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ABSTRACT

A globally integrated economy is one of the most prominent features of globalization and how city stakeholders respond to the global economy varies from city to city. Connecting to the global economy is often portrayed to be necessary for the continued economic development of a metropolitan area. Large transportation infrastructures such as airports represent one of the most visible ways of connecting to the global economy. Decisions made by city stakeholders regarding airports in order to reposition their city in the global economy have profound consequences for its residents. This thesis aims to examine the role played by air transportation in the processes of globalization present in Tampa Bay, Florida, and focuses specifically on investigating the following research questions:

1) What vision of Tampa Bay is driving the economic development plans of stakeholders of Tampa International Airport and St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport?
2) What understanding of globalization do Tampa Bay economic development and air transportation stakeholders have?
3) How does air transportation fit into the economic development plans of Tampa Bay stakeholders and how will each airport play a part?

To answer these questions, this thesis uses a qualitative research approach that relies on open-ended, in-depth interviews and artifact review as the methods of data collection. Interviews were conducted with representatives of transportation facilities, government economic development entities, non-profit economic development
organizations, and private business interests. These interviews focused on the themes of visions of a future Tampa Bay, stakeholder understandings of globalization, stakeholder perceptions of space-time, and ultimately how air transportation assets in Tampa Bay may or may not be used in the economic development process as a response to the global economy.

The results reveal that Tampa Bay stakeholders largely share in a vision of a future Tampa Bay but are not in as much agreement on how to achieve this vision, particularly regarding air transportation. Governance structure is found to be one of the greatest challenges associated with stakeholders’ response to the global economy. The subject of governance structure in this case study is tied to changing perceptions of space-time, brought about by the pressures of a global economy, which in the minds of stakeholders requires one to do more with less in order to compete in the global economy. The findings provide important insights on how Tampa Bay stakeholders use air transportation in the process of economic development as a response to the global economy.
1 INTRODUCTION

Globalization is a process that covers many dimensions: economic, political, cultural, and ideological (Steger 2003). Globalization poses new landscapes for cities as they continue to develop and how cities address these changing landscapes can vary from city to city. One of the most prominent features of the economic dimension of globalization is a globally integrated economy. Connecting to the global economy is often portrayed to be necessary for the continued economic development of a metropolitan area. As cities decide how to continue their economic development, their stakeholders must decide whether and how to reposition their city in the global economy.

Air transportation has been documented to be an effective method of connecting to the global economy and is often put forth as proof of globalization (Adey et al. 2007; Sassen 2002). The existence of capital-intensive air transportation infrastructures and networks is often referred to as one of the manifestations of globalization. These infrastructures and the networks they form provide humans with extensive capabilities to rapidly move themselves and material throughout the world, which in turn allows for the development and maintenance of additional global processes.

The ways in which these global infrastructures are used to reposition cities in a globally connected economy can have profound consequences for the residents of the city and the city as a whole. These consequences include a local interface to global processes, the quality of residents’ everyday life, and economic opportunities available to residents
of the city. Air transportation is a good example of a local to global interface because it is a physical link to the outside world. The ease with which one can connect through this link to the outside world determines the number and nature of opportunities that are available to the city and to the residents of the city. How a city chooses to structure its local circuits of transportation and how these local circuits integrate into global circuits of transportation strongly influences how resources are distributed to the residents of a city. If global transportation processes are not well integrated into the local mobility, then local residents are relegated to local processes and are bypassed by global mobilities. This condition highlights the social justice aspect of global transportation infrastructures. Decisions regarding these infrastructures are likely to indicate, for example, who the decision makers are in the city (or outside the city in certain cases) and who benefits the most from the connections to the outside world and whether they are local to the city or remote beneficiaries.

Globalization is a phenomenon that has world-wide acceptance as a process that exists but is constantly changing. Thus, a universally accepted definition has not been established and there are multiple viewpoints on what globalization means. These different viewpoints illustrate the multi-dimensionality of globalization. It is often portrayed as an economic phenomenon and this aspect of globalization gets much of the attention in the topic of globalization in the media and popular literature. For example, both the news magazine *U.S. News and World Report* (2011) and the newspaper *The Wall Street Journal* (2011) contain a globalization section in their publication and economic issues represent the subject of many articles in these sections. However, upon further examination one can find evidence that the processes of globalization involve the
political, social, and environmental realms. One’s understanding of globalization is critical in how one defines globalization. One’s involvement in the various dimensions of globalization, awareness of the processes that exist within these dimensions and awareness of the reciprocal relationship between these dimensions largely determines one’s stance on globalization. In other words, there is a large mental component to globalization that must be taken into account.

Much research has shown that perception of space and time is an inherent part of globalization (Steger 2005; Held 1999; Scholte 2005). This is evident in the vernacular in comments like the world is smaller today than it used to be or time passes much quicker today that it used to. While geographic space is still measured using the same measurement standards that have existed for centuries and can be shown to be the same size as before contemporary globalization began, social space is another matter. People’s perception of space and time are changing due to communication and transportation technologies. These technologies allow people to experience the world in different ways and these experiences lead to the “re-production” of space that has tangible differences and uneven effects across populations.

One of the tangible effects of the “re-production” of social space is the pressure that the processes of globalization are putting on the system of nation-states. Communication and transportation technologies have enabled processes of globalization that allow individuals and entities such as corporations, non-governmental organizations, and social justice groups in many cases to operate outside the structure of the nation-state. This activity is challenging the authority of nation-states and the subordinate governmental structures contained within them. This governance structure is often at
odds with the flows of capital, political activity, and social engagement that define globalization. Political entities such as cities and the various municipalities, economic development groups, and business groups that make up cities and the regions in which they are located are still figuring out how to respond to the challenges of globalization. This response is the continually developing “re-production” of social space.

Tampa Bay is a coastal metropolitan area on the west central coast of Florida. Officially, this area is defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget as the Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) and comprises the following counties: Hernando, Hillsborough, Pasco, and Pinellas (U.S. Office of Management and Budget 2009, 51). However, other definitions of Tampa Bay often include additional counties such as Polk, Manatee, and DeSoto depending on who is making the reference. As described earlier, the Tampa Bay area is actively working through the issues presented by globalization. Tampa Bay contains dozens of municipalities and several densely populated counties such as Hillsborough, Pinellas, and Manatee. Thus, questions presented by globalization that include issues of space-time awareness, transportation, and governance structures are very relevant to this urban area. Tampa Bay stakeholders are facing the question of how to respond to the global economy. These stakeholders must decide if or how they are going to respond to the global economy. If they choose to respond to the global economy they must decide how they are going to use the air transportation infrastructure of Tampa Bay in their response. They must also decide how they are going to address issues of governance structure as they deal with the stress that globalization puts on current political boundaries and
governance structures. Both of these decisions involve issues of space-time awareness whether stakeholders realize it or not.

The decisions that stakeholders make in response to the conditions of globalization will have a profound impact on the residents of Tampa Bay. The effects of the response will be varied and unevenly distributed across the population. Decisions regarding transportation infrastructures are one of the visible tangible responses that stakeholders will make, particularly with air transportation. Airports are very expensive and occupy large amounts of space, but they bridge the local flows of transportation within a metropolitan area to the global flows of transportation. This means that decisions regarding the development of the airports in Tampa Bay will influence how those within Tampa Bay will be able to access the outside world and those outside of Tampa Bay will be able to access Tampa Bay.

My thesis aims to examine the role played by air transportation in the processes of globalization that are present in Tampa Bay. More specifically, my research focuses on investigating the following questions based on a case study of Tampa Bay:

1) What vision of Tampa Bay is driving the economic development plans of stakeholders of Tampa International Airport and St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport?

2) What understanding of globalization do Tampa Bay economic development and air transportation stakeholders have?

3) How does air transportation fit into the economic development plans of Tampa Bay stakeholders and how will each airport play a part?
The answers to these research questions demonstrate how the stakeholders of Tampa Bay are responding to the changing landscapes brought about by globalization, specifically their decisions regarding air transportation. This thesis documents how stakeholders are imagining the continued economic development of Tampa Bay in a globally connected economy and which air transportation assets in Tampa Bay are a part of this image. By analyzing the visions that stakeholders have of Tampa Bay and how air transportation fits into these visions, I have constructed a picture of how air transportation is being used in Tampa Bay to support economic development.
2 LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides a review of the academic literature that describes the theories, methods, and research frameworks which are pertinent to my research topic and inform my research questions. The relevant themes include global cities, globalization, social space, space-time awareness, and transportation geography. Each of these themes are described and discussed in detail below.

2.1 Geographies of Globalization

This section focuses on several aspects of globalization: global cities, globalization ideologies, awareness of globalization, social space, and space-time awareness. These themes are fundamental to this thesis research because they provide the theoretical context for the case study.

2.1.1 Global Cities

According to Friedman’s article titled The World City Hypothesis (1986), the study of global cities was formalized by Harvey (1972) and Castells (1973) when they linked the formation of cities to the “larger historical movement of industrial capitalism” (Friedman 1995, 317). This implies that cities came to be seen as products of economic development forces. Since then, the study of cities has been extended to link the formation of cities to the development of the global economy (Browning and Roberts 1980; Cohen 1981; Portes and Walton 1981; Friedmann and Wolff 1982; Walton 1982; Soja, Morales and Wolff 1983; Ross and Trachte 1983; Thrift 1984; Hill and Feagin 1984; Glickman 1984; and Sassen-Koob 1986). As the global economy has developed,
many cities have established themselves as important centers of production in the global economy. Friedman listed a series of statements that he refers to collectively as “the world city hypothesis” (1995; 317). This hypothesis provides a framework for investigating how labor has been organized across the globe as part of the global economy. The statements that comprise Friedman’s world city hypothesis are detailed below:

1) The form and extent of a city’s integration with the world economy, and the function assigned to the city in the new spatial division of labour, will be decisive for any structural changes occurring within it.

2) Key cities throughout the world are used by global capital as ‘basing points’ in the spatial organization and articulation of production and markets.

3) The global control functions of world cities are reflected in the structure and dynamics of their production sectors and employment.

4) World cities are major sites for the concentration and accumulation of international capital.

5) World cities are points of destination for large number of both domestic and/or international migrants.

6) World city formation brings into focus the major contradictions of industrial capitalism – among them spatial and class polarization.

7) World city growth generates social costs at rates that tend to exceed the fiscal capacity of the state.

Several important considerations associated with these statements are relevant to this thesis. In his first statement, Friedman defines a city in an economic sense. The city is a “spatially integrated economic and social system at a given location or metropolitan region” (318). The form and extent of a city’s integration with the global economy are unique to a city and influence a city’s economic development because structural changes
to a city are largely determined by the specialized function it performs in the global economy. In his second statement, Friedman points out the formal links which involve capital, labor, and commodities that connect the urban economy to the global economy. These links are what position the city in the hierarchy of cities within the global economy.

In his sixth statement, Friedman takes note of the social impact of the formation of a world city. This formation generates an uneven distribution of wealth, income, and power. This polarization occurs at three scales according to Friedman. The first is at the global level which includes a select number of countries and cities within these countries that comprise the core of the global economy. The second level on the scale is the region within a country. There is less inequality of wealth within countries that are at the core of the global economy than there is within countries that are on the periphery of the global economy. The third scale is metropolitan. World cities experience a large gap in income between those who operate at the top tiers of the global economy compared to low-skilled workers in the city.

Friedman’s seventh and final statement of his world city hypothesis comments on the inability of a world city to sustain the burden that participation in the world economy places on the city. The large number of low-income migrants in world cities generates a large need for services such as education, housing, health, transportation, and welfare. Despite the accumulation of capital in world cities, the population of low-income residents typically receives a disproportionate share of the capital which often is diverted to those with the political power to direct the capital to their benefit.
2.1.2 Globalization

Globalization is not a universally defined concept, but is often described in terms of processes and interactions that span the globe and cross long established territorial and social boundaries. In the words of Jan Scholte (2005), globalization can be identified by “the spread of trans-planetary connections between people” (Scholte 2005, 424). In his book Globalization: A Very Short Introduction (2003) Manfred Steger describes the scope of globalization by writing that “[t]he ‘local’ and the ‘global’ form the endpoints of the spatial continuum whose central portion is marked by the ‘national’ and the ‘regional’” (Steger 2003, 11). There has been much attention given to the intensity of globalization in recent decades. Steger observes that “[i]ndeed, the tensions of particularism and those of universalism have reached unprecedented levels only because interdependencies that connect the local to the global have been growing faster than at any time in history” (Steger 2003, 6).

The ideas of globalization that I am going to utilize in my research are those of Roland Robertson, Manfred Steger, and Rob Watts. Robertson posits that globalization is a mental as well as a material condition (Steger 2002, 37). Robertson’s focus on the mental is, I propose, a fundamental aspect to understanding globalization. Steger also notes the part that one’s awareness plays in globalization: “As Roland Robertson notes in his definition, globalization processes also involve the subjective plane of human consciousness” (Steger 2003, 12). Robertson and Inglis (2006) describe how global awareness predates modernity. They provide examples of subjective awareness of the world as a whole as far back as the centuries preceding the Common Era. This leads to the question then that if a subjective awareness of the global whole can be documented
prior to the period which is commonly referred to as contemporary globalization, what then is different about global awareness in the period of contemporary globalization?

Manfred Steger, in his book *Globalism: The New Market Ideology*, defines globalization as “a set of complex, sometimes contradictory, social processes that are changing our current social condition based on the modern system of independent nation-states” (Steger 2002, 3). He distinguishes the process of globalization from the conditions that these processes create by using the term ‘globality’ to refer to these conditions. Further, Steger posits that globalization as a concept can be considered an ideology. Steger calls the ideology of globalization globalism. He writes that globalism is used by proponents of globalization processes to perpetuate the processes in which they have a vested interest. In his updated version of his 2002 work he proposes that there are now three ideologies based on globalization.

In this updated book *Globalisms*, Steger proposes that the neo-liberal view of globalization, which he calls “Market Globalism”, has been the dominate ideology of globalization (Steger 2009, 4). According to Steger, this ideology has morphed into what Steger calls Imperial Globalism. In Imperial Globalism, the threat or actual use of military force is used to enforce the maintenance and expansion of Market Globalism. Steger posits that this has happened because since the terrorist attacks of 9-11 the U.S. has used the idea of democracy and open markets as goals of the war on terror. Steger proposes the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan as examples.

