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Overview of Hotline Data

• Over 2000 cases
  – December 2007 – December 2017

• Over 7800 potential victims described
  – Over 2200 individual victims logged
  – Over 2000 individual traffickers logged

• Nearly 4700 sites of exploitation identified
  – Cases reported in 44 U.S. states
  – Cases reported in 17 of 20 Latin American countries
  – No cases reported in Uruguay, Paraguay or Chile
Data Quality

Caller Proximity to Potential Victim

- Direct Contact: 42%
- Observation: 24%
- Victim Self-Report: 18%
- Indirect Contact: 16%
Callers

Top 10 Caller Types for STLA Cases

- Community Member: 652
- Potential Victim: 395
- Family Member of PV: 220
- Federal Law Enforcement: 165
- Local Law Enforcement: 143
- Friend of PV: 123
- NGO - Anti-Trafficking: 119
- Legal Professional: 108
- Government: 104
- NGO - General Social Services: 70
Response

• Over 2,300 referrals to critical service providers and government
• Nearly 900 cases reported to law enforcement (43%)
Victim and Survivor Demographics
Who Are the Victims?

Victim Demographics
- Women and girls from cities, rural towns, and high poverty regions in Mexico, Central America, and South America
- Minors often come without family members – 267 cases with UACs

Recruitment
- Deceived into romantic relationships, offered fake jobs, coerced by older family members, or approached by other victims

Trafficked into:
- Residential brothels
- Cantina bars and clubs
- Escort delivery services
- Personal sexual servitude or forced marriage
Potential Victim Demographics

Gender by Case (Non-cumulative)

- Female: 90%
- Male: 10%
- Transgender: 0%
Potential Victim Demographics

Adult/Minor at 1st Contact with Polaris
- Adult: 59%
- Minor: 34%
- Unknown: 7%

Adult/Minor at Start of Exploitation
- Adult: 43%
- Minor: 21%
- Unknown: 36%
Potential Victim Demographics

Age Ranges of Potential Victims at 1st Contact With Polaris
Minors from Latin America
• Often fleeing violence, poverty, and/or abuse
• Lured with fraudulent job offers or abducted on the journey to the U.S.
• May be sold to traffickers or into forced marriages in the U.S. by family members
• Most common access points are U.S. immigration officials and the Office of Refugee Resettlement

U.S. Latino Community
• Frequently recruited at high schools or by friends
• Gang involvement in recruitment is common
• Victims often have access to family members and phones and are dismissed as “runaways” by officials
• Common access points include family members, educators, law enforcement

More than half of hotline cases reference minor victims
Potential Victim Demographics

Region of PVs by Case

- Mexico: 612
- Central America: 511
- U.S.A.: 345
- South America: 247
- Caribbean: 136
- East & Southeast Asia: 69
- Eastern Europe: 32
- Other: 28
Potential Victim Demographics

Top Ten PV Nationalities

- Mexico: 497
- U.S.A.: 341
- Honduras: 158
- Guatemala: 139
- El Salvador: 126
- Colombia: 81
- Dominican Republic: 67
- Brazil: 57
- Cuba: 47
- Venezuela: 22
Recruitment Methods

- Familial: 512
- Smuggling-Related: 490
- Intimate Partner: 477
- Job Offer: 470
- False Promises/Fraud: 394
- Posing as Benefactor: 357
- Coercion: 348
- Abduction: 279
- Other: 147
Force, Fraud, and Coercion

- Isolation: 1858
- Potential Minor: 1745
- Economic: 1381
- Threat of Harm: 946
- Intimidation: 943
- Physical Abuse: 887
- Emotional Abuse: 862
- Sexual Abuse: 637
- Threat to Report to Authorities: 293
- Withholds Documents: 285
Access Points

- Friends/Family: 361
- Law Enforcement: 311
- Health Services: 159
- General Social Services: 159
- Potential Buyer of Commercial Sex: 141
- Mobile Apps/Social Media: 116
- Education: 82
- Child Welfare System: 72
- Other: 64
- Transportation: 58
Mexican Government Data - Victims (2010-2013)

