wage and Hour Abuses, Inadequate Enforcement and Oversight for more information on the attestation-based process.
time law provides a special rule for student employees of taken for a thief epidemic, spur nationwide protests to be kept by employers for their employees subject to minimum wage and overtime hours.


Id.

See Mont. Code Ann. § 39-3-405 (2011) (Montana’s overtime law provides a special rule for student employees of amusement establishments.).


Interview 15 (Sept. 9, 2012).

Interview 14 (Aug. 31, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

Interview 1 (June 24, 2012); Interview 2 (June 24, 2012); Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 7 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 8 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 9 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 10 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 11 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 12 (Aug. 29, 2012); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012).

Interview 1 (June 24, 2012); Interview 2 (June 24, 2012); Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 7 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 11 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 12 (Aug. 29, 2012); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012).

Interview 1 (June 24, 2012); Interview 2 (June 24, 2012); Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 7 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 11 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 12 (Aug. 29, 2012); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012).

See, e.g., Art Levine, Shocking State Fair Scandal, Wage Theft Epidemic, Spur Nationwide Protests, Truthout (Nov. 12, 2010), http://archive.truthout.org/shocking-state-fair-scan-dal-wage-theft-epidemic-spur-nationwide-protests65115 (last visited Jan. 13, 2013) (discussing the workers held in slavery-like conditions and made to work approximately 100 hours a week by a food vendor at the New York State Fair); see also Interview 1 (June 24, 2012) (who worked approximately 15 hours daily); Interview 3 (Aug. 24, 2012) (who worked approximately 16 hours daily); Interview 9 (Aug. 24, 2012) (who worked approximately 17 hours daily); Interview 13 (Aug. 31, 2012) (who worked approximately 11 hours daily); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012) (who worked approximately 17 hours daily); Interview 25a (June/July 2012) (who worked approximately 13 hours daily).

See Interview 10 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker) (This worker was also paid $320 USD, or 4,112 MXN, per week.).

See Interview 8 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 9 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 13 (Aug. 31, 2012); Interview 17 (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 25a (June/July 2012).

See Interview 1 (June 24, 2012); Interview 2 (June 24, 2012); Interview 3 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 7 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 8 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 9 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 10 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 11 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 12 (Aug. 29, 2012); Interview 13 (Aug. 31, 2012); Interview 14 (Aug. 31, 2012); Interview 15 (Sept. 9, 2012); Interview 16 (June/July 2012); Interview 17 (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 18 (Sept. 18, 2012); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012); Interview 21 (Sept. 22, 2012); Interview 22 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 24 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 25a (June/July 2012); Interview 25b (Oct. 25, 2012).

See Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 21 (Sept. 22, 2012); see also Ruelas, supra note 49 (describing how H-2B workers deconstruct the rides rapidly after the close of the fair, for example, from 10 p.m. to 3 a.m.).

See, e.g., Ruelas, supra note 49 (describing how H-2B workers deconstruct the rides rapidly after the close of the fair, for example, from 10 p.m. to 3 a.m.); see also Sieff, supra note 69. Interview 1 (June 24, 2012); Interview 2 (June 24, 2012); Interview 3 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 6 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 7 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 8 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 9 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 10 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 11 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 12 (Aug. 29, 2012); Interview 13 (Aug. 31, 2012); Interview 15 (Sept. 9, 2012); Interview 16 (June/July 2012); Interview 17 (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 18 (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012); Interview 21 (Sept. 22, 2012); Interview 22 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 24 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 25a (June/July 2012); Interview 25b (Oct. 25, 2012). Some workers’ names have been changed to protect their identities.

ETA Form 9142, supra note 83.

For more information on the attestation-based process, see infra Part III, Wage and Hour Abuses, Inadequate Enforcement and Oversight.


See Foreign Affairs Manual, supra note 126, at N27.1.

See Interview 24 (Oct. 20, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); Interview Worker 25a (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).
196 See Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment of H-2B Aliens in the U.S., 77 Fed. Reg. 10,038, 10,086 (Feb. 21, 2012) (to be codified at 29 C.F.R. pt. 503). The job opportunity offered to the H-2B worker must be for at least 35 hours of work per workweek. Workweeks are defined “as a regularly recurring period of 168 hours,” or in other words, seven consecutive 24-hour days. The 2012 H-2B Regulations would require that all H-2B employers guarantee workers pay for at least three-fourths of the hours offered with the job opportunity. This means that for every 12-week period, workers must be paid for the total number of hours equal to three-fourths of the workdays in that period. If the job order were for a workweek of 5 days a week and 8 hours per day, the employer would have to guarantee a worker 360 hours during every 12-week period. (12 weeks x 40 hours = 480 hours x 75 percent = 360 hours). See 29 C.F.R. § 503.16.