Watts’s (2000) case study on the processes of globalization (2000) provides an excellent example of how an individual’s awareness influences the processes of globalization. It shows that there are decisions to be made in the processes of
globalization and the outcome is not a foregone conclusion, which Steger points out is a common claim of globalization. Watts asks if those who deregulated the Australian dollar were forced to act that way because of the new reality of globalization, or if they had a choice in the matter.

2.1.3 Social Space

David Harvey first proposed the term ‘time-space compression’ in 1989 (Gregory 2009, 757) to illustrate the effect of capital accumulation on the global “space-economy”. Harvey used ‘time-space compression’ to refer to the increase in speed of social life and the reduction of effects of distance on social life. Harvey tied this concept to the development of the economic system of capitalism. Over time, capitalism can be associated with an increase in the pace of life that results in the perception that “the world sometimes seems to collapse in upon us” (Gregory 2009, 757). Harvey has responded to criticism that the experience of time-space compression is not evenly experienced by concluding that an increase of speed and a reduction of effects of distance on social life is not experienced the same across all locations and by all people.

2.1.4 Space-Time Awareness

Awareness of space and time is fundamental to understanding the phenomenon of globalization. Many definitions of globalization refer to reconfiguration of space and time. For example, Steger (2005) states that one of the central factors of globalism is that it is “about the unprecedented compression of space and time as a result of political, economic, and cultural change, as well as powerful technological innovations” (Steger 2005, 13). According to Held (1999), “globalization can be thought of as a process (or a set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization or social
relations and transactions – assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity, and impact – generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power” (Held 1999, 16). Scholte (2005) states that “contemporary globalization has gone to the heart of conceptions of time as well as space” (Held 1999, 268). These statements make it clear that a serious inquiry into globalization must address the subject of space and time.

To explore this subject I am going to utilize the ideas of space and time, as suggested by Doreen Massey and Henri Lefebvre, to guide my research. Acknowledging a reconfiguration of space and time referred to in the statements above, the two questions one must ask are: (1) what has space and time been reconfigured from, and (2) into what have these been reconfigured? Massey offers two ideas of space and time that are applicable to my research. These comprise definitions of space and time, and the idea that space and time cannot be considered separately. In her lecture at the Open University (2006), Massey promoted the idea of space as the dimension of things and people existing at the same moment. She said that this dimension then presents us with the existence of others and it poses the basic of social and political questions: “how are we going to live together?” (2006). Massey proposed that this diversity is being reworked as a result of globalization. As for time, Massey said that it is the dimension of change which she contrasts with space as being the dimension of simultaneity (2006). In another article, Massey (1999) ties these definitions of space and time together by writing that “entities and space-time as being constituted in the same moment and as that in itself happening through the relational constitution of them both” (Massey 1999, 263). Massey supports a subject based idea of time and space. She refers to the work of Raper and
Livingstone (1995) to support this claim by stating that space and time are “dimensions that are defined by the entities that inhabit them and not vice versa” (Massey 1999, 262). A second idea that Massey proposes in this work is the consideration of space and time together. Again, Massey refers to Raper and Livingstone’s work to provide the insight that we can think of space and time as a four-dimensional reference system that is unique to each entity’s world.

Lefebvre (1991) provides a historical review to describe the philosophical evolution of space in Western thought. He states that the ideas of space evolved through several centuries based on the ideas of philosophers such as Aristotle, Rene Descartes, and Emanuel Kant. Aristotle proposed that space and time were among the categories which facilitated the naming and classifying of evidence of the senses. Descartes moved space from the subject to the object by proposing that space contains all senses and all bodies. Kant moved the idea of space back to that of the subject by adding space as a dimension of the consciousness. Although this was a step back towards the idea of classification held by Aristotle, Kant made an important change by separating time from space. This split has persisted to the present.

Lefebvre (1991), like Massey, reunites space and time. So, when Lefebvre writes of space he is also writing of time, or rather space-time. Lefebvre describes space-time in three basic forms: mental space, natural space, and social space. Mental space is how we as humans conceive of space. It is the logic we assign to space. Natural space is the physical that we can perceive through our senses. Social space is something that is secreted by social life. It is unique to the entities that are doing the living. The gaps
between these different conceptions of space-time are what Lefebvre attempts to bridge in his work *The Production of Space* (1991).

Lefebvre posits that what he calls social space is space created by social life. To support this idea, Lefebvre proposes three concepts: (1) spatial practice, (2) representations of space, and (3) representational space. Spatial practice is the process whereby a society creates its own social space. Representations of space are conceptualized spaces. These representations are the spaces of those who identify what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived. This includes planners, urbanists, technocrats, and social engineers. Representational spaces are spaces that are directly lived through associated images and symbols, and hence the space of inhabitants and users. It is through these processes that Lefebvre proposes that social space can be analyzed and explained.

Lefebvre’s description of what he refers to as social space serves as a fundamental reason why we are experiencing the phenomenon of globalization. According to Lefebvre, the “forces of production and technology now permit an intervention at every level of space: local, regional, national, worldwide” (Lefebvre 1991, 90). Lefebvre writes that these forces of production and technology lead to new productions of space. It is these new productions of space (and time because we are talking about space-time) that stakeholders of globalization are observing when they make statements like the world is getting smaller, and I don’t have as much time as I used to, or the world is much faster today than it used to be.
2.2 Transportation Geography

Transportation geography involves the study of movement, particularly how people move themselves, as well as goods and services through space. This includes transport systems themselves and the impact of transportation on societies. The analysis of transport systems focuses on the geography of infrastructures that comprise the transport systems and why they were built the way they are, while the study of impacts on societies focuses on the social, cultural, and environmental impacts of these transportation systems (Shaw et al. 2008) and (Black 2003). In order to inform my research questions, I have identified and reviewed the literature which encompasses four themes from transportation geography that are relevant to my thesis. These comprise globalization, space-time, economic development, and the mobilities paradigm.

The literature on transportation geography addresses the subjects of globalization and space-time reconfiguration. Transportation plays a fundamental role in globalization and is responsible for the reconfiguration of space-time. Regarding globalization, Shaw et al. (2008) cite Hoyle and Knowles (1998) to point out “that greater levels of mobility are an attribute of an increasingly globalized world space economy” (Shaw 2008, 3). Transportation includes many modes such as air, road, rail, and sea. All of these modes contribute to the mobility that enables globalization, as documented by Rodrigue et al. (2009). They write that “economic opportunities became global in scale and scope, particularly because of the capacity to maintain an intricate network of trade and transactions through transport systems” (Rodrique at al. 86).

While mobility makes many processes of globalization possible, this relationship is not unidirectional. Once established, the processes of globalization that transportation
helped to make possible support the further development of the same transportation networks that made them possible in the first place. In other words, transportation is an enabler and a manifestation of globalization. This reciprocity has been noted by many, but Graham and Goetz (2008) put it simply by stating that “globalization would simply not be possible without air transportation”. Then subsequently note that “the airline industry would be much less significant without concomitant global expansion” (Graham and Goetz 2008, 141).

Having established that transportation is highly integrated with globalization, we can turn to Keeling (2007, 2008, 2009) who describes how transportation is present in local, regional, and global contexts. Using Keeling’s work to summarize the relationship between transportation and globalization is to link the local and the global through the regional. Keeling (2009) states that “from a practical standpoint the demand for, and supply of, transportation is always grounded in the local” (Keeling 2009, 516). Thus, for examining transportation’s role in globalization, it is necessary to rethink the local within the context of the global. Keeling (2008) theorizes that the region is the bridge between the local and the global by writing that “it is the region that provides meaningful connections between the global and the local” (Keeling 2008, 275).

Transportation is involved with the reconfiguration of space and time directly and as a manifestation of globalization. A common theme in transportation geography is how transportation is responsible for influencing a reconfiguration of space-time (Graham 2000; Grubesic et al. 2009; Adey et al. 2007; Sheller and Urry 2006; L’Hostis 2009). The most common way that transportation is described to reconfigure space and time is through the shortening of distances between locations and the time taken to travel
between locations. This is often described as a collapse of space-time. However, this collapse is not evenly distributed. Knowles (2006) argues that there is a differential aspect to it because not everyone has equal access to transportation. Thus, the effects on the practical and perceived reconfigurations of space-time are not evenly distributed. Knowles explains this uneven distribution by noting that “transport innovations benefit advanced economies most, especially those countries and areas that are centrally located in relation to the world’s trade flows” (Knowles 2006, 416).

Another consequence noted by Knowles that results from a differential collapse of space-time is that the world has shrunken unevenly into a “misshapen world in travel time” (Knowles 2006, 420). A result of this change is that economies and societies have become more intermeshed and interdependent. In contrast to this convergence of space-time, people are moving farther apart. Knowles writes that “social exclusion limits the access of individuals to transport modes and services and consequently to activity sites” (Knowles 2006, 420). Knowles attributes this to “unequal investment in modal capacity, routes and terminals at local, national and international scales. This tends to enhance the importance of the largest demand centres in developed countries and of nodal centrality and intermediacy” (Knowles 2006, 423).

2.2.1 Economic Development

Transportation, especially air transportation, is a fundamental element of economic development. Since producers of goods and services are not usually in the same location as those who demand their goods and services, transportation is necessary to bring the producers and consumers together. The question of what transportation infrastructures are necessary thus becomes an important question for cities as they decide
how they are going to situate themselves in the regional, national, and global economy. My research focuses specifically on air transportation in Tampa Bay. To investigate the importance of air transportation in Tampa Bay, I have made inquiries as to the appropriateness of air transport in the current efforts to reposition Tampa Bay in the regional, national, and global economies. In other words, if air transportation is emphasized, then why is it being emphasized now and why in Tampa Bay?

This is an important question for cities, because transportation has a tangible effect on the economic conditions of a city. Keeling (2007) describes this as “those regions and places that are better endowed with transportation have fared better overall, as measured by macroeconomic statistics of development, than those that are poorly equipped” (Keeling 2007, 217). Just as transportation can benefit a city, the absence of transportation can have the opposite effect. Rodrigue et al. (2009, 83) conclude that “when transport systems are deficient, they can have an economic cost in terms of reduced or missed opportunities.” There are many modes of transportation and no single mode can be used to universally explain economic growth. Rodrigue et al. (2009, 85) point out that “it has been observed that throughout history no single transport mode has been solely responsible for economic growth. Instead, modes have been linked with the direction and the geographical setting in which growth was taking place.”

Air travel is a specific type of mobility that plays a prominent role in the processes of globalization. Adey et al. (2007) apply the mobilities paradigm as described by Sheller and Urry (2006) and Cresswell (2006) to air travel. Sheller and Urry use the term “mobilities paradigm” to refer to the increased influence of the movement of people and goods in networks on shaping social ties. By applying the mobilities paradigm to air
travel, Adey et al. (2007) propose that air travel is socially produced and consumed. Both Adey et al. and Sassen (2002) point out that air travel is the dominant method of international travel. To underscore this phenomenon, Adey et al. use the term aeromobility to refer to the use of air transport.

The notion of social justice is present in the mobilities paradigm in general, and in the concept of aeromobility, in particular. Technologies such as large volume air transportation infrastructures require large amounts of resources to build and maintain, and the capability to do this varies across nations and cities. Furthermore, the groups that have access to use these infrastructures once they have been built also vary. L’Hostis (2009) and Knowles (2006) state that as certain locations are connected by high-speed air travel, they gain advantages which the locations that are not being connected do not realize. This is because the places that are located between the connected locations are being excluded to varying degrees from the wider world.

Large air travel infrastructures are a visible point of power and pride for cities that can afford them (Adey et al. 2007). This includes the number of direct international flights from a city and the volume of passenger and flight traffic handled by a city’s airport. It is not uncommon for a city to include its airport and air travel connections with the rest of the world as evidence of their world city status (Sassen 2002). The status of a city is important to note because airports are city resources and greatly facilitate city stakeholders’ efforts to promote economic development for their city. To demonstrate this point, Grubesic et al. (2009) indicate that air travel can be representative of a city in the hierarchy of world cities which Sassen (2002) reiterates in her work. This status is not static, however, because cities are subject to local, regional, and global events and
dynamics that cause fluctuations in an airport’s place in the hierarchy of the global airport network (Grubesic et al. 2009).

Graham (2000) writes of the construction of network spaces as premium spaces for the privileged. He elaborates by describing the process by which these premium spaces are constructed. These “premium network spaces are the results of the strategies of coalitions of interests within the contested and highly complex geopolitical and governance contexts of their respective cities” (Graham 2000, 186). Graham continues by stating that these efforts at seceding from the wider metropolitan context are not guaranteed. They are countered by other social movements, protests, and regulatory and governance processes. The consequence is a mixture of the effort to withdraw into a premium network space and that which works to disallow or dismantle the premium network space.

2.2.2 Case Studies on Air Transportation

The transportation geography literature includes a number of case studies that have used qualitative and quantitative methods to explore air transportation, its social and cultural impacts, and its use in economic development. Three empirical studies relevant to my research have been conducted in the city of Toronto, Canada (Keil and Young 2008); the Sanford, Florida airport (Vowels and Mertens 2005); and the city and airports of Berlin, Germany (Alberts et al. 2009). Each of these studies provide a picture of how the stakeholders in the subject city have approached economic development and how they have used transportation in repositioning their city in the regional, national, and global economies.
Keil and Young (2008) have concluded that transportation is a bottleneck that is preventing continued globalization of the region in which Toronto is located. The reason offered by the authors is that there is a “disconnect between premium and everyday networks of transport in Toronto” (Keil and Young 2008, 749). Additionally, there is no collective actor that appears capable or willing to bridge this disconnect. The primary reason for the lack of a collective actor is that there is a contradiction between the use value and the exchange value of transportation in the region. This means there is a contradiction “between the quality of life of people as they travel in and through the region and the efficient movement of commodities in and through the region” (Keil and Young 2008, 732). Until this disconnect is addressed, Keil and Young conclude that Toronto will be unable to move past the current bottleneck and realize additional economic benefit from globalization.