Number of victims identified per state, 2010-2013

- Sinaloa: 1
- Durango: 1
- Coahuila: 2
- Morelos: 4
- Tamaulipas: 8
- Tabasco: 10
- Campeche: 17
- Querétaro: 27
- Guanajuato: 29
- Sonora: 30
- Hidalgo: 44
- Chihuahua: 46
- Oaxaca: 86
- Puebla: 122
- Baja California: 136
- Jalisco: 283

Polaris
Mexican Government Data on Victim Demographics (2010-2013)
Mexican Government Data – Victims (2010-2013)
Mexican Government Data on Victim Demographics (2010-2013)

Percentage of victims identified in Mexico by country of origin, ONC

- Mexico: 73%
- Unknown: 20%
- Latin America: 4%
- Eastern Europe: 2%
- Western Europe: 1%
Venues and business models
Ten Most Common STLA Venues

- Residence-Based: 383
- Bar/Club/Cantina: 245
- Escort/Delivery Service: 172
- Personal Sexual Servitude: 127
- Hotel-Based: 90
- Illicit Massage: 68
- Internet-Based: 58
- Pornography: 45
- Street-Based: 45
- Hostess/Strip Club: 39
Most Common Types of Location

- Residence: 673
- Business: 455
- Hotel/Motel: 192
- Internet: 182
- Street: 70
- Other: 58
- Farm: 29
- Truck Stop: 25
Overlap between venues

- Residential Brothels
- Cantinas
- Escort Services
- Personal Sexual Servitude
  - Cartels
  - Smuggling
  - Gangs

- Family networks
- Business owners
- Drivers
- Pimps
- Individuals
Residential Brothels – Prevalence in U.S. States
Residential Brothels – Operational Model

- ** Traffickers:** Typically Mexican traffickers; notably associated with Tlaxcala-based trafficking groups
- ** Victims:** Mexican and Central American; aged 16-35 typically, but some minors as young as 15, women as old as early 50s
- ** Recruitment:** romance method; other potential victims; job offers
- ** Marketing:**
  - Cater to Latino clientele almost exclusively
  - Advertise using tarjetas or Spanish-language newspapers; some word of mouth;
    - Some advertise as IMBs in newspapers
- ** Typical network structure:**
  - Recruiters and smugglers in Mexico
  - House managers in U.S. locations
    - Often female director, male controllers
  - Drivers
    - Usually junior network members; commercial driving services in some cities

Residential Brothels Case Study – Sacramento, CA

- FBI/local law enforcement took down 5 Latino residential brothels in Sacramento area; also linked to brothels in San Jose and the Bay area.
- **Victim demographics:** Most from Mexico (some from Tenancingo), some from Ecuador, Colombia, Guatemala; from poor/economically stressed backgrounds; 18-30
- **Operations:**
  1. Traffickers in Mexico would recruit women through promise of restaurant jobs, then smuggle them into the U.S.
  2. On arrival, women forced to work by threats to family in Mexico
  3. Women required to make quotas for trafficker: had agenda with addresses/phone numbers; required to schedule appointments to work; lived on premises while working; had their own cell phones; had to take care of transportation  - Apparent independence caused serious problems with establishing case
  4. House managers picked up food, condoms; house “protectors” oversaw, sometimes drove girls  - High volume times: morning (10am) then immediately after work day
Cantinas – Prevalence in U.S. States
Cantinas – Prevalence in the U.S.

• High prevalence in Houston, TX
  – Numerous federal cases prosecuted

• Other notable locations:
  – Atlanta, GA
  – Chicago, IL
  – Queens, NY
  – D.C. metropolitan area
  – Seattle, WA
  – Florida

• Operational model varies depending on location
Cantinas – Recruitment paths and sites of exploitation
• **Traffickers**: Mexican, Salvadoran, and Honduran rings most commonly seen.