197 See Interview 1 (June 24, 2012); Interview 2 (June 24, 2012); Interview 3 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 6 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 7 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 8 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 9 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 10 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 11 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 12 (Aug. 29, 2012); Interview 13 (Aug. 31, 2012); Interview 15 (Sept. 9, 2012); Interview 16 (June/July 2012); Interview 17 (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 18 (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 19 (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 20 (Sept. 22, 2012); Interview 22 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 24 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 25a (June/July 2012); Interview 25b (Oct. 25, 2012).

198 de Lira Aff. ¶¶ 16-17, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.

199 Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

200 Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).


203 Interview 16 (June/July 2012).

204 Jaime received a weekly cash payment of $283 USD (approximately 3,837 MXN). At the number of hours Jaime worked weekly, anywhere from 63 to 91, Jaime was effectively earning approximately $3.10 to $4.49 (approximately 40 to 58 MXN) per hour. Interview 18 (Sept. 16, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

205 Carmona Aff. ¶ 3, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.

206 See id. at ¶¶ 16-21.

207 Id. at ¶ 18.

208 See, e.g., Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker); see also id. at ¶¶ 3, 16-21.

209 Employer retaliation against workers is discussed infra, Part V, Retaliation.


211 Most H-2B workers interviewed mentioned only having access to employer-supplied transportation, often limited and usually to acquire basic necessities only. See Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 9 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 20 (Sept. 19, 2012); Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 24 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 25b (Oct. 25, 2012).


215 See S. POVERTY L. CTR., supra note 22, at 1, 30.

216 See id.


Setting the prevailing wage for H-2B workers is a hotly contested issue, and finalizing how to determine the prevailing wage for H-2B workers is currently being litigated. In 2008, President George W. Bush’s administration promulgated the regulations that currently govern the H-2B program. A series of lawsuits has delayed DOL implementation of the new prevailing wage rule. The legal and administrative delays in implementing the rule show how much is at stake. Employers claim that the new prevailing wage determination would render H-2B visas useless because they would be unable to pay the workers. However, as this report highlights, businesses that utilize the H-2B program are well funded and organized against efforts to improve laws affecting H-2B workers. See Comité de Apoyo a los Trabajadores Agrícolas v. Solis, No. 09-240, 2010 WL 3431761 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 30, 2010); supra Part I, Federal Litigation over the Dep’t of Labor’s 2012 H-2B Rule.

For example, a traveling fair company employing workers interviewed for this report did not have DOL certifications for at least one of the states where those workers had been employed. See, e.g., Interview 17 (Sept. 16, 2012) (The company employing this worker was only certified in Florida, though the worker had worked in Maryland, among other states); see also Appendix A: H-2B Labor Certification and Visa Application Process.

220 See ETA Form 9142, supra note 83; see also H-2B Certification for Temporary Non-Agricultural Work, supra note 32.


224 The “2009 H-2B Regulations” were issued on December 19, 2008 with an effective date of January 18, 2009. Id.


226 See OABA Public Comment to Proposed Changes to Wage Methodology for Temporary Non-agricultural Employment H-2B Program, supra note 139.


231 See S. Poverty L. Ctr., supra note 22 at 29 (discussing the Southern Poverty Law Center’s belief that there was little investigation of H-2B employers based on no available data and the organization’s experience in the field); see also Brennan Ctr. for Justice, Trends in Wage and Hour Enforcement by the U.S. Dep’t of Labor, 1975-2004, Economic Policy Brief, No. 3, (2005), http://www.brennancenter.org/page/-/d/download_file_35553.pdf (last visited Jan. 12, 2013) (documenting the downward trend in DOL WHD enforcement of employment laws over the last three decades, despite the increase in the number of workers and workplaces).


240 In the interim. See Brennan Ctr. for Justice, supra note 233.


243 See Brennan Ctr. for Justice, supra note 233.

244 See News Release: Statement by Secretary of Labor Hilda L. Solis on Wage and Hour Division’s increased enforcement and outreach efforts, U.S. Dep’t of Labor (Nov. 19, 2009), available at http://www.dol.gov/opa/media/press/whd/whd20091452.htm#.UPTTHlO9t94.