Vowel and Mertens (2005) have explored the international airport in Sanford, Florida, to understand how the stakeholders have repositioned their airport. The stakeholders of Sanford International Airport (SFB) have decided to market the airport as a destination for foreign charters. SFB is located in the metropolitan area of Orlando, Florida, which is served by Orlando International Airport (MCO) and is a large domestic and international tourist destination. Over time and through focused development efforts, the stakeholders of SFB have turned it into the largest U.S. gateway for charter passengers as of 2000. They have done this with relatively little impact on its neighbor airport MCO, by providing a complementary service which has allowed them to maintain more of a harmonious relationship with MCO. SFB’s story is one in which stakeholders developed a vision for their airport and brought it to fruition.
Alberts et al. (2009) have examined the city of Berlin, Germany, and its airport system. Berlin has a unique history in many aspects, the most relevant of which is its political history and aviation history. There were three airports in operation in Berlin when the Berlin Wall fell in 1989 and during the unification of West and East Germany in 1990: Schönefeld, Tempelhof, and Tegel. The authors note that there were high expectations that Berlin would return to the status of a political and cultural global city whose airport would become a gateway for Eastern Europe. The main effort to accomplish this objective was to replace the existing three airports with a new airport called the Berlin Brandenburg International Airport (BBI). Despite the efforts of Berlin’s stakeholders, they have failed to achieve their goal of repositioning the city of Berlin and the airport(s) in the global city network. Alberts et al. offer two reasons for this. The first is that Berlin had a disadvantage because of its three airports and the competing interests of each airport. The second reason is that the market structure of international air travel in Europe did not leave much room for Berlin as a node in its network. The authors point to the consequence of liberalization and globalization that reinforces the advantages of already privileged places and the disadvantages of marginal places.

These case studies provide the theoretical and empirical context for this thesis research which focuses on transportation, globalization, economic development, and space-time issues in the Tampa Bay area. Using the Keil and Young case study of Toronto as a model, I have examined economic development and air transportation in Tampa Bay through the use of stakeholder interviews. I then used the data that I collected in these interviews to analyze the economic development activities in Tampa Bay, and the role played by air transportation plays in these activities. In the next chapter, I will
provide a geographic definition of the study area and situate it in a historical, socioeconomic, and air transportation context.
3 STUDY AREA AND RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter is organized into two sections. The first section contains a description of my study area to provide the geographic context in which I conducted my research. After describing why Tampa Bay is an appropriate study area for this work, I present the historical background and data on relevant socioeconomic and air transportation characteristics. The second section of this chapter includes a description of my research design, outlines the different steps utilized for my research, and describes how it was conducted.

3.1 Study Area

This section contains a description of my study area of Tampa Bay and several relevant aspects. First, I provide an introduction and a description of the geographic area and explain how I have defined Tampa Bay for the purpose of this research. I then include an overview of the history of Tampa Bay and how the area in which I am conducting my research evolved. I complete this section with a description of the social, economic, demographic, and air transportation aspects of the area in the form of qualitative data to provide the reader with a context for my research.

3.1.1 Introduction and Geography

Tampa Bay serves as an appropriate study area for this research for several reasons. It is a metropolitan area of more than two and a half million residents for the Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater Metropolitan Statistical Area, according to the Greater
Tampa Chamber of Commerce (2011). The area contains a number of actors who are engaged in economic development and air transportation activities. Economic development is taken up by both government and non-governmental entities which include city and county organizations such as the mayor’s office of the cities of Tampa and St. Petersburg, city councils, and county commissions. The non-governmental entities include economic development organizations such as Tampa Bay Partnership and The Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce. The economic development and air transportation actors in Tampa Bay are engaged with the global economy, as evident from the presence of international businesses that were documented in the Foreign Direct Investment Survey published by the Tampa Bay Partnership in 2009.

On the transportation front, Tampa Bay has seven major air and sea transportation infrastructures. Four of these include air transportation: Tampa International Airport (TPA), St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport (PIE), MacDill Air Force Base, and Sarasota/Bradenton International Airport (SRQ). The remaining three interfaces are the sea ports of The Port of Tampa, Port Tampa, and Port Manatee. This research focuses on civil air transportation in Hillsborough and Pinellas counties which are home to TPA and PIE, respectively. The reason for focusing on these two airports is twofold. First, TPA provides the largest amount of air service to the Tampa Bay area. Second, Hillsborough and Pinellas counties are the most populous counties in the Tampa Bay area and are home to the governance structures that manage these two airports.

The stakeholders of these transportation resources and of Tampa Bay itself comprise elected city and county leaders and appointed board members of the Hillsborough County Aviation Authority which has jurisdiction over TIA. Other
stakeholders include those involved with business and economic development for Tampa Bay and comprise non-profit groups such as Tampa Bay Partnership and the Chamber of Commerce. Finally, there are citizens who have a personal interest in the economic development of Tampa Bay and have definite ideas about the part that air transportation can play in this process.

For this thesis, the geographic scope is Tampa Bay as defined by the service area of Tampa International Airport. The service area is divided into primary and secondary service areas (Hillsborough County Aviation Authority 2006b, I-12). The primary service area is the Tampa Bay Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) which is composed of the counties Hillsborough, Hernando, Pasco, and Pinellas. The secondary service area includes the counties of DeSoto, Hardee, Manatee, Polk, Sarasota, Sumter, and Citrus.

![Map of the TPA Service Area](image)

**Figure 3.1: Map of the TPA Service Area**
3.1.2 Historical Context

The U.S. government built a large number of military bases in the early 1940s for the purpose of training for World War II. Many of these military installations were aviation related because the Florida climate was conducive to flying throughout the year. The history of both Tampa International Airport (TPA) and St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport (PIE) is linked to the military. TPA was constructed in 1928 as Drew Field Municipal Airport. In 1940, the City of Tampa leased Drew Field to the U.S. Government which operated a U.S. Army Air Corp training base until 1945 when the airport was returned to the City of Tampa. During World War II, the U.S. Army Air Corp trained up to 120,000 air crew members and greatly expanded the airport size. The increase in size of Drew Field during World War II made it suitable to be the primary passenger airport in Tampa after World War II, a role that had been filled by Peter O. Knight (TPF) Airport, which is also located in Tampa, up to this time, according to the TPA website (Hillsborough County Aviation Authority 2011). In 1947, the City of Tampa purchased Drew Field from the U.S. War Assets Administration and named it Tampa International Airport and in 1951 it was designated as an international port of entry (Kerstein 2001).

PIE was constructed as Pinellas Army Airfield in 1941 in Pinellas County on the eastern edge of Clearwater and north of St. Petersburg. Pinellas Army Airfield was a flight training base that trained pilots to fly the P-40 and P-51 fighter planes. After World War II, the U.S. Government gave Pinellas Army Airfield to Pinellas County which turned it into a commercial airport named St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport.
according to the PIE website (2011). The diagrams in Figure 2 illustrate the current layout of both of these airports.

Figure 3.2: Airport Layout of TPA and PIE

3.1.3 Governance Structure

As mentioned earlier, I am employing the case study to analyze the use of air transportation infrastructure in Tampa Bay. For this purpose, I am focusing on the two main commercial airports in the two most populous counties in Tampa Bay area. I am using each airport as a starting point to describe, compare, and contrast the governance structure of the two counties that are host each airport. Through this method, I have identified stakeholders who were interviewed to collect data about the economic
development and air transportation development activities within Tampa Bay. The following is a brief description of the governance structures of each airport (TPA and PIE), the counties in which they are located, and the cities of Tampa and St. Petersburg.

Tampa International Airport (TPA) is the largest commercial airport in the Tampa Bay area, based on its service area. TPA is governed by the Hillsborough County Aviation Authority (HCAA), which is governed by a Board of Directors. TPA is managed by this Board of Directors and an administrative staff. The administrative staff is led by an executive director who has the following seven positions as direct reports: Executive Director, Director of Air Service Development and International Commerce, Director of Governmental and Legislative Affairs, Director of Public Information and Community Relations, General Counsel and Director of Legal Affairs, Director of Performance Management and Internal Audit, and Director of Human Resources. The Board of Directors of HCAA is composed of six members: Executive Director of TPA, the Mayor of the City of Tampa, a member of the Hillsborough County Commission, and three additional members who are appointed by the Governor of Florida.

Hillsborough County’s form of government is specified in a Home Rule Charter according to the County’s website (Hillsborough County Florida 2011a). The charter requires an executive branch in the form of a County Administrator and a legislative branch in the form of a County Commission. The County Commission is composed of seven commissioners, four of whom are elected from single-member districts and three which are elected at-large. This version of the County Charter went into effect in 1985 but attempts to institute this form of government can be traced back to the 1950s. According to the website of the Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners
(Hillsborough County Florida 2011b), the charter dictates that it is the Commission’s responsibility to develop policy for the management of Hillsborough County and the policies are implemented by the County Administrator.

The City of Tampa has a similar governance structure and history for the legislative branch in that it changed from all seats being at-large to a mixture of four at-large and three district seats (Kerstein 2001). The mayor’s office is the executive branch of the City of Tampa. The current system of mayor-council government evolved from 1927 when the commission-manager system of government in place at the time was replaced with a mayor-council form of government (Kerstein 2001).

St. Petersburg/Clearwater Airport is operated by the Pinellas County government. The director of PIE reports to the director of Public Works and Transportation which reports to the Board of County Commissioners. The Airport Director is supported by the following staff: Deputy Director of Operations and Facilities, Deputy Director of Finance and Administration, Airport Engineer, Operations Manager, Director of Air Service Development/Marketing, Community and Media Relations Director, Real Estate Property Manager.

The Pinellas County is composed of 24 municipalities and an unincorporated area. This results in 25 government bodies that are managed by a County Commission of seven members. These members are district seats. There is no independent executive branch, but there is a County Administrator that reports to the County Commission. According to its website (Pinellas County Florida 2011), the County Commission is authorized to adopt ordinances, approve the budget, and set millage rates.
The City of St. Petersburg is governed by a mayor-council form of government. The city council contains eight district seats. The City’s charter was last updated in March 2007 by referendum. According to the City Charter of St. Petersburg, the mayor is responsible for the administration of all city affairs defined in the charter, whereas the City Council holds the legislative responsibilities of the City.

### 3.1.4 Social Demographics

This section contains socioeconomic data from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2005-2009 American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates. This data is collected through samples taken over five consecutive years and then averaged to produce an estimate for the five year period. The intent of this survey is to produce a continuous stream of data about the U.S. communities for the following population characteristics: demographic, economic, social, housing, and financial (U.S Census Bureau 2011b). I have selected data that describes demographic, economic, and social characteristics, which I present below, to provide an overview of these characteristics for Tampa Bay.

In 2009, the total population of the Tampa Bay area based on TPA’s service area of eleven counties is 4,222,758 according to the U.S. Census Bureau (2011a). As shown in Figure 3.3, Hillsborough and Pinellas are the most populous counties collectively comprising almost 50 percent of the population of this service area. Pasco, which lies to the north of Hillsborough County, and Polk County, which lies to the east of Hillsborough County, are the next two most populous counties. These two counties contain an additional 24 percent of the population of TPA’s service.
Figure 3.3: Population by County

The median age of the Tampa Bay population is 43.2 years, according to the U.S. Census Bureau (2011a). The age distribution of the population that is 18 years or more is given in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Age Distribution of Tampa Bay of 18 Years and Older Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20 years</td>
<td>141,972</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-61 years</td>
<td>2,221,312</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-64 years</td>
<td>148,786</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>807,332</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The U.S. Census Bureau (2011a) has produced a distribution of the annual household income at the county level. I have averaged the county proportions in each
income category for the 11 counties in the TPA service area to generate the household income distribution for the TPA service area (Figure 3.4). My analysis suggests that almost 55 percent of the households in the TPA service area have an annual income of less than $50,000, which is slightly higher than the corresponding figure for Florida (53 percent) and the U.S. average (49 percent) in the same household income categories.

![Figure 3.4: Annual Household Income Distribution for Tampa Bay](image)

The U.S. Census Bureau (2011a) also provides the county level unemployment rate for those who are 16 years and older and in the labor force. Using this data, I calculated the average 2009 unemployment rate for this population for the counties that make up TPA’s service area (Figure 3.5). The average unemployment rate of all counties is 8.23 percent, compared to the Florida rate of 7.47 percent and the U.S. rate of 7.15 percent. It is interesting to note that the most populous counties (Hillsborough, Pasco, Pinellas, and Polk) have the lowest unemployment rates in the TPA service area.
In order to set the context for the industries that stakeholders are targeting for economic development, it is helpful to see the distribution of occupations in the TPA service area. I have used the county level distribution of occupations provided in the U.S. Census Bureau (2011a) data to create an average of the distribution of occupations for the TPA service area. This data (Figure 3.6) shows that civilian occupations in the Tampa Bay area are heavily weighted towards service oriented occupations. The following chart shows that 79 percent of all occupations are categorized as professional, service, and sales with the remaining 21 percent of the occupations being related to agriculture, construction, and production and transportation industries.
3.1.5 *Air Transportation*

Air traffic volumes in terms of passengers enplaned (i.e. boarded) for the 20 years preceding this research are depicted below in Figures 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9. I have included not only Tampa International Airport (TPA) and St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport (PIE) but three additional airports to allow a comparison of other commercial airports that are located within the Tampa-Orlando “super region” that compete with TPA and PIE. These air traffic volumes are based on data from the T-100 Data Bank 28DS Domestic Segment Data and 28IS International Segment Data (Bureau of Transportation Statistics 2011). This data is referred to as “segment data” because it represents segments of flights, or what is commonly referred to as a leg of a flight. In other words, this data represents only non-stop flights. It is collected by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS) within the Research and Innovative Technology Administration (RITA), which is governed by the U.S. Department of Transportation. This data includes both U.S. and
foreign air carriers on Form 41 Schedules T-100 and T-100f. It is reported to the BTS on a monthly basis and made available as a public version of the data and a restricted version. The statistics summarized in Figures 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9 represent the public version of this data.