• **Victims**: Latina victims, usually 16-late 20s

• **Recruitment**: fake job offer; smuggling-related; sometimes romance method

• **Marketing**:
  – Cater to Latino clientele (usually exclusively)
  – Advertise by word of mouth

• **Typical network structures**:
  – Trafficking business similar to residential brothels networks
  – “Legitimate” business where women are apparently independent of the establishment and directly controlled by pimps – owners can claim ignorance of trafficking
Cantina Case Study – Houston, TX

SIGN OF HUMAN SLAVERY
The Maria Bonita Cantina in 2005 was designed to conceal the sale and storage of women and girls used as sex slaves.
Variations on the cantina model

Houston-style cantinas
• Cantinas (Houston, Seattle, Atlanta)
• Casitas (LA area)
• “41 clubs” (Chicago)
  • Sling referring to the typical charge for customers: 20 for house, 20 for women (goes to pimps), 1 for linens

Latino bars/clubs
• Dance bars / bailarinas / “teibols” (NYC, Mexico)
• Salvadoran “restaurants” (DC area)
• Latino night clubs (DC/MD/NJ area)
• Latino strip clubs (FL)
Escort/Delivery Services

- Significant overlap with residential brothels
- **Locations:**
  - Residences
  - Hotels/motels
  - Mobile brothels
  - Agricultural worksites
- Houston-model cantinas also may run escort services instead of having commercial sex occur on the premises
  - Lower visibility to law enforcement
  - May rent out apartments for this purpose, bring PVs to hotels, or (rarely) send PVs home with customer
• **Traffickers**: Family, gang/cartel members, intimate partners
• **Victims**: Minors, women seeking to migrate
• **Recruitment**: Familial, abduction, some social media
  1. Family sells minor “bride” to a much older husband – rooted in cultural practices
  2. Women abducted, often while migrating, by cartel/gang members or coyotes
  3. Woman develops a relationship with a man living in the US via Facebook, dating site, etc.; PT pays for smuggling or visa but situation ends up being highly exploitative
Geography of Cases
STFM Cases: Dec 2007 – Jan 2017
## Sites by Country - Exploitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Exploitation</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sites by Country - Recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Exploitation</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sites by Mexican State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Province</th>
<th>Border Crossing</th>
<th>Exploitation</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Transitional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrito Federal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo Leon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queretaro</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Potosi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michoacan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Migration is the single biggest factor contributing to trafficking vulnerability for STLA cases.
Central American Migration Routes
Why is Migration So Dangerous?

• Cartels control key border crossings and transportation corridors
• Migrant smuggling gangs control the routes and pay taxes to cartels
  – Increased border control has led to the smuggling journey being “professionalized”
  – Fees for the journey are high and migrants are often in debt
• Drug traffickers and human traffickers specifically target migrants
• Migrants are less likely to report crimes to law enforcement since they fear being deported
• Migrants often have preexisting vulnerabilities:
  – Economic difficulties
  – History of domestic or other abuse
  – Fleeing violence
Human Trafficking Sites and Major Routes Associated With Latin America (2018)

- Major Recruitment Route (land or sea)
- Recruitment Route (air)
- Major Exploitation Route

Red dots indicate individual or massed sites of exploitation; Blue dots indicate recruitment sites; Green dots indicate actual or approximate sites of border crossings.
Length of Migration Journeys

HSI Research on Lengths of Smuggling Journeys:

- 19 days from Mexico
- If from Guatemala, add 14 days (33 days total)
- If El Salvador or Honduras, add four days (37 days total)
- If Nicaragua, add five days (42 days)
- If Costa Rica, add two days (44 days)
- If Panama add 22 days (66 days)
- If Colombia or Ecuador, add two days (68 days)
  – Colombia and Ecuador are major transit points for flows from Europe and Asia to the US
- There are fees at each border point.
Migration Drivers - Corruption
Latin America has the highest rates of income inequality of any region in the world.

- Latin America accounts for 11 out of 25 developing economies with the highest levels of income inequality.
- However, this has been improving for several decades and inequality continued to decline in 14 out of 16 countries in 2017.
Economic Crisis in Venezuela

• 2012-present: Venezuela has been the midst of a severe economic crisis featuring:
  – Massive debt
  – Food, medicine, and basic goods shortages
  – Rising crime rates
  – Increased political authoritarianism
Migration Drivers - Domestic Violence

Guatemala
- 5,015 cases of victim attention to women in 2011 in relation to the Law against Femicide and other forms of Violence against Women.
  - 33.3 cases per 100,000 inhabitants.
  - 13.7 cases per day.

Honduras
- 3,088 women were evaluated due to presenting signs of domestic violence in 2012, representing 16.7% of all cases legal medical evaluations.
  - 8.5 evaluations per day.
- 1,055 children were evaluated due to presenting signs of child abuse, at a rate of 2.9 evaluations per day.
  - Of these, girls represent 57.6% of the cases and boys 42.4%.

El Salvador
- 1,266 judicial reports were made for intra-family violence between June 2012 and May 2013.
  - 20.4 reports per 100,000 inhabitants.
  - 3.5 reports made per day.
  - 1,758 cases of attention to victims of intra-family violence.
  - 365 cases of attention to victims of gender violence.

Nicaragua
- 10,375 clinical reports emitted for intra-family violence in 2012, representing the second most frequent cause of clinical examination.
  - 59.6% committed against a partner.
  - 7.7% against an infant.
  - 2.1% against an elderly member of the family.
  - 170.9 per 100,000 inhabitants.
  - 28.4 reports emitted per day.

Costa Rica
- 4,902 cases were attended to by the Prosecutor for Sexual Crimes and Domestic Violence in 2012.
  - 104 cases per 100,000 inhabitants.
  - 13.4 cases per day.
  - 3,752 cases were entered.
  - 3,380 cases were processed/completed.

Panama
- 3,581 cases of domestic violence reported in 2012.
  - 94.5 per 100,000 inhabitants.
  - 9.8 cases reported per day.
Homicides in Mexico reached a 20 year high in 2017

- Over 29,000 homicides in 2017, higher than the previous record of over 27,000 in 2011
Violence in Mexico
Violence in the Northern Triangle

Figure 1
The homicide rate in the Northern Triangle is far higher than that in the United States
Homicides per 100,000 people, by country

- El Salvador: 60.0
- Honduras: 42.8
- Guatemala: 26.1
- United States: 5.3

Notes: The most recent data available for the United States are from 2016. Data for the Northern Triangle countries are from 2017.
Surveys of migrants and refugees carried out by Doctors Without Borders (MSF) in Mexico showed 39.2 percent cite attacks or threats to themselves or their families, extortion or forced recruitment into gangs as the main reasons for their flight.
Starting in April 2018, violent clashes between government security forces and protesters

- Government-backed security forces attacking citizens protesting the presidency of Daniel Ortega
- Over 300 killed, 800 injured in three months

Possibility of a migration spike:

- Early reports of long lines at migration offices
- Unclear how long violence will last
- Costa Rica and parts of South America are more popular destinations for migrants from Nicaragua than the U.S. is
Intercontinental Migration

Las rutas que llevan a EU

Migrantes ilegales de todo el mundo utilizan como trampolín Cuba, Colombia y Ecuador, entre otros países, para llegar a México y de ahí a Estados Unidos. El INM reportó más de 16 mil indocumentados de enero a marzo de 2011.

Somalíes
- Arriban a Dubai, luego a Emiratos Árabes, después a Moscú y al final Cuba; posteriormente van a Colombia, para terminar provisionalmente en territorio mexicano

Chinos
- Pagan entre 30 mil y 50 mil dólares para llegar a México. Vuelan desde Ecuador al DF, después son trasladados por tierra hasta a Tijuana

Hindúes
- Están exentos de visa para ingresar a Guatemala, donde se mezclan entre los ciudadanos centroamericanos para ingresar a México por Tapachula, Chiapas y continuar con su sueño americano

Nigerianos
- Se trasladan a Italia y España con pasaportes falsos. De ahí viajan en barco a Cuba, Colombia, Ecuador y/o Argentina, donde permanecen seis meses trabajando para juntar dinero, y continuar a México

Etiopes
- Salen desde Sudáfrica con pasaportes falsos hasta Brasil, donde no se pide visado a los sudaneses. Desde ese lugar viajan a Colombia para seguir hacia México

Fuente: ONG, ING, Servicio de Inmigración de Estados Unidos
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Major Hotspots City Level Analysis

*Houston, Los Angeles, and New York Sites Analyzed with Census Data*
Houston, TX

Median Household Income
Houston, TX
Per Capita Income
Houston, TX
Population Growth Percentage
Los Angeles, CA

Median Household Income
Los Angeles, CA

Population Growth Percentage
Los Angeles, CA
Hispanic or Latino Ancestry
New York, NY
Population Growth Percentage
New York, NY
Hispanic or Latino Ancestry
Traffickers, recruitment, and means of control
Trafficker Demographics - Hotline

Top Ten PT Nationalities

- Mexico: 382
- U.S.A.: 363
- Honduras: 91
- Guatemala: 56
- El Salvador: 49
- Dominican Republic: 49
- Colombia: 34
- Brazil: 22
- Cuba: 21
- Nicaragua: 13
Who Are the Traffickers?