246 See Process for Filing, supra note 121; see also Office of Inspector Gen., supra note 157, at 1. DOL recognizes the increased potential for fraud and abuse with the attestation-based model and therefore, reverted to its compliance-based program via the 2012 H-2B Regulations. With the compliance-based system, DOL requires documentation demonstrating compliance with H-2B program requirements prior to issuance of a labor certification. See Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment of H-2B Aliens in the U.S., 77 Fed. Reg. 10,038, 10,040 (Feb. 21, 2012) (to be codified at 29 C.F.R. pt. 503). However, implementation of these regulations is stalled due to federal litigation and therefore, DOL continues to use the attestation-based system in the interim.

See Interview 12 (Aug. 29, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker) (describing how travel days were his only “day off,” and he would be expected to work the following day, upon arrival at the new fair site).

See Fatality and Catastrophe Investigation Summaries, OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY & HEALTH ADMIN., U.S. DEP’T OF LABOR, http://www.osha.gov/pls/imis/accidentsearch.html (last visited Jan. 25, 2013) (follow “A” hyperlink found under “Keyword List”; follow “Amuse Park/Carnival” link) (providing a list of all worker injuries and fatalities that have been investigated at amusement parks and carnivals since 1984).


See Fatality and Catastrophe Investigation Summaries, supra note 264.

See Interview 1 (June 24, 2012); Interview 6 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 15 (Sept. 9, 2012); Interview 16 (June/July 2012). Some of the names have been changed to protect the identity of the workers.

Workers often report being shown by another worker how to assemble and operate a ride. See de Lira Aff. ¶¶ 29-31, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.; see also Interview 6 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 16 (June/July 2012); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012); Interview 20 (Sept. 19, 2012); Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 25b (Oct. 25, 2012); see also Ruelas, supra note 49.

See Interview 14 (Aug. 31, 2012); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012); Interview 24 (Oct. 20, 2012).


Assurance of Discontinuance at ¶ 21, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.

Carmona Aff. ¶ 39, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.; see also Interview 16 (June/July 2012); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012).

Interview 16 (Sept. 13, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

Id.

Id.
The Recreational Industry

Recreational Industry
[60x668], 51

see also Patricia Ziminski, Note, Are we Being Taken for a Ride?—The Need for Uniform Regulation in the Recreational Industry, 51 Syracuse L. Rev. 883, 899 (2001).

See Levinson, supra note 287, at 5.

Interview 4 (Aug. 31, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

Interview 4 (Aug. 31, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

Carmona ¶ 29, In re Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements, Inc.

See, e.g., First Am. Compl. at ¶ 28, Rosales v. Geren Rides, Inc., No. 1:09-cv-01390-CAP (N.D. Ga. May 22, 2009) (“[Workers] worked an average of 12 hours per day, 7 days per week—for an average of 84 hours of work per week.”); see also Interview 1 (June 24, 2012) (who worked approximately 15 hours daily); Interview 3 (Aug. 24, 2012) (who worked approximately 16 hours daily); Interview 9 (Aug. 24, 2012) (who worked approximately 17 hours daily); Interview 13 (Aug. 31, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker) (who worked approximately 11 hours daily); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012) (who worked approximately 17 hours daily); Interview 25a (June/July 2012) (who worked approximately 13 hours daily).

One H-2B worker described riding along with as many as 17 others in a van designed for 8 to 10 people. See Carmona Aff. ¶ 29, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.


See Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

de Lira Aff. ¶ 28, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.

Carmona Aff. ¶ 38, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc. (Carmona was told he would not receive income tax reimbursements as a result of his 2-day stay in a hospital); see also Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

See Small Urban & Rural Transit Ctr. et al., Rural Transit Factbook 2011 3 (2011), http://www.surtc.org/transit-factbook/downloads/2011_RuralTransitFactBook.pdf (reporting that fewer than 1 percent of rural residents use public transportation to get to work); see also S. Poverty L. Ctr., supra note 22, at 31 (noting that workers are often geographically isolated, presenting a significant practical challenge to accessing services).

301 Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

302 See id.

303 Eisenstadt, supra note 2; see also Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 16 (June/July 2012); Interview 21 (Sept. 22, 2012). Some of the names have been changed to protect the identity of the workers.

304 See Interview 12 (Aug. 29, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

305 See Interview 1 (June 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

306 See Interview 7 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker). Another worker reports that their employer rarely covered work-related accidents, so the costs of medical care fall to the worker. See Interview 12 (Aug. 29, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).