The first graph provides the number of passengers that boarded flights where the destination was one of the five airports in each year, and includes both domestic and international flights. From these numbers, we can see the Orlando International Airport (MCO) is clearly the busiest of the five airports, followed by TPA. Both MCO and TPA increased their passenger volume during this period but MCO had a larger increase of 86 percent compared to TPA’s increase of 56 percent. Both PIE and Orlando Sanford International Airport (SFB) indicate passenger volume increases of more than 200 percent. It is important to note that there are five years (1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995) for which data was unavailable for SFB. Sarasota/Bradenton International Airport (SRQ) was the only airport which experienced an overall decline in passenger volume –of about 41 percent.
The domestic portion of passenger volumes shows a trend (Figure 3.8) that is largely similar to the overall trend. Two important changes are the rates of increase for PIE and for SFB. Domestic passenger volume for these two airports began at very low numbers for this data set (1990 for PIE and 1996 for SFB) whereas domestic passenger travel at the other three airports was well established.
The international passenger volume (Figure 3.9) differs from the domestic passenger volume (Figure 3.8). First, it is important to note that all airports experienced a decline in international passenger volumes in the early 2000s as a result of the terrorist attacks of 2001. While MCO experienced an overall increase of 110 percent in passenger volume, SRQ had the largest overall increase in volume (262 percent). Volumes at PIE and TPA decreased by 97 percent and 39 percent, respectively. There are several years (1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995) for which data for SFB is unavailable, but this airport experienced no change from 1996 to 2009. SFB’s international passenger volumes were quite volatile despite the drop in the early 2000s due to the terrorist attacks. From 2006 to 2007, SFB experienced another decline in passenger volume that has continued until 2009. This change has been more drastic than the decrease caused by the terrorist attacks.
3.2 Research Design

This section describes and summarizes how my research was structured, the questions that motivated my research, the underlying philosophical basis of my research, and my data collection methods and procedures.

3.2.1 Research Questions

To reiterate, my thesis aims to understand what factors are driving the decisions regarding economic development and air transportation in the Tampa Bay area related to TPA and PIE. This investigation was guided by the following research questions: 1) What vision of Tampa Bay is driving the economic development plans of stakeholders of Tampa International Airport and St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport? 2) What understanding of globalization do Tampa Bay economic development and air
transportation stakeholders have? 3) How does air transportation fit into the economic development plans of Tampa Bay stakeholders and how will each airport play a part?

The first research question is designed to understand the stakeholder entities’ vision of Tampa Bay’s future, and more specifically, the goals that are driving the entities economic development plans. These goals have been described by each stakeholder. It is possible that the vision of a future Tampa Bay will dovetail into the second research question. This second question is designed to understand how each stakeholder entity views today’s globalized world. These views of the stakeholders are relevant because they will describe the world in which each stakeholder is operating. Gaining an understanding of the conceptual world of each stakeholder has helped me define what the stakeholder believes is possible based on how they believe the world and specifically the global economy is structured.

The literature reviewed previously on globalization demonstrates that this term has multiple meanings. Steger (2002, 2003) addresses this issue by proposing that there is an ideology to globalization and demonstrates how this ideology is presented as a definition of contemporary globalization. Since Steger presents this common view of globalization as an ideology, he has argued that globalization is socially constructed. I am interested in this process of social construction as seen by Tampa Bay stakeholders. I have used Watts’ (2000) model of analyzing actions taken in the context of, and in the name of, globalization to critically examine the views of Tampa Bay stakeholders. For as Watts has argued, an individual’s awareness determines how they formulate problems and the possible responses to the problems. I have examined the awareness globalization of Tampa Bay stakeholders and how this leads to their formulation of problems related to
the economic development and air transportation of Tampa Bay and the choices they make in response to these problems.

The third research question asks how air transportation fits into the economic development plans of Tampa Bay stakeholders in general, and specifically, how each airport is to be used. This question addresses directly the issues outlined in the transportation geography literature. As my review has indicated, there are several dimensions to transportation, and particularly air transportation. These include what part air transportation plays in economic development, the social and cultural implications of air travel (Adey et al., 2007), and how large air travel infrastructures are a visible point of power and pride for cities that can afford them (Sassen, 2002; Adey et al., 2007). A recently emerging paradigm of transportation is how mobility is one of the defining characteristics of modern society (Cresswell, 2006; Urry, 2000). Just as globalization and space-time are socially constructed, the mobilities paradigm argues that mobility is socially constructed and this construction is embedded with meaning.

One explicit source of a vision for Tampa Bay economic development and the part that air transportation plays in it is the Master Plan of the Tampa International Airport (TPA). There are several demand forecasts included in the Master Plan of TPA. Several of these demand forecasts address international processes that can impact passenger traffic at TPA, such as an increase in globalized free trade, tourism, and the opening of Cuba as a market (Hillsborough County Aviation Authority, 2006). These demand forecasts are based on certain assumptions about the economic development of Tampa Bay. I analyzed these assumptions and compared them to the assumptions of the
other Tampa Bay stakeholders that I interviewed in order to identify the political
decisions that affect social justice and mobility issues of air transportation in Tampa Bay.

The third theme that I addressed in the literature review is the reconfiguration of
space-time. All three research questions address the issue of space-time reconfiguration.
Although this topic may not be addressed directly by each stakeholder, space-time
reconfiguration is present in the processes of modern air transportation and other
processes of globalization as the literature has shown (Knowles, 2006; L’Hostis, 2009;
Adey, 2007; Graham, 2000). As I will explain below, some of my interview questions are
designed to investigate the stakeholder’s awareness of space-time. I hypothesize that this
awareness of space-time reconfiguration makes a difference in how each stakeholder
views contemporary globalization and by extension what they believe is possible for
Tampa Bay from a structural point of view and how to get there through economic
development and air transportation.

The main theoretical approach for investigating space-time awareness and
reconfiguration is based on what has been proposed by Lefebvre (1991) and Massey
(1993). My literature review described how Lefebvre and Massey posit that space-time is
socially constructed. Lefebvre proposes a reconciliation of space-time as it is conceived
mentally with how it is perceived through the senses with how it is physically
constructed. This reconciliation will then result in a full understanding of how space-time
has been constructed. The tangible result of this three-fold interaction is what Massey
describes as space-time that is defined by “the entities that inhabit them and not vice
versa” (262). In Tampa Bay, this three-fold interaction results in the construction of
space-time by the stakeholders I have interviewed. These dimensions will contribute to
the understanding of the state of economic development, air transportation, and globalization in Tampa Bay.

3.2.2 Methodology

This thesis research on the state of globalization and air transportation in Tampa Bay is a qualitative research effort that relied on in-depth, open-ended interviews as the main method of data collection. My selection of stakeholders was based on their participation in the decision making processes of economic development and air transportation in Tampa Bay. After a brief review of the recent methodological trends in transportation geography, the following sections describe why I selected the interview as my main data collection tool and its contribution to my research. I also outline my interview process and how I analyzed the interview data in order to find answers to the three research questions that were mentioned above.

A variety of methods can be used to investigate transportation systems and the impact of transportation on societies. The current sub-field of transportation geography was developed during the ‘quantitative revolution’ in geography, during the 1950s and 1960s. As the name suggests, the quantitative revolution was founded on the application of quantitative research methods and models. It was not until the turn to humanistic geography in the 1970s that qualitative research methods were used in transportation geography. The current state of transportation geography is representative of this binary history. Goetz et al. (2009) have stated that while there is a perception that most studies in transportation geography are quantitative, more qualitative research has been conducted than one may think. They arrived at this conclusion by conducting a survey of articles published in well-known geography journals. In these published articles, they
noted the occurrences of transportation geography and identified whether quantitative or qualitative methods were used to conduct the research. These authors found a significant presence of qualitative research in transportation geography and concluded that the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods can deliver richer and more critical transport geography. Adey et al. (2007) have also outlined the benefits of using qualitative research in transport geography. They write that because air transportation is socially produced and socially consumed, qualitative methods are appropriate for understanding the social and cultural implications of this mode of transportation.

While Adey et al. argue that qualitative research is necessary to help move beyond the mapping of air routes and other empirically based studies, quantitative research continues to contribute to transportation geography as Goetz et al. (2009) have documented. L’Hostis (2009) demonstrates this by using time-space relief to create a visual representation of terrestrial and air transportation in the U.S. The researcher has proposed that time-space relief can be used to represent “global distances and local distances simultaneously” (L’Hostis 2009, 438). Based on the model created by L’Hostis, he concludes that the entry points to high speed transportation networks such as air transport are getting closer together while the “interstitial space is left behind in the third dimension” [on the time-space relief map] (L’Hostis 2009, 439). The author adds that a consequence of this reconfiguration is that high speeds do make selections of places which disadvantages places on secondary networks compared to primary global networks. (See Appendix D for the time-space relief map related to this article.)

The differential in space-time that has been represented visually with quantitative methods by L’Hostis can also be effectively explored with qualitative research methods.
As I noted previously, the geography of transportation involves both spatial and temporal processes. Exploring how space and time have been and continue to be reconfigured by transportation and globalization can be problematic due to the complex nature of the concepts of space and time. One way of investigating this subject is through exploring statements like “the world is flat”, or “the world has gotten smaller”, or “time moves so quickly today”. It has been demonstrated by many researchers such as Knowles (2006) that the time-space collapse described as a part of contemporary globalization is differential. Therefore, it is necessary to describe the context and the actors who are experiencing the collapse and those who are not. Defining the context and the actors lends itself to qualitative research because the social implications can be much better investigated through qualitative research methods. These methods include in-depth open-ended interviews and focus groups and can be used to determine who is experiencing a change in space-time awareness and who is not. Further, the spatial element of where people are or are not experiencing it, and what they believe are the impacts of this change, can also be investigated.

My choice of methods for this case study is indicative of the research paradigms on which my research will be based. These research paradigms are philosophical hermeneutics and social constructivism. Philosophical hermeneutics focuses on clarifying the conditions in which understanding takes place. It has the philosophical goal of understanding what is involved in the process of understanding (Linge, 1977). Social constructivism’s epistemological base is the idea that humans construct knowledge. This includes the inventions of concepts, models, and schemes to make sense of experience. Further, these inventions are continually tested and refined. I regarding meaning, what is
real, and what is true as situational, or mediated. This approach follows the tradition of human geography that focuses on human interaction with the landscape. This interaction results in a specific human meaning which includes knowledge about the world and the self.

My case study research follows the methodological approach utilized by Keil and Young (2008) who conducted a survey of transportation, globalization, and regionalization of Toronto. In their research, Keil and Young examine how transportation has been used to enhance Toronto’s competitiveness in a regional and global economy. They look specifically at Toronto’s Pearson International Airport and how it has been used in the process of economic development and integrated with other modes of transportation. These researchers also look at how the governing structures involved in this process that range from the local to the regional to the federal have evolved to take part in the process of managing transportation and economic development.

3.2.3 Data Collection

I used two methods to gather data: the artifact review and the semi-structured, open-ended, and in-depth interview. The semi-structured, open-ended, and in-depth interview is the primary method that I have employed in my research to collect data. I have spoken to a number of individuals whom I have identified as being stakeholders in the economic development of Tampa Bay and development of air transportation in Tampa Bay.

I have selected the interview as my primary data collection method for several reasons. Interviews in the social constructivist approach, as defined in The New Language of Qualitative Method (Gubrium and Holstein 1997), as cited by Elliot (2005, 18) focus
on questions that ask ‘how’. These questions ask how meaning making practices are identified and understanding the ways in which people participate in the construction of their lives (Elliot, 2005). The interview is a very appropriate method of data collection for my research, because it has allowed me to explore directly the world in which the stakeholder is a co-constructor. It also allows me to identify what drives their decisions as they work to construct and reconstruct Tampa Bay’s global economic position in a globalized world. In semi-structured, open-ended, and in-depth interviews, the interviewee has had the freedom to define what is meaningful to them in response to the questions I asked them.

There are major benefits to using interviews that make this approach an appropriate choice for my research. First, face-to-face contact with research participants allowed me to build a rapport with the participants which increased the chances that the participant shared more meaningful information with me. Second, interviews are a flexible method of gathering data. Throughout my interview process I was able to modify my interview questions and techniques to meet the individual and the context. I was able to continually apply what I learn through the interview process as I proceeded through the interviews. I would not have been able to do this if I had been conducting structured survey interviews.

The research interview process requires a large amount of time to plan, schedule, conduct, and then transcribe interviews. The time available did affect the number and individuals that I interviewed. Interviewee’s availability played a factor in securing several interviews. I planned for this by developing a long list of candidates to pursue, in case I was unable to secure an interview from a candidate. Another consideration for
conducting research interviews is the time spent after an interview transcribing the data. This effort, however, was a benefit to my research as it resulted in a verbatim record of each interview that I was able to analyze. In addition to producing a written record of each interview, it was helpful to listen to each interview because it allowed me the opportunity to gain deeper insights on the data.

I took into consideration the influence that I, as a researcher, may have had on the interviewees. Care was taken not to lead an interviewee to say things they normally would not say. It is impossible not to have any influence on the interviewee. However, the influence should conform to the position of the research paradigms of social constructivism and philosophical hermeneutics on which my research methods are based. The interactions between me as the researcher and the interviewee are considered data in the research paradigms of philosophical hermeneutics and social constructivism. Therefore, this potential disadvantage is a potential benefit as long as I exercised awareness during the interview so that I realized when I was about to cross the line and inappropriately influence the interviewee.

3.2.4 Interview Format and Process

My interview format was semi-structured, but open-ended and in-depth. It was semi-structured because I was researching a subject and looking for meaning from the interviewee on the subject of economic development in Tampa Bay in the context of globalization and the part that air transportation plays in this process. My interviews were open-ended because I wanted the interviewees to define the boundaries of discourse for the field of research. I allowed them to do this by giving them the freedom to determine what is important and what is meaningful. My interviews were in-depth because I did not
limit the responses of the interviewees. My interview process consisted of three phases: 1) pre-interview preparation; 2) interview; 3) post-interview activities, as described below. I completed each of these phases according to the steps defined in my interview checklist included in Appendix B.

My interview process began with a preparation for the interview. The first step was to schedule the interview. As I stated previously, interviews can be problematic because they require flexibility on the part of the researcher in scheduling the interview. An interviewee’s time is valuable and if a potential research participant agrees to an interview, their window of availability may be small. Thus, when contacting the potential interviewee, I was prepared with my available times so that I was able to quickly identify when the interviewee’s schedule can be accommodated. Once scheduled, I made the arrangements necessary to ensure that I would have the time to complete my full interview process.

Before each interview I conducted a final review of material on the interviewee. Since all of the potential interviewees I identified are employed in professional positions with at least some public exposure, it is not uncommon to find mention of the interviewee in news articles or in publications by the interviewee’s organization. For example, an organization’s web site is a good resource for its latest activities. For the final pre-interview step, I reviewed the interview questions that I prepared and made final changes based on any new material I may have encountered in my review of material on the interviewee.

My interview protocol can definitely be categorized as formal. I spoke to interviewees who are often classified as elites, because they are policy makers. Thus, I
was formal in my appearance, manners, and speech. With this said, I did have a flexible approach to the interview. I paid particular attention to the dynamics of the interview. If I found that an interviewee is willing to have a more informal discussion then I changed my style to accommodate this.

I recorded each interview when the interviewee and context allowed. For each recorded interview, I made a digital recording that captured both my questions and the interviewee’s responses. The recorder that I used was small and unobtrusive so as not to attract attention during the interview, but it was also easy for me to operate and did not interfere with the discussion during the interview.

My post interview process consisted of writing up all of my thoughts and reactions to the interview in the time immediately following the interview. Capturing my thoughts and reactions to the interview served the purpose of capturing insights I had of the interview. I categorized this data as theoretical, format related, or content related. I was then able to use this information to refine my interview format and skills throughout my research process. It also allowed me to capture responses to what transpired in the interview so that I would not forget important observations and thoughts. Another reason for this self-debrief was to capture my personal experience so I would have reflexive material to use in my data analysis. The more I identify my experience, the more I expose my biases that potentially influence my interpretation and analysis of the data. This exposure of my biases has brought more objectivity to this research.

I ended each debrief with a follow-up email to the interviewee. In this email, I thanked the interviewee for their time and confirmed any agreement of future contact that they may have committed to. I also confirmed any commitments made by myself to
provide the interviewee with written or recorded material resulting from the interview. In all cases, the interviewee either asked for or responded in the affirmative when I asked if they would like a copy of my completed research.

3.2.5 Who I Interviewed

My research questions and objectives were used to determine who should be interviewed. Specifically, I sought individuals who are involved in the economic development of Tampa Bay and air transportation processes in this metropolitan area. These processes of economic development and air transportation may be mutually exclusive in the minds of those involved in both of these processes.

Economic development takes place on multiple levels. I focused on entities that define and promote the economic development policies for the Tampa Bay area. Although there could be influences at higher levels in the governmental structure such as the state and federal level, I limited the scope of my research to those entities that make decisions only at the city and county level. If any representative of these entities I interviewed raised the subject of influence from these higher levels of government, I took note of this but I did not seek the perspective from the state and federal level of economic development in Tampa Bay. At the city level, the obvious actors who define policy are the offices of the mayors of the City of Tampa and the City of St. Petersburg. The leaders in these positions make decisions in conjunction with members of the city council in their respective cities. Some of these decisions directly address the issue of global position as is evident in the City of Tampa’s Global Business plan published in 2005.

The source of my data collection was determined by the governance structure of the two main airports in the Tampa Bay area: Tampa International Airport (TPA) and St.
Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport (PIE). I targeted stakeholders of each airport beginning with upper level of organizational management. One notable gap in my completed interviews is that I was unable to secure an interview with a representative of PIE. From these airports, I focused on stakeholders at the county and city levels of the largest city within each county.

My list of transportation facility stakeholders and government stakeholders, and non-profit economic development, and private business interests represents only two of the counties in my study area: Hillsborough and Pinellas. As the two most populous counties in the area they are appropriate for this case study, but it must be kept in mind that their view of my study area is from their geographic perspective. It is important to note that the interviewees’ comments are their own. And while they are expressing opinions from their perspective, sometimes the point of view they expressed is their personal one and sometimes that of the organization they represent.

3.2.6 What I Asked

Considering that my data collection instrument is the semi-structured, open-ended, and in-depth interview, I asked interviewees questions that directed them to the field of research that I have defined as a starting point for the interview. I did allow them to add their boundaries and definition to this field by having them tell me what is meaningful on the subject, i.e. what should be included in the field according to them (see interview questions in Appendix C).

3.2.6.1 Tampa Bay and Economic Development

To investigate the state of economic development of Tampa Bay, I first needed an overview from each interviewee on how they view the world today, Tampa Bay’s current
place in this world, and a future vision of Tampa Bay. This information gave me an indication of what processes of globalization the interviewee is aware of, and how they believe Tampa Bay is affected by them or is influencing them.

3.2.6.2 Globalization

With respect to globalization, I also asked about is how much choice the actors believe they have in today’s globalized world. Watts (2000) pointed out that both those who argued for the deregulation of the Australian dollar and those who argued against it feel that there was no choice in the matter. According to Steger (2005), globalization is often presented by its proponents as something that is inevitable, something over which the world has no choice. I explored this concept with the interviewees to find out what they think the possibilities are for a coastal city like Tampa Bay in a globally connected economy. I wanted to explore the possibilities that each interviewee believes exist and how this affects their thinking and behavior.

3.2.6.3 Space-time Awareness

Another subject I asked about is the space-time awareness. This can be a confusing subject because it is not normally talked about directly. Instead of addressing this subject in terms of space-time reconfiguration, I broached this subject with a couple of anecdotal questions that ask about space and time in a way in which it is often talked about in the context of globalization. Regarding space, it is not uncommon to hear people say that “the world is smaller than it used to be”. Or, in talking about time perception, it is not uncommon to hear people make the statement that “we lived in a fast paced world today”. These are levels of space and time awareness that most people are able to relate to, and thus allowed me to explore their awareness of space and time. If these probing
questions did not lead anywhere with an interviewee, I considered this to be data. This told me something about how an interviewee thinks about today’s globalized world.

3.2.6.4 Transportation

When I spoke to research participants who are involved with air transportation processes in Tampa Bay, I first wanted to find out what role air travel plays in the economic development of a city, and specifically Tampa Bay. I did not expect only those participants who work for the airports to have something to say about this topic. I expected that air transportation would be on the radar of everyone that I spoke to. However, those who work for the airports will have a unique perspective. Since they work in the processes of air transportation, I would expect them to have a more insightful view of what air transportation can and cannot provide for a city.

Once an interviewee told me what part they believe air transportation plays for a global city, I asked them if they think that current air transport capabilities in Tampa Bay are sufficient to place Tampa Bay in a desirable position in the global economy. I was interested in the matching of transportation capabilities to the desired economic position of a city. If an interviewee stated that air transportation capabilities are or are not sufficient for the desired economic development, I expected the interviewee to have specific ideas on what part air transportation should play in Tampa Bay’s economic development.

I believe the element of time to be an important determiner in this subject. I expected the interviewees’ answers to questions about air transportation and economic development to be qualified by time. In other words, economic development may be described in terms of what is happening now, as opposed to what is planned for the
future. If an interviewee did not qualify their response with time I asked the interviewee if they were making decisions with the future in mind or did they have a present day mindset, or perhaps both.

The aforementioned issues and questions formed the foundation of my conversations with interviewees and spawned additional questions that I used in subsequent interviews. Being able to adapt interview questions is an example of the flexibility of the interview as a research method which makes it very useful for evolving discourses such as those on air transportation, economic development, globalization, and space-time reproduction.
4 RESULTS

This chapter summarizes the data collected from stakeholder interviews, based on the type of stakeholder for each theme of my research: Tampa Bay and economic development, globalization, space and time, and transportation. Within each theme, the views of each of the stakeholder groups are compared, and relevant artifacts are included. Several of my interviewees are affiliated with organizations that have published documents on the subject of economic development of the Tampa Bay area. I have reviewed one artifact from each of the stakeholder categories to supplement the information provided in stakeholder interviews.

It is important to be aware of two considerations of my list of interviewees. First, by design, my list of transportation facility stakeholders and government stakeholders represent only two of the counties in my study area (Hillsborough and Pinellas). So, it should be kept in mind that their view of my study area is from their geographic perspective. Second, it should be noted that the interviewees’ comments are their own. And while they are expressing opinions from their point of view, sometimes the point of view they expressed is their personal one and sometimes that of the organization they represent.

4.1 Artifact Review

In this section, I review the contents of four artifacts that are relevant to my research. The first one is the Master Plan of Tampa International Airport. The second is
the Master Plan of St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport. The third is a
document maintained by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Policy. This document was
created to implement and further the goals and policies of the Florida State
Comprehensive Plan, and serves as the input from the stakeholders of the Tampa Bay
Regional Planning Council (TBRPC). For all official responses to my interview
questions, stakeholders V and W referred to documents produced by TBRPC. This
document was the most relevant document for my research produced by this entity. The
final artifact I reviewed is the super region study produced by the Pennsylvania School of
Designed that was commissioned by the Tampa Bay Partnership and the Central Florida
Partnership. This document presents a view of economic and social development across
central Florida, from Tampa Bay and Orlando to the east coast of Florida.

4.1.1 Artifact Review: Master Plan of Tampa International Airport (TPA)

Tampa International Airport has a master plan (Master Plan-TPA) which provides
additional insight into the role of TPA in the Tampa Bay area. This plan was last updated
in 2005 and describes the demand scenarios that the Hillsborough County Aviation
Authority has identified which the plans within the Master Plan-TPA were designed to
meet. This Master Plan is a projection to the year 2025 of how the airport will be
developed to meet the six demand scenarios. These conditions are as follows: (5-6)

1. Aggressive International Traffic Growth: This scenario would be triggered by
   increased globalization of local businesses and bilateral free-trade agreements,
   as well as increased air service to the Caribbean/South America/Central
   America, and Europe. While Asian markets were also discussed it was
generally assumed that most of that activity would likely access TPA via an
existing U.S. gateway airport.

2. Aggressive Population Growth in the Region along with Higher Economic
   Growth: This scenario was based on potential activity growth generated by
   additional population migration into Tampa’s Metropolitan Statistical Area
   (MSA) over and above that currently taking place, and by growth in
employment in a variety of industries in the Tampa Bay Region, including the medical and bioscience services industry.

3. High Tourism Growth: This scenario was developed in recognition of the role that tourism plays at a number of Florida destinations, taking into consideration the increase in demand that might be triggered by potential future attractions, such as the emergence of another large-scale theme park that would foster an increase in tourism demand in the region.

4. Alternate Operational Activity Levels Resulting from Fleet Mix Adjustments: Changes in domestic airline business models have caused significant growth in the use of regional jet aircraft and significant expansion in the role that commuter airlines play in meeting demand for service in various markets. An increased use of regional jets by airlines serving markets to and from TPA was assumed in this scenario.

5. Liberalization of Cuba: In this scenario, the effect that the opening of the Cuban market to business with the United States could have on travel to and from Cuba via TPA. In developing this scenario, it was assumed that the liberalization of Cuba would occur by 2010 and would initially consist primarily of tourism activity, with flights serving Havana, eastern Cuba, and north-central Cuba from TPA. Additional frequencies and new destinations were assumed in subsequent years of the forecast period to reflect business needs and the expansion of destinations in the Cuban market.

6. Alternate Air Service (Low Cost Carrier Impact/Focus City Combined): This scenario is defined by an increase in the low cost carrier market share at the Airport and the emergence of a low cost/low fare carrier choosing the Airport as a focus city or mini-hub to serve as a domestic/international market interface for service between the United States and the Caribbean and South America/Central America.

The Master Plan-TPA contains goals to support the community. Page four contains the following two goals:

- Develop the airport in a manner that supports local and regional economic goals and plans, while providing the flexibility to accommodate new opportunities and shifts in development patterns (4).

- Foster public confidence and support by proactively seeking input from and collaborating with the public throughout the Master Plan process (4).
A review of the document did not reveal detailed plans for how the fostering of public support would occur beyond the creation of the Master Plan-TPA. For example, one section contains input from airport user and stakeholder surveys. These surveys asked users about various aspects of the airport through 28 questions. The questions focused on the geographic origins and destinations of travel, the number of travelers in a party, the purpose of travel, and the travelers’ experience of the airport.

In summary, the Master Plan-TPA appears to be a very comprehensive document in terms of identifying the infrastructure needs to maintain the current and expected level of service that users of the airport have come to expect. The document includes plans for an additional runway and an additional terminal which will have the capability to handle international travelers that could be generated from the demand scenarios identified in the document. The Master Plan-TPA focuses on the preparation for the demand but not bringing the demand to fruition. There appears to be a delineation of responsibility between the role of TPA and the role of those who would focus on developing demand scenarios.

4.1.2 Artifact Review: Master Plan of St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport (PIE)

As mentioned in Chapter 3, I was unable to secure an interview with a representative of PIE. Thus, this review of the St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport Master Plan Update (Master Plan-PIE), updated in January 2004, serves as almost the only input from PIE representatives. The Master Plan-PIE refers to the service area of the greater Tampa Bay area. However, a definition is provided in the economic
development plans into which PIE has been integrated. In chapter 2 of the Master Plan-PIE on pages 2-74 and 2-75 the following economic development plans are described:

- Tampa Bay Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP) created by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TBRPC)
- Comprehensive Plan for Pinellas County
- The Pinellas County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO-Pinellas)
- St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan

The most specific definition of the geographic boundaries of Tampa Bay that can be taken a definition of PIE’s service area is found in the SRPP. The Master Plan-PIE states that the SRPP defines the Tampa Bay area as being composed of the counties of Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco, and Polk. One of the goals of the SRPP is to create a regional transportation system and the Master Plan-PIE states the importance of PIE contributing to the meeting of this goal (2-75). The additional economic development plans are specific to Pinellas County and the City of St. Petersburg.

The Master Plan-PIE contains a series of ten goals. Goal number six is the most relevant to my research. This goal states the intent to “[d]evelop an Airport that supports local and regional economic goals while accommodating new opportunities or shifts in development patterns” (1-4). There are two objectives to this goal that relate to my thesis. The first is that PIE must “[a]chieve a level of service and user convenience such that the Airport is a positive factor in regional economic development decisions”. The second is that PIE must “[d]evelop an airport layout plan that easily integrates with existing and proposed transportation infrastructure, and encourages economic growth”. In this goal and the two underlying objectives, we can see the awareness of a regional
outlook and intent to integrate into a multi-modal transportation system. We can also see some foresight in the focus of integrating into a multi-modal transportation system in the Master Plan-PIE. The Master Plan-PIE refers to the integration of ground transportation and specifically mentions high speed rail. It is interesting to note this reference to high speed rail, considering the Master Plan-PIE was updated in 2004, well before 2010 when most of the funding for the first high speed rail line in Florida was secured. PIE stakeholders had a longer term outlook regarding high speed rail when we consider that as late as 2009, the executive director of TPA expressed the view that that high speed rail between Tampa and Orlando would “probably be no impact” (Hillsborough County Aviation Authority 2006b, 78.

A specific example of accommodating new opportunities can be found on page 12-1. The Master Plan-PIE specifies that PIE should remain cognizant of changing market conditions that would impact passenger volumes and thus impact the Master Plan-PIE. One possible change in market conditions relative to this research is the possibility of expanding international corporate flight service at PIE. The Master Plan-PIE contains a specification for an increase in the length of the longest airport to from 8,800 feet to 10,000 feet in order to accommodate non-stop flights to Europe and Latin America.

Overall, the Master Plan-PIE indicates a regional outlook for a different geographic area than that of TPA. While there is cooperation between PIE representatives and the surrounding regional economic stakeholders in Pinellas County as evidenced by references to the SSRP, Comprehensive Plan for Pinellas County, the MPO-Pinellas, and the St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan, the effort does appear to be self-contained within the boundaries of Pinellas County.
4.1.3 Artifact Review: Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council

I interviewed two (V and W) representatives of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TBRPC). For responses to my questions they referred me to documents that the TBRPC has published. Therefore, I have conducted a review of several artifacts that were produced by the TBRPC or those on which the TBRPC was a collaborator. According to its website, the mission of the TBRPC is “To serve our citizens and member governments by providing a forum to foster communication, coordination, and collaboration in identifying and addressing issues and needs regionally” (Tampa Bay Regional Planning Commission, 2011). The TBRPC is an association of local governments and gubernatorial representatives. The TBRPC covers the counties of Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco, and Pinellas are required by law to participate on the council.

One of the main responsibilities of the TBRPC is the maintenance of a document that is titled Future of the Region: A Strategic Regional Policy Plan for the Tampa Bay Region (amended September 2005) (SRPP-2005). The SRPP-2005 was created to implement and further the goals and policies of the Florida State Comprehensive Plan that is mandated in Chapter 186, Florida Statutes (FS), and Chapter 27E-5, Florida Administrative Code (FAC). The SRPP-2005 does not provide a mandate to implement policies that cannot be funded by the local governments under its jurisdiction and the SRPP cannot authorize or require any activity that is not authorized by existing legislation (SRPP-2005, 3). The SRPP-2005 also aims to accomplish the following (SRPP-2005, 4):

- Establish public policy for the resolution of regional problems, needs, and opportunities.
• Establish goals and policies that provide a basis for review of regional issues for the TBRPC.
• Establish goals and policies to assist in the determination of consistency of local comprehensive plans with strategic regional policy plans.
• Establish land development and transportation goals and policies that support regional transportation systems.
• Guide the administration of federal, state, regional, and local agency programs as provided by law.
• Identify significant regional resources, infrastructure needs, problems, and opportunities.
• Identify and promote the protection of significant natural resources within the region.
• Set economic development goals and policies that promote regional development.
• Set goals that address affordable housing and emergency preparedness.

The SRPP-2005 is a revision of the original SRPP created in 1995. The purpose of the revision was to evaluate the successes and failures of the SRPP and to determine how the goals and policies of the SRPP were being used. These two activities resulted in the formation of goals that address the following topics: affordable housing, economic development, emergency preparedness, natural resources, and regional transportation.

The two topic areas that are most relevant to my research are economic development and regional transportation. There are several economic development goals that promote Tampa Bay’s interaction with a wider geographic area. They are (SRPP-2005, 9-12):
Economic Development Goals

- Promote the Tampa Bay region as a regional trade, hospitality, financial, and healthcare center for Florida and the Caribbean.
- Promote export of Tampa Bay region products and services, attract venture capital, and build businesses to expand the number and quality of job opportunities.
- Maintain and expand food, agriculture, ornamental horticulture, aquaculture, forestry and related industries production to be a competitive force in the national and international marketplace.
- Build and strengthen partnerships between the business community, education institutions, government entities, and non-profit organizations to meet the Tampa Bay region’s economic challenges.
- Improve the capability of small businesses, disadvantaged businesses and businesses within distressed communities to participate fully in Tampa Bay region's economic activities.

Regional Transportation Goals

- Develop a regional transportation system which is coordinated with land use patterns and planning and minimizes negative impacts on the environment.
- Plan, fund, build, and maintain a balanced and integrated multi-modal transportation system which ensures the safe, efficient, and economic long-term movement of goods and people.
- Ensure that the transportation impacts associated with Developments of Regional Impact are appropriately mitigated.
- Develop a safe, coordinated, and efficient regional intermodal transportation system.
- Recognize and promote regional activity centers as a growth management tool.
- Monitor the development of a high speed rail system in Florida and ensure its extension into the Tampa Bay region.

The SRPP then identified the objectives that must be achieved in order to achieve these goals. For the economic development subject, it identified education, vocational training,
and workforce development as objectives. The objectives for the transportation subject area are better land-use coordination, a regional approach to transportation, identification of additional funding sources, a multi-modal mass transit system, and an improvement in leadership over transportation issues.

4.1.4 Artifact Review: Super Region Study from Pennsylvania School of Design

The artifact Connecting for Global Competitiveness: Florida’s Super Region is a study that was commissioned by the Tampa Bay Partnership and the Central Florida Partnership. The Tampa Bay Partnership is a non-profit economic development organization that describes their mission as the following:

“The Tampa Bay Partnership is the regional organization that works with its partners to market the region nationally and internationally, to conduct regional research and to coordinate efforts to influence business and government issues that impact economic growth and development.” (Tampa Bay Partnership 2011)

Tampa Bay Partnership defines Tampa Bay as the eight-county area that includes Citrus, Hernando, Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Sarasota counties. This organization began formally in 1994 with the incorporation of Tampa Bay Partnership.

Central Florida Partnership is the sister non-profit economic development organization of Tampa Bay Partnership but one that is much younger than Tampa Bay Partnership. Central Florida Partnership, according to its website, formed in December of 2007 as:

“an essential place for leaders to convene, set priorities, and address our region’s toughest challenges and identify our greatest opportunities. Serving business, civic and community leaders in Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Polk, Seminole and Volusia Counties – the Central Florida Partnership is a business lead initiative where regional leaders come together to share regional conversations – moving ideas to results.

“The Central Florida Partnership is America’s Newest Regional Partnership – and is a platform where regional leaders can learn to better collaborate, cooperate and
coordinate – resulting in improved communications throughout the Central Florida Region. The Central Florida Partnership is where positive ideas are advanced on behalf of our region – ideas that matter most to the millions of people who live, work, learn and play in Central Florida.” (Central Florida Partnership 2011)

These two organizations commissioned urban planner Jonathan Barnett and his City Planning 702 Urban Design Studio at the University of Pennsylvania (Penn Design) to conduct a study to: “demonstrate the potential advantages of coast-to-coast connectivity in order to develop a Super-Regional strategy for transportation and land use, economic and workforce development, environmental sustainability and quality of life issues” (Tampa Bay Partnership 2010). This study compares two paths of development for the geographic region that includes Tampa Bay, Orlando, and the Central East Coast of Florida that the study refers to as a super region. One path of development extends the current trends to the year 2050 and the other path extends development that includes the presence of high speed rail and integrated local transit to the year 2050. The study proposes benefits that will result from Central Florida communities working together as a super region in terms of quality of life, employment, and the environment. Much of the public input for the study was collected through the Central Florida Regional Growth Vision which was the result of a series of surveys, presentations, and meetings conducted from March 2006 to August 2007 (PennDesign, 14).

   The concept of the super region and the existence of this study exhibits a strong awareness of change in spatial awareness among those who commissioned the report. The report is based on the idea that historical community and political boundaries can no longer marshal the resources necessary to produce the economic strength to maintain the quality of life and environmental spaces that are expected by the residents of the super
Transportation plays a large part of the alternative plan of development and hinges on the development of high speed rail. The integration of high speed rail into local flows of transportation is necessary to provide access throughout the super region. This integration involves the development of light rail within the metropolitan areas of Tampa Bay and Orlando that will link the high speed rail to major economic and residential areas such as airports, beaches, city downtowns, universities, and retail areas. The report makes references to features such as the Canary Wharf financial district in London, England and a university related research center in Tsukuba City, Japan, and proposes that cities in the super region of Central Florida have the potential to develop similar features. The conclusion is that Central Florida will lose its ability to compete in the global marketplace if actions are not taken to connect the Central Florida super region with mass transit, conserve the environmental assets of the super region, and create dense but livable urban areas that will attract a younger, capable population or “creative class” as the report refers to this demographic (PennDesign, 101).

In summary, the report concludes that the current trend of development is unsustainable for the super region. The current trend will result in a decrease of environmental areas, more congestion due to continued population growth that relies on inadequate transportation infrastructures and a growth policy of urban sprawl. The report recommends an alternative development trend that relies on a combination of three policy efforts to change the current development trends: economic competitiveness, transportation improvements, and proactive environmental conservation. Increasing economic competitiveness will result from leveraging the existing assets of the super region. These assets include economic factors such as Central Florida being a major
tourism and retirement destination, as well as existing industries such as healthcare and technology (e.g. Kennedy Space Center). These assets also include geographic advantages such as access to the Gulf of Mexico, Atlantic Ocean, the Port of Tampa which is the 16th largest port and Orlando International Airport which is the 22nd busiest airport in the U.S. (PennDesign, 28). Transportation improvements include high speed rail and regional light rail that integrates regional and local transportation flows and recommends an aggressive timeline to implement many specific transportation infrastructures. Finally, the report stresses the importance of conserving the environmental assets of the super region for aesthetic, agricultural, and tourism activities in addition to basic issues such as preserving a sustainable water supply. This report also addresses the need to successfully adapt to climate change that will include “a rise in sea level, intensified weather conditions, disturbed ecosystems, and changes in agriculture yields” (PennDesign, 46). The report concludes that by addressing these three areas will allow the Central Florida Super Region to compete on the global stage (PennDesign, 98).

4.2 Thematic Review of Interview Results

This section focuses on the results of stakeholder interviews within the structure of the five themes that I used to explore my research topic: Tampa Bay and economic development, effects of economic development, globalization, space-time awareness, and transportation. Within each theme, I have presented the results and compared them across stakeholder groups. I begin each theme with a summary table which presents the sub-themes that stakeholders identified within the theme. A brief description of each sub-theme is also included.
The list of different stakeholders I interviewed and other relevant details are provided in Appendix E, Tables 7.1 to 7.3 (pages 132-133). Each stakeholder has been assigned a letter that is used in the text to refer to the stakeholder in describing the information I received in an interview. I interviewed these 26 people in the course of 20 separate interviews. As I present the results of the interviews below, I will refer to the stakeholders in the plural in an effort to maintain confidentiality. It is for this same reason that I do not identify the title of any stakeholder within their organization.

4.2.1 Tampa Bay and Economic Development

The theme of Tampa Bay and economic development contributes to my research primarily to answer my research question “What vision of Tampa Bay is driving the economic development plans of stakeholders of Tampa International Airport and St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport?” In this section, I present the results of my investigation of this theme with stakeholders by describing the economic development goals of stakeholders in terms of a future Tampa Bay and how they propose to reach this goal through economic development plans.
Table 4.1: Tampa Bay and Economic Development Thematic Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring of Economy</td>
<td>Tourism and construction can no longer be relied upon as drivers of the economy of Florida and Tampa Bay. Economy must be restructured but to what there was not a consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Industries</td>
<td>Industries of healthcare, corporate headquarters, I-4 Corridor, medical technology, high-tech were common industries that were pointed to as being key industries for Tampa Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>A regional outlook is necessary for Tampa Bay to be competitive in the global market. For some stakeholders this includes the concept of a super-region that includes Tampa Bay and Orlando.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young and Professional Demographic</td>
<td>Many stakeholders expressed a need to attract a young and professional demographic that will bring innovation and help create and maintain new business activities in key industries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail is Key</td>
<td>High speed rail is key to the future of Tampa Bay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a large amount of consistency in the descriptions of a future Tampa Bay by stakeholders within and across stakeholder groups. The most notable description of the future Tampa Bay expressed by all stakeholders is the need for Tampa Bay and for Florida to restructure its economy. This restructuring will be a move from a reliance on tourism and population growth (i.e., home construction) to a reliance on a diverse range of industries. All stakeholders said that tourism and home construction will remain part of the economy, but will not be the drivers. There were a variety of suggestions on what the range of industries should be, but there was a large overlap among these suggestions. The most common industries suggested were medical technology, healthcare, research and development, high-tech in the I-4 Corridor, corporate headquarters, and international
trade that would take advantage of Tampa International Airport (TPA) and the Port of Tampa.

Stakeholder L of the Tampa Bay Partnership raised the issue of the need to restructure the Tampa Bay economy by saying that there is a need to now behave differently as a city, metropolitan area, region and super region. This interviewee related a conversation that he had prior to my interview with him in which a participant questioned whether the Florida economy would come back like it always has due to the strength of growth in the form of construction and property tax revenues. This stakeholder said that this was a sobering realization and caused them to realize how important it is to have a plan to create a new vision of Tampa Bay. This leads one to the question “what do we do when we acknowledge that we cannot rely on the historical foundations”. Stakeholder Z was more brash in their assessment of the historical foundations of the economy when they said that relying on tourism and population growth is no way to build an economy and referred to it as the “third world model of economic development”.

As expected, the TPA stakeholders (A and B) stressed the part that TPA would play in the economic development of Tampa Bay. For example, these stakeholders proposed that TPA can facilitate the mobility of upper income mobile residents who choose to reside in Tampa Bay. This is ironic because stakeholder A of TPA also described the most common type of tourist that is attracted to the Tampa Bay area as being in the lower income scale. This would include people described as being middle class or working class and often families, both domestic and international. Both TPA representatives described the act of supporting the economic development of Tampa Bay
as an exercise in planning ahead, but being flexible enough to accommodate changing conditions and requirements of the community. Representative A stated that the old philosophy of “build and they will come” no longer works for airports. It is a question of how TPA leaders can assist the community leaders to expand and develop. This requires a connection to the community by being a critical thinker and a political thinker with the community. It is no longer an issue of just building infrastructure to meet demand as was done in the past but rather, as this representative said, “in today’s global market one has to look at the broader sense”.

Another commonly repeated theme was the expansion of geographic outlook. All stakeholders said in one form or another that Tampa Bay needed to become more of a regional metropolitan area. Being regional ranged from thinking of, and acting on behalf of, the Tampa Bay area as a multi-county area that matches the service area of TPA to Tampa Bay being part of a super region stretching eastward to Orlando and ultimately to the east coast of Florida. The most common reason expressed by stakeholders for the need to think and act regionally is to pool resources in order to become competitive in the global marketplace. This is even more important in the current economic climate of Tampa Bay and in Florida, since resources are limited due to the recession. Acting regionally, regardless of the definition of region, for each stakeholder meant having a regional multi-modal transportation system that includes high speed rail and light rail. The future Tampa Bay will have more densely populated urban centers which residents can travel to and from using mass transit.

However, many stakeholders said that an expanded geographic outlook also comes with challenges because it creates many more voices that must be coordinated to
act on behalf of Tampa Bay as a region. Several stakeholders said that there are so many municipalities just within the counties that make up the Tampa Bay area that making progress at the county level can be difficult. For example, stakeholder E said that “we all have to get in the game [because things] can’t be handled just on the basis of the city boundaries”. Then there is the question of Tampa Bay speaking with one voice to work together with Orlando in the context of a super region. Stakeholders as diverse as A of TPA, L of the Tampa Bay Partnership, and P of the Caribbean-American Chamber of Commerce described the geographic diversity as both a blessing and a curse.

The theme concerning Tampa Bay that contained the largest difference in opinion between different groups of stakeholders was governance structure. This difference was between the transportation stakeholders of TPA along with the government economic development stakeholders and a number of stakeholders of non-profit economic development groups, and private business interests. For example, both TPA stakeholders and Port of Tampa stakeholder K commented on the governance structure of Tampa Bay by pointing out that geographic awareness has increased to include actual cooperation with Orlando with the development of high speed rail and with talk of additional forms of cooperation with a geographic area extending past Orlando to the east central coast of Florida as a super-region. However, stakeholder A of TPA concluded discussion on this issue by saying that they did not think that the creation of a regional or super-regional airport authority is realistic. The governmental economic development stakeholders commented on the need for regional outlook and pointed to organizations like TBARTA (Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority) and the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization, but stopped short of advocating a radical restructuring of these
types of governmental structures to accommodate a regional jurisdiction. Rather, they advocated increased cooperation among existing governmental and non-profit economic development entities. TBARTA was created in 2007 by the Florida State Legislature for the purpose of improving “mobility and expand multimodal transportation options for passengers and freight throughout the seven-county region” according to its website (Tampa Bay Area Regional Transportation Authority, 2011). The MPO is an organization that has developed a strategic transportation plan for the Tampa Bay area and to which stakeholder H is a contributing member as a representative of the Planning Commission. According to its website, The Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization (2011) is a:

“transportation policy-making board comprised of representatives from local governments and transportation agencies. According to federal and state laws, the Hillsborough County MPO is responsible for establishing a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for Hillsborough County. Key responsibilities are the creation of the twenty-year Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the five-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).”

The representatives of non-profit economic development groups and private business interests expressed the view that the governance structure of Tampa Bay is not conducive to a regional outlook. There are too many groups and individuals that have a place at the table of Tampa Bay economic development and often these different voices have competing interests. The reasons given by stakeholders for competing interests may be due to a different opinion on an issue, or because of an interest in protecting one’s turf. Although the stakeholders of TPA and governmental economic development did acknowledge the number of voices at the table, they did not express the view that this was an insurmountable obstacle. However, the non-profit economic development and
private business interests group of stakeholders expressed the view that the governance structure of Tampa Bay must change before significant progress can be made. The opinions on what an effective governance structure should be were varied and not expressed completely, but there was a large degree of agreement among this group that changes are required. This point was illustrated by stakeholder P who said that “they are on different time lines, they are on different schedules, but they are not working together to that common goal. Now they know of each other. They talk back and forth. But there is no common vision and [no effort to] move forward together by this specific date”.

It appears that the non-profit economic stakeholders and the private business interest group of stakeholders hold this opinion because to some extent they feel left out of the process since they don’t have enough of a voice at the table. They seem to be a bit more frustrated than the government group or the transportation group. It appeared to me that the reason for this frustration is that they do not feel what they want is coming at all or quickly enough. Their stake is both personal and civic; where civic is the business community and specifically the bi-national business community that they represent.

Many stakeholders described a change in demographics for a future Tampa Bay where a “young and professional” class of people will be attracted to the Tampa Bay area. A couple of stakeholders used the term “creative class” to describe this type of person, which is a reference to a book titled The Making of the Creative Class by Richard Florida (2002). The qualities of Tampa Bay that would entice this group of people were described in many ways. Tampa Bay would provide a desirable quality of life which would include professional opportunities, an urban experience that would be conducive to a mobile lifestyle, cultural experiences, and natural attractions. Many stakeholders stated
that it is necessary for Tampa Bay to be perceived as an exciting, trendy, or hip location in order to attract the young professional which is the type of person necessary to engage in a diverse range of economic activities that will grow the Tampa Bay area economically. For example, stakeholder R said that what Tampa Bay lacks “is an international image…Tampa doesn’t have the image of a really exciting place to be or to live”. Stakeholder Z described this demographic by saying that “creating a cluster of curious people…that is really the secret between cities that work and cities that don’t work and cities that remain competitive. Nurturing and culturing young and old curiosity in them”.

Several stakeholders across the various groups said that another desirable demographic are people who can bring a lot of resources to Tampa Bay. One example provided by multiple stakeholders is business owners who have the flexibility to live in a location other than where they conduct their business. This was a view of stakeholder E who said that the City of St. Petersburg is well suited for this type of individual because it offers a great quality of life with a number of cultural and natural attractions of the Tampa Bay landscape. In keeping with the regional outlook, this stakeholder said that the accessibility of TPA would allow quick access to air transportation to wherever the individual needs to go to conduct business.

Another theme expressed by many stakeholders across the groups was the ethnic and cultural diversity of Tampa Bay. This diversity was noted as a strength by many stakeholders such as stakeholder P who said that the identity of Tampa Bay is its diversity. Several reasons were provided for identifying diversity as a strength and one of the common reasons given is that it creates a desirable community for international companies because a multi-cultural metropolitan area would be attractive to international
workers. Another reason that ethnic and cultural diversity is seen as a strength is the economic potential of different cultural groups. There are a number of different ethnicities in Tampa Bay that have connections with their native countries. Stakeholders commented that these connections have economic potential that could be built upon. Many stakeholders concluded that this diversity within Tampa Bay from an economic perspective to be both a blessing and a curse by stakeholders. This idea also extends to ethnic and cultural diversity. This is because the different ethnic and cultural groups speak with different voices and do not work together in the interest of common economic growth.

This effort to attract outside resources is a very prominent trend in the thinking of Tampa Bay stakeholders. A majority of stakeholders across all stakeholder categories stated that there is a need to attract business to the area. What they were not saying, but implying, by this focus is that there is not as much possibility for organic growth within the Tampa Bay area. This thinking is further reinforced by the views expressed by stakeholders that there is a need to attract “young and professional” people to the area who will be willing to innovate and take the risks necessary to create new forms of wealth within this metropolitan area. From these views we can conclude that stakeholders’ response to the global economy is to identify the economic, capital, and intellectual resources that the global economy has produced and import them to the Tampa Bay area. One of the tools that will make this possible in the eyes of stakeholders is a multi-modal transportation system. This includes air transportation, but at the time of my interviews with the stakeholders, the focus was on the development of high speed rail
and light rail networks that will link the airports to the Tampa Bay area to Orlando and the East Coast of Florida.

Another tool that stakeholders are attempting to use to attract global resources to Tampa Bay is name recognition. A number of stakeholders pointed out that Tampa Bay does not have enough name recognition outside of the U.S. to compete with other Florida cities such as Orlando and Miami. An additional tool that stakeholders see as a resource includes the natural assets of Tampa Bay (i.e. the physical geography) which leads to a desirable quality of life that has the potential to entice outsiders to bring resources to Tampa Bay either by becoming a resident or by moving a business to the area. Finally, the internal economic development potential of the existing medical, healthcare, and university related research provides a foundation upon which to build organically.

In summary, the tools that Tampa Bay stakeholders have to work with to attract outside resources from the global economy are multi-modal transportation system, appropriate demographics, and name recognition. These tools are going to require a longer amount of time and a large volume of resources to attain. For example, a referendum to fund a light rail network in Hillsborough County was defeated in the November 2010 elections and the officials elected in this election are questioning the plans to build the mostly funded high speed rail link that will connect Tampa Bay to Orlando. Tampa Bay’s more immediate prospects appear to be more likely to come from existing organic growth opportunities such as the healthcare industry, high-tech companies in the I-4 corridor, and public-private partnerships related to university research and development.
4.2.2 Effects of Economic Development Plans

I included the theme concerning the effects of economic development plans to investigate the claims of Tampa Bay stakeholders about the benefits of globalization. Specifically, I wanted to explore one of the claims that Steger (2009) proposes is part of the market approach ideology to globalization and that is the claim that everyone benefits from globalization. Being a case study, I attempted to identify the thoughts of Tampa Bay stakeholders on this subject by asking who they thought would benefit from their economic development plans.

Table 4.2: Effects of Economic Development Plans Thematic Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyone Will Benefit</td>
<td>All stakeholders responded that everyone will benefit from economic development plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictory Views</td>
<td>Some stakeholders engaged this subject in depth and with candor. In this discussion some qualifications were made that contradicted the view that everyone will benefit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response from stakeholders to the question of who would benefit from the economic development plans and the future Tampa Bay that they described to me was overwhelmingly consistent. Each stakeholder responded that everyone will benefit. My research did not collect the data to determine the positive and negative effects across all social and economic demographics. However, the indications provided both directly and indirectly by the interviewees are such that their vision of a future Tampa Bay is one that focuses on the demographic(s) that can build and sustain a Tampa Bay which will be competitive in the global marketplace. This demographic group was described as being young, professional, mobile, and with enough means to select Tampa Bay as a place of
residence even though they may not work in the area nor live full-time in the area. Thus, the direct goal of the economic development plans articulated by the stakeholders of this research project is to create a metropolitan area that appeals to the type of person who can add to the economic value of Tampa Bay. In many cases this type of person was described as someone who is not currently a resident. In other words, it is someone who needs to be enticed to come to Tampa Bay to take part in its economy. However, several stakeholders said this also includes young people who graduate from the universities in the Tampa Bay area.

Stakeholder X argued that economic development and globalization will benefit everyone. This stakeholder explained that there will be greater job opportunities if economic development occurs while the environment is protected and quality of life is maintained. This interviewee then explained that often economic development and protection of the environment and quality of life are seen as mutually exclusive, but if you have economic development but have bad air and water quality then people are not going to remain or come to the area. On the other hand, if there is no economic development then there is most likely not going to be funding for maintaining the environment or other quality of life factors. The stakeholder continued by saying that it is possible to solve inequality and benefit the underprivileged through economic development. Stakeholder X quoted an unnamed colleague who said that “the best social program they know of is a job”. This stakeholder then said that “we should have the dream goal of putting every social service agency out of business because of lack of business”. The stakeholder then acknowledged that this probably will not happen but it would be nice to have this as a goal.
Some stakeholders were engaging in conversation about the effects of globalization and went beyond their initial response that everyone will benefit. From these comments, it is apparent that there is a delineation of responsibility for the welfare of the residents of a city. Stakeholder M’s comment is representative of the stakeholders who believe that it is not the responsibility of economic developers to ensure that everyone benefits from globalization, although this is an argument that all stakeholders used. They articulated this point by saying that “whether or not it helps the man in the street, you cannot influence, that’s got to be the people of the nation themselves and the government. But, clearly they are reaping the rewards financially and otherwise that globalization brings because they have products, services, commodities that others have an increasing demand for”. Stakeholder D said that there are some factors that are beyond the control of economic developers. Despite their best intentions, the actions of economic developers will not always have the desired effect of bringing a benefit to all residents of a city. Stakeholder E mentioned that residents of Tampa Bay should take a long term view and support the measures that need to be taken to increase jobs even if the residents may not see an immediate benefit to themselves. Stakeholder O addressed this issue by saying that there was inequality before globalization, so the fact that there is inequality during the time of globalization is not necessarily due to globalization.

4.2.3 Globalization

The theme of globalization provides context to my research. In my thesis I looked at Tampa Bay against the backdrop of the global economy. Specifically, I investigated how Tampa Bay stakeholders may or may not be responding to the global economy when they make their plans for a future Tampa Bay and when they formulate their economic
development plans to achieve their vision. Globalization is also the context for my investigation of how air transportation may or may not be used in these economic development plans. In this section I present the stakeholders’ understanding of globalization.

Table 4.3: Globalization Thematic Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Phenomenon</td>
<td>All stakeholders understand globalization from a primarily economic perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Dimensions</td>
<td>All stakeholders acknowledged other dimensions of globalization such as political, social, and environmental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Perspective</td>
<td>What each stakeholder includes as part of globalization appears to be driven by personal experience and awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to Articulate</td>
<td>It appeared difficult for many stakeholders to articulate non-economic views of globalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Several social aspects of globalization were mentioned by stakeholders (e.g. a global village, everyone is your neighbor, a necessity to be accepting of different people and cultures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do More with Less</td>
<td>Globalization requires one to do more with less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>A regional outlook is necessary in globalization. For example, it is necessary to pool resources across a region to be competitive in the global economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>To be successful in the globalization one must be willing to take risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholders’ understanding of globalization was overwhelmingly from an economic perspective, across all groups. This was not surprising, since the professional focus for each of the stakeholders interviewed was the economic development of Tampa Bay. The economic understanding of globalization was expressed in terms of a global
market, business without frontiers both physical and virtual, pursuit of profits and cost-savings, anyone is your customer, and access to all for all. For example, stakeholder A called globalization a “global economic situation. It’s free trade. It’s an opportunity for profit:” which was also echoed by stakeholder L of Tampa Bay Partnership. This stakeholder said that “I define globalization as connectivity, connectivity of markets and access to buyers and sellers.” They expanded on the concept of access to markets by saying that the international activities of ports and airports are important because in a global economy one needs access to people. “I need not just you and me to buy stuff locally here, I need someone in China to buy product, that money comes to us that wasn’t there before and now we have the ability to spend it and invest it. So it’s not you and I trading pennies back and forth. But it’s us getting new pennies on the table or whatever. So that’s the charm of it. It makes my pie a lot larger without having to bake a whole other pie or having to learn how to bake it”.

The economic dimension of globalization expressed by all stakeholders is very similar to the market approach to globalization described by Steger (2009). As a reminder, the market approach to globalization is one in which a *laissez-faire* approach is applied to the global economy which challenges traditional political, social, and geographic boundaries. One interesting comment that more than one stakeholder made (e.g., Q, L) was that if one does not take advantage of the tools that enable globalization such as communications and transportation technologies then one will be unable to compete with anyone who does. This comment appears to confirm one of the claims of the ideology of the market approach of globalization (Steger 2009) that there is no choice in the matter of globalization. In contrast, a number of stakeholders (e.g. D, L, Y) pointed
out that the economy of Tampa Bay needs to be restructured, but how that will happen is yet to be determined.

While the perspective of globalization of each of the stakeholders was economic, almost all stakeholders identified additional dimensions of globalization. However, the stakeholders did not express a consistent list of dimensions or properties for commonly identified additional dimensions of globalization. These additional dimensions of globalization identified by stakeholders ranged from social and political to geographic. A geographic dimension to globalization was noted by many stakeholders and these are summarized in the discussion on space and time awareness (section 4.2.4 of this chapter).

Several stakeholders commented on social aspects of globalization by referring to the world either as a global village, or noting that everyone is our neighbor, or that there is a global market which is not homogenous because of social and cultural differences. For example, stakeholder Q said that we now live in a global village and we are all connected which transcends political boundaries.” Several stakeholders (e.g., M, N, P) also commented on the social aspect of globalization by saying that it is important to embrace the diversity across the globe in order to collaborate and do business in a global environment. Stakeholder Q said that globalization raises the question of human rights, because human rights are determined by the various political systems in the world. Since there is more contact between the people of these political systems due to the processes of globalization, the differences in human rights are very evident. The issue of inequality was also mentioned by stakeholder F. This person pointed out that globalization is also a source of job loss because of outsourcing. This comment exposes a moral issue of globalization which, according to this stakeholder, is not often addressed in discussions
of globalization and economic development. Stakeholders M and O said that globalization makes the world a safer place because it makes it more stable and provides more opportunities to people for business and employment.

As stated previously in chapter 2, Watts (2000) provided an example of how an individual’s awareness influences their choices as they engage in the processes of globalization. This is also evident in the descriptions of globalization from stakeholders. There were a number of comments made by Tampa Bay stakeholders which indicate that they believe choice is a part of globalization and that it is not a forgone conclusion over which there is no control, as stated by the proponents of the market approach ideology to globalization (Steger 2009). Stakeholder F pointed out while talking about the development of the I-4 corridor that we “really get the opportunity to realign the population to the place where you want it.” This is a clear statement of belief that there is choice in the process of economic development in the context of globalization. There were several other comments that express the view that choice exists in globalization. Stakeholder K said that globalization is not finished and that there are no mature markets because they are still being developed. This comment was shared by stakeholder Q who said that globalization is an open question for Tampa Bay. Stakeholder C said that globalization requires ideas and resources which will influence the processes of globalization and are thus not predefined. Finally, stakeholder G said that we are no longer dependent upon a particular place.

Additional evidence to support the idea that there is a mental aspect to globalization was provided by a number of stakeholders. Stakeholders B, D, M, O, and P all pointed to their international travel experience as being a factor in their view of the
world and understanding of globalization. These stakeholders look upon this experience as an advantage because they have seen different ways of living and doing things. They said that they know first-hand that there are different people and places out there and now want to engage with them.

4.2.4 Space-Time Awareness

As I demonstrated above in my literature review in chapter 2, the literature on contemporary globalization and transportation geography shows that globalization involves changing perceptions of space-time. Thus, in my case study of Tampa Bay I have investigated space-time awareness among Tampa Bay stakeholders. In this section I present what turned out to be a very rich theme to research in this case study despite my anticipated difficulty in addressing this subject in the context of research interviews.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Compression Is Bidirectional and Time is Faster but Not as Regimented</td>
<td>All stakeholders acknowledged that there is an expectation to respond quickly in globalization. However, the speed provided by communication technologies also allows one the flexibility in when they can respond to communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Feel Distance</td>
<td>The stakeholders that acknowledged that &quot;the world is getting smaller&quot; expressed the view that distance does not matter as much and that they don't feel the effects of distance anymore or as much as they used to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blending of Personal and Work</td>
<td>The flexibility of communication technologies blurs the line between personal and work lifestyles because the communications are not contained within the time or spatial boundaries of each. This allows one the choice to blend these two lifestyles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do More with Less</td>
<td>It is necessary to do more with less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>It is necessary to realize that what happens throughout a region and globe has a direct impact upon local life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal</td>
<td>All stakeholders stressed the necessity of a multi-modal transportation system in Tampa Bay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All stakeholders acknowledged that awareness of space and time perception is changing for them and for at least some other people. Some stakeholders said this without being asked whether or not they are aware of these changes, and others acknowledged only after I asked the question. There were two notable observations about this changing awareness displayed by stakeholders. The first is that the change is not unidirectional. My question to stakeholders on this subject is whether or not they observe others making comments to indicate that the world is getting smaller or that time moves faster than it used to. All stakeholders acknowledged this change in perception in one form or another. Stakeholders U and T of the Scandanavian and Baltic Trade Association observed that
globalization requires an increased speed in order to survive. While stakeholder U said that “the effect of globalization [is that] people, money, goods, they are going to flow faster, ship faster”, stakeholder T said that “the ones who make decisions and put them into effect the fastest are going to do well”.

A number of stakeholders described how time not only seems to move faster, but also how they experience more time. For example, stakeholder B said that there is an expectation to respond quickly to emails which drives the person to continually monitor their “Blackberry”. However, stakeholder B reported that when the person they are communicating with cross time zones, they have more time because it “reduces the awkwardness of having to schedule around phone calls”. Stakeholder F also voiced an awareness of contradicting perceptions of space and time and also attributed it to communications technologies. This stakeholder described how they can participate in work related communications with a Blackberry which eliminates the need to be in the office for a fixed schedule. The result of this is a blending of work and personal lifestyles that provides one more personal freedom on how they structure their time. Stakeholder O said that they no longer feel the distance between their international coworkers. They continued by saying that the ability to communicate easily with anyone regardless of where they are “makes the distance or difference be gone”. Despite these attestations to the benefits of virtual communication no stakeholder said that communications technologies will replace face-to-face contact and some stakeholders, such as L, M, and O) pointed this out. These stakeholders said that in-person contact is necessary to begin relationships and although relationships can be maintained to some extent through virtual contact, they cannot survive on virtual communications alone.
A second observation is that changing perceptions of space and time are not just in the abstract. One tangible result in Tampa Bay is the formation of a regional transportation authority, Tampa Bay Area Regional Transit Authority (TBARTA). The spread of the SARS virus in the early 2000s, according to stakeholder J, was an event that had tangible effects. In response to the risk of this virus, national governments began to quarantine travelers and residents of some countries began wearing masks to protect themselves from the virus. One of the changes in perception of space and time that the risk of this virus caused was a view that the world felt smaller, because the spread of this virus in Asia was a direct threat to stakeholder in U.S. This also affected the stakeholder’s perception of time, because air travel decreased the time it would take for the virus to spread to other countries and increased the chances that it would spread.

Another reason given for changing perceptions of space and time is economic conditions. Because of the recession, there are fewer resources available so one must do more with less. One way of accomplishing this, according to stakeholders L and Y, is by employing economies of scale which means looking outside one’s borders to find economic opportunities. Stakeholder L said that this situation will affect the role of Tampa International Airport (TPA), because its role must be rethought. This stakeholder said that it is not necessary to duplicate the air transportation capabilities of Orlando International Airport (MCO) at TPA because Tampa Bay stakeholders may need to pool resources with Orlando stakeholders so that TPA and MCO complement each other to the benefit of the Tampa Bay and Orlando super region.
4.2.5 Transportation

Transportation is a prominent theme in my research. I am primarily interested in the response of economic development in terms of air transportation infrastructures. As my literature review on transportation geography has shown, transportation is one of the enablers of globalization and this is especially true for air transportation. How Tampa Bay stakeholders use or do not use air transportation in processes of economic development in Tampa Bay provides us with an example of the application of air transportation in response to the global economy. And, in the context of my case study, how air transportation is used or proposed to be used in Tampa Bay also provides us with a picture of what is to come in Tampa Bay if the plans of stakeholders are realized.

Table 4.5: Transportation Thematic Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Transportation</td>
<td>Air transportation cannot stand on its own in Tampa Bay. It is a necessary part of whole transportation system and must be seamlessly integrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail is Key</td>
<td>High speed and light rail are key to the future of Tampa Bay because they are necessary for globalization. They are also key to a multi-modal transportation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Transportation Is Necessary for Globalization</td>
<td>Air transportation is a necessary component of globalization and a tool for being competitive in the global economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Tampa Bay's transportation system must be built with a regional scope. This not only includes the counties that make up Tampa Bay but includes Tampa Bay and Orlando.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholders across all the categories acknowledged that air transportation will play an important part in the future of Tampa Bay. However, there was not much
consistency on just what that role will be. The most common role that air transportation is expected to play is provide a global connection to support intellectual capital, provide a steady supply of passengers for the cruise ship industry, and support the development of import and export dependent industries. All stakeholders stressed the necessity of creating a multi-modal regional transportation system for the Tampa Bay area of which air transportation is one mode which cannot stand on its own. A regional approach to transportation was stressed by all stakeholders with the largest reason being that in order to compete on a larger economic scale, the Tampa Bay area must consolidate its resources. This included the representatives of TPA (stakeholders A and B), but this may be more of a recent opinion at TPA and could be attributed to the recently planned high speed rail that is supposed to connect Tampa Bay and Orlando. The 2005 Master Plan document contained a supplement which included the minutes of a TIA Master Plan Update Technical Working Group held in September 2009. In this meeting the TPA Executive Director expressed the opinion that high speed rail between Tampa and Orlando would “probably be no impact” (Hillsborough County Aviation Authority 2006b, 78). This contradicts the view expressed by stakeholder F, who described a very thoroughly thought multi-modal transportation system that took into consideration the number of trees that have been planted on the streets of St. Petersburg to facilitate pedestrians.

The role of TPA in the Tampa Bay area is regarded in most aspects as positive by all stakeholders that I interviewed. They pointed out the benefits of TPA as being a well-run airport, accessible in terms of its proximity to the downtown areas of the City of Tampa and the City of St. Petersburg as well as the Gulf Coast beaches in Pinellas
County such as Clearwater. The criticisms that were presented during interviews were small in number and in frequency. The largest criticism is the lack of international non-stop flights to and from TPA. While no interviewee denied that that the addition of these flights would be desirable and a benefit to the area, there were opposing opinions on the realistic number and type of non-stop international flights. This debate highlights how much the role of TPA is evolving. On one hand of this debate are the representatives of the bi-national chambers of commerce and private business interest stakeholders who have a vision of TPA being a larger international airport with many direct international connections. On the other side of this debate are certain stakeholders of government or non-profit economic development groups who, while not against it by any means, held what is in their view a more realistic role of TPA. This group of stakeholders believes that there will be niche international markets that will be appropriate for the Tampa Bay area which will stimulate the development of new international non-stop flights. There were a couple of different dynamics offered for this view. One is the development of high speed rail between Tampa and Orlando, and the other is the nature of demand potential in the Tampa Bay area.

A few stakeholders who held the view that economic development should lead the development of transportation, expressed the following argument. Stakeholders B and F said that demand needs to support air travel growth, but the airport needs to stay a step or two ahead of the demand to not be a roadblock. In other words, it must find a balance. Stakeholder D compared the air travel demand for TPA and MCO to point out how each metropolitan area interacts with the global processes of tourism and business. This stakeholder said that MCO’s demand is worldwide and spread out among countless
destinations. In contracts, TPA’s demand is local and is directed outward to a relatively small number of locations. Therefore, it is no surprise to this stakeholder that TPA would not support the number of non-stop international flights that MCO does. This observation illustrates how local flows of transportation interact with global flows of transportation, which is one example of the relationship between air travel and globalization. A proponent of the argument on the side of transportation leading economic development was stakeholder O of the US-Indo Chamber of Commerce. This stakeholder said that “we don’t have a lot of real international flights”. One can get to anywhere in the world from TPA, or to TPA from anywhere in the world, but it takes many legs of flying to do so. Having more direct international flights will allow people to save time when they travel to TPA, which will mean more business will come to Tampa Bay.

St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport (PIE) was not consistently included in the economic development plans of stakeholders. The representatives of TPA do take PIE into consideration in their transportation plans. They summarized the relationship by saying that when possible they do cooperation with PIE representatives in the development of air transportation. This cooperation consists of recognizing that TPA and PIE serve different markets and it is in the best interest to foster this complementary relationship. However, when there is overlap in markets between TPA and PIE, as stakeholder B put it, “at the end of the day they are competitors”.

The governmental economic development stakeholders D and E both take PIE into account in the economic development picture. Stakeholder D sees this airport as playing a part in the air transportation system of Tampa Bay in the following ways: 1) it provides market forces (i.e. completion) for Tampa International Airport (TPA); 2) it
provides regional opportunities that TPA may not be able to support, or may not be the best airport to support such as low cost airlines like Allegiant; and 3) it does provide international travel [in the form of seasonal low cost airlines or chartered flights] which provides additional global connections for Tampa Bay. Stakeholder E echoed the opinion that PIE’s strength is as provider of a low-cost leisure travel.

The awareness of PIE among the non-profit economic development and private business interest group was least consistent. For example, stakeholders L of the Tampa Bay Partnership said that PIE is definitely part of their economic development plans, because PIE provides a complementary service to TPA. This