**Trafficking as a business**
- Tenancingo traffickers and other human trafficking organized crime groups
- Some cartels (Zetas) and U.S.-based gangs (MS-13, Mexican Mafia)
  - Cartel/gang-controlled trafficking
- Non-Latino networks (Eastern European, Chinese, Japanese)

**Opportunistic traffickers**
- Most cartels and U.S.-based gangs
  - Cartel/gang-influenced trafficking
- Coyotes and human smugglers
- Family members and intimate partners
Who Are the Traffickers?

- Pimps
- Family Members
- Intimate Partners
- Gang Members
- Business Owners
- Recruiters
- Smugglers
- MS-13
- Other U.S. Street Gangs
- Tenancingo
- Other Crime Groups
- Los Zetas
- Most Cartels
- Gang Members
- Family Members
- Business Owners
- Opportunistic
- Organized
- Disorganized/Individualist
Organized crime involvement - Hotline

Top 15 Notable Organized Crime Groups by Case

- MS-13
- Mexican Mafia
- Los Zetas
- Tenancingo Networks
- Latin Kings
- Motorcycle Gangs
- Sureños
- Barrio 18
- White Supremacist Groups
- Nortenos
- Italian Mafia
- Sinaloa Cartel
- Russian Mafia
- Crips
- Bloods
Tlaxcala and other familial networks

- 5 of ICE’s 10 Most Wanted sex traffickers are from Tenancingo.
- Trafficking detected in 23 of Tlaxcala’s 60 municipalities in 2008; 35 of 60 by 2014.
  - Notably: Tenancingo, Axotla del Monte, San Pablo del Monte, Teolocholco, Acuamanala, Zacatelco
- *Padrotes or lenones* go to other states in Mexico to find vulnerable girls
  - Poor southern states of Chiapas, Oaxaca and Guerrero
  - Romance method of recruitment
  - Control methods: romance, then threats to family and children
- Movement of victims:
  - Place of origin to Tlaxcala
  - Trafficked in Tlaxcala and Puebla
  - Moved to more lucrative areas in Northern Mexico
  - Transported across the border into the U.S.
Recruitment methods

• Romance model: psychological deception and fake relationships
• Increasingly using other potential victims to befriend and recruit new girls.

Control methods

• Threats to family members
• Physical violence
• Psychological coercion
Known Tenancingo cases
Familial Trafficking

• Family members of potential victims, usually parents or much older siblings, either sell victims into trafficking situations or act as their controllers.
  – Frequently preceded by child sexual abuse, especially when family members are controllers.
  – Abuse may start in home country and continue after travel to the U.S.

• May also be forced marriage situations
  – Parent perceives this as an opportunity for profit and/or an opportunity for their child to have a better life with a wealthy spouse.
Recruitment Methods
- Years of childhood abuse (normalization of violence)
- Forced marriage
- Fraud
- Posing as benefactors

Control Methods
- Manipulation of young children/teenagers by older family members
- Sexual/physical abuse
- Cultural expectations (especially surrounding forced marriages)
- Relocation or forced migration
- Provision with shelter, food, etc.
• **Involvement:**
  – Control many smuggling routes, including all US-Mexico border crossings
  – Extort local taxi services, strip clubs, cantina bars, massage parlors, pimps
  – Sometimes directly involved: members will also kidnap women and girls for personal sexual and domestic servitude
    • Los Zetas, notably
    • Commercial element often less evident
    • Victims typically killed when no longer useful

• **Venues:** Personal sexual servitude, domestic servitude
Gangs

• **Involvement:**
  – Notably: MS-13, Mexican Mafia (La Eme), Sureños X3, Latin Kings, Barrio 18
  – Trafficking activities unlikely to be highly organized or networked beyond individual cells – MS-13 is an exception
  – Traffickers from different gangs may cooperate
  – More likely to be directly involved in trafficking in the US than cartels

• **Venues:** Frequently involved in trafficking in residential brothels and cantinas
Gang involvement in LST

Gang-influenced trafficking

- Traffickers are gang members and use gang affiliations to intimidate PVs
- “Retirement plan” for gang members
  - Safer than drug trafficking
- Traffickers may cooperate with members of other gangs
- More common than gang-controlled trafficking

Gang-controlled trafficking

- Gangs directly control trafficking activities through the gang hierarchy
- Less common
  - MS-13 in D.C. /Northern VA
  - San Diego cases
Recruitment methods

- Kidnapping
- Fake job offer
- Smuggling turns into trafficking
- Occasional connections to familial trafficking

Control methods

- Threats to family members
- Threats of physical violence and actual violence
  - Large number of murders linked to cartels in Mexico
  - US gang members threaten repercussions from other gang members if PV escapes to another city
- Debt bondage
Coyotes and Human Smugglers

• Types of involvement:
  – **Organized trafficker-smugglers**: Smugglers in the human trafficking business; will often work both in recruiting and smuggling (typically on border regions)
  – **Suppliers**: Transport victims across border, where they are handed off to individual traffickers and/or human trafficking organizations (throughout U.S.)
  – **Opportunistic traffickers**: Not regularly involved in trafficking, but will traffic clients who cannot pay smuggling fee
  – **Gang affiliations**: Some gangs directly engage in human smuggling, others may act as enforcers to ensure that smuggled individuals are compliant in paying off their debts to smugglers.

• **Venues**: various, depending on type of involvement
Human Smuggling Economics

Smugglers probably charge around $4,000 to $10,000 to move Central Americans to the U.S.

Payments include:

- Guide who makes the trip: $500-$600
- Boatmen at Mexico's southern border: $1.50 to cross Suchiate River from Guatemala
- Lodging: $11.50 a room, which can hold many migrants
- Central American gang: At least $100 per migrant to board Mexican freight train known as La Bestia or The Beast
- Mexican police and immigration officials: $230 to $540 to pass; $25 to $40 a person to free detained migrant
- Drug cartels: $250 to $300 for Mexican migrant, $500 to $700 for Central American, about $1,500 for someone from Europe or Asia, plus 10 percent flat fee per smuggler to cross northern Mexico to U.S. border
- Boatmen at Mexico's northern border: $100 per immigrant to cross Rio Grande into U.S.
- Drivers: $150 for ride from Rio Grande to stash house; $200 for ride north of Border Patrol's highway checkpoint to Houston
- Caretaker at stash house: $20 per person per day
Recruitment methods

- Promises of safe passage to the USA or Mexico
  - Sometimes to other Central American states
- Sometimes kidnap migrants en route or at destination

Control methods

- Threats to family members
- Debt bondage
- Physical violence
Non-Latino networks

• Involvement:
  – Chinese, Ukrainian, Russian, Cuban traffickers
  – Highly likely to be organized crime networks

• Venues: Typically operating in resort areas – brothels and massage parlors

• PVs mostly from Eastern Europe, Argentina, Brazil or Cuba
  – Can bring as much as $2,000 in Mexico, compared to $15 for local women
Recruitment methods

• Job offers
  – Usually modeling or aide jobs

Control methods

• Living quarters provided by traffickers
• Documents confiscated
• Surveillance by traffickers
  – Large number of murders
Mexican Government Data – Arrests (2010-2013)

Number of arrests per state, 2010-2013

- Zacatecas: 3
- Sinaloa: 4
- Durango: 6
- Baja California Sur: 7
- Morelos: 8
- Aguascalientes: 10
- Tamaulipas: 17
- Jalisco: 20
- Campeche: 20
- Sonora: 72
- Querétaro: 34
- Tabasco: 74
Mexican Government Data – Prosecutions (2010-2013)

Number of human trafficking cases opened compared to number of convictions per state, 2010-2013

- Tlaxcala: 31 cases opened, 7 convictions
- Baja California: 31 cases opened
- Tabasco: 13 cases opened, 4 convictions
- Querétaro: 8 cases opened, 1 conviction
- Chihuahua: 6 cases opened, 2 convictions
- Tamaulipas: 3 cases opened, 3 convictions
- Campeche: 2 cases opened
- Zacatecas: 3 cases opened
- Sinaloa: 2 cases opened
- Jalisco: 3 cases opened

Legend:
- Number of cases opened
- Number of convictions