310 Id.


312 Id. at 802-06.

313 See Workers’ Compensation, U.S. Dep’t of Labor, http://www.dol.gov/dol/topic/workcomp/index.htm#UKAaCoXrFVo (last visited Jan. 27, 2013); see also S. Poverty L. Ctr., supra note 22, at 25; id.

314 Many foreign recruiters have rules on age and gender that dominate their hiring practices; for example, one recruiter openly admitted to not hiring anyone over the age of 40. See H-2B Guestworkers Facing Rampant Abuse, Hispanic News (May 22, 2008), http://www.hispanic8.com/h-2b_guestworkers_facing_rampant_abuse.htm.

315 Id.

316 See S. Poverty L. Ctr., supra note 22, at 25.


See, e.g., supra, Part IV, Workplace Health and Safety Violations and Abuses, Worker Story: Leonardo.

See, e.g., id.

See S. POVERTY L. CTR., supra note 22, at 9.

See id.

Cleveland, supra note 311, at 819.

See S. POVERTY L. CTR., supra note 22, at 26.

H-2B visa holders have 10 days to leave the U.S. after the validity of their H-2B visa petition ends. See FOREIGN AFFAIRS MANUAL, supra note 126, at N10.


Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

Carmona Aff. ¶ 26, 28, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.

See Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

See, e.g., Larry Hertz, State Penalizes Carnival Operator, POUGHKEEPSIE J. (Sept. 3, 2009) (reporting on a settlement reached between the New York Attorney General and carnival operator Dreamland Amusements Inc. in which Dreamland agreed to ensure that worker housing meet health and safety standards in response to an investigation finding substandard conditions).

See 20 C.F.R. § 655.122

See Interview 2 (June 24, 2012); Interview 3 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 6 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 7 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 9 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 10 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 14 (Aug. 31, 2012); Interview 15, (Sept. 9, 2012); Interview 16 (June/July 2012); Interview 17 (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 18 (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 22 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 24 (Oct. 20, 2012); see also Eisenstadt, supra note 2; Ruelas, supra note 49 (noting that workers typically live in “bunkhouse trailer[s] that contain bunk-bed compartments, stacked like a railroad sleeper car, just big enough to sleep in”).

Interview 15, (Sept. 9, 2012); Interview 16 (June/July 2012); Interview 19 (Sept. 18, 2012); Interview 22 (Oct. 20, 2012).

Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 17, (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 20 (Sept. 19, 2012); Interview 22 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012).


See Interview 4 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 16 (June/July 2012); Interview 17, (Sept. 16, 2012).

Carmona Aff. at ¶ 31, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.

Most often, the housing costs and any extra charges for damages were deducted from the pay of H-2B workers interviewed for this report. See Interview 2 (June 24, 2012); Interview 3 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 6 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 9 (Aug. 24, 2012); Interview 13 (Aug. 31, 2012).

Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

Interview 16 (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).


Carmona Aff. ¶ 34, In re the Investigation of Andrew W. Cuomo, Att’y Gen. of N.Y., of Dreamland Amusements Inc.

Id.


Id.

42 U.S.C. § 2000e(b); Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII, §701(b)


Id.

See Interview 6 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

See Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

See Interview 25b (Oct. 25, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).


Interview 14 (Aug. 31, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

Interview 1 (June 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).
An H-2B visa-holder has 10 days after the validity of the H-2B petition ends to leave the U.S. See FOREIGN AFFAIRS MANUAL, supra note 126, at N10; see also Petition on Labor Law Matters Arising in the U.S. to the National Administrative Office of Mexico under the North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation at 11, ¶ 5 (Sept. 19, 2011) (on file with author).

When one interviewee was asked if other workers might wish to be interviewed, he replied that workers are scared to come forward because they depend on the recruiter for work and do not want to jeopardize their relationship with him. See Interview 16 (June/July 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

An H-2B visa-holder has 10 days after the validity of the H-2B petition ends to leave the U.S. See FOREIGN AFFAIRS MANUAL, supra note 126, at N10; see also Petition on Labor Law Matters Arising in the U.S. to the National Administrative Office of Mexico under the North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation at 11, ¶ 5 (Sept. 19, 2011) (on file with author).

Several workers interviewed mentioned their need to send money home to families, though it was not a specific interview question. See Interview 14 (Aug. 31, 2012); Interview 18 (Sept. 16, 2012); Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012); Interview 25b (June/July 2012); see also infra, Methodology (providing a sample interview questionnaire).

See CENTRO DE LOS DERECHOS DEL MIGRANTE, INC., supra note 116, at 22. See Interview 2 (June 24, 2012); Interview 25b (Oct. 25, 2012); Sieff, supra note 69; see also S. POVERTY L. CIR., supra note 22, at 31.

See NAT’L GUESTWORKER ALLIANCE ET AL., supra note 51, at 17.

See David Weil & Amanda Pyles, Why Complain? Complaints, Compliance, and the Problem of Enforcement in the U.S. Workplace, 27 COMP. LAB. & POL’Y J. 59, 63-64 (2006) (describing the low-wage workers’ weighing of risks and benefits when deciding whether to complain about working conditions); also S. POVERTY L. CIR., supra note 22, at 31; see also 45 C.F.R. § 1626.6-1626.5 (2013); Interview 5 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker) (recounting when he was told he would be sent home if he complained); Interview 25b (Oct. 25, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

See supra, Part III, Wage and Hour Abuses, Inadequate Enforcement and Oversight (describing DOL enforcement efforts).


See Interview 1 (June 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

See Interview 7 (Aug. 24, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker). Another worker reports that their employer rarely covered work-related accidents, so the costs of medical care fall to the worker. See Interview 12 (Aug. 29, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

Interview 23 (Oct. 20, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

See Interview 25b (Oct. 25, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

Interview 16 (Sept. 13, 2012) (name has been changed to protect the identity of the worker).

The labor certification process is codified at 20 C.F.R. § 655, Subpart A.
The prevailing wage may be determined in one of two ways. One option is that employers may themselves assess the corresponding prevailing wage amount via the Occupational Information Network (O*NET). See O*NET Online, http://www.onetonline.org (last visited Jan. 18, 2013). Through the O*NET, the employer or labor contracting agent may determine the appropriate wage level commensurate with the experience and education expected of the employee and the position’s level of supervision. Alternatively, an employer or labor-contracting agent can obtain a prevailing wage determination (PWD) from the National Prevailing Wage Center by filing an Application for Prevailing Wage Determination (ETA Form 9142). Once issued, a PWD has a validity period of no less than 90 days and no more than one year, and must be valid either on the date recruitment begins or when an Application for Temporary Employment Certification (ETA Form 9142) is submitted. See H-2B Certification for Temporary Non-Agricultural Work, supra note 32.


H-2B Certification for Temporary Non-Agricultural Work, supra note 32.


H-2B Certification for Temporary Non-Agricultural Work, supra note 32. (questioning whether local advertising and unequal offers of transportation and housing benefits limit access of U.S. workers to H-2B positions).

H-2B Certification for Temporary Non-Agricultural Work, supra note 32.

Process for Filing, supra note 121.

ETA Form 9142, supra note 83.

See ETA Form 9142, APPENDIX B.1, supra note 245.

Process for Filing, supra note 121.

See H-2B Certification for Temporary Non-Agricultural Work, supra note 32.; see also OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GEN., supra note 157, at 1.

Process for Filing, supra note 121.


Process for Filing, supra note 121.
Temporary Worker Visas, supra note 410. Consular officers are advised that a “large majority of approved H petitions are valid” and are instructed to refer H petitions to USCIS for reconsideration only sparingly. See Foreign Affairs Manual, supra note 126, at N2.2.


OFLC Case Disclosure Data, supra note 48.


2012 Schedule, Bates Brothers Amusement Co., http://www.batesbros.com/Schedule.html (last visited Jan. 17, 2013) (The fair is divided into two different units, “Michelle’s Unit” and “Amy’s Unit,” and the two units meet up to work larger fairs and carnivals.).

Big O Amusements, http://www.bigoamusements.com/ (last visited Jan. 17, 2013) (During the summer months, the company operates in the northern U.S. and during the winter months, it operates in the southern U.S.).


More About Us, Casey’s Rides, http://www.caseysridesinc.com/more.htm (last visited Jan. 17, 2013) (Casey’s Rides operates mostly in Kentucky, however, it has been known to operate in Tennessee.).


Myers Internationals Midways 2012 Schedule, Myers Internationals Midways, http://www.myersmidways.com/fairlist.htm (last visited Jan. 17, 2013) (The fair is divided into two different units, the “Blue Unit” and “Gold Unit,” and the two units meet up to work larger fairs and carnivals).


Reithoffer Shows, supra note 103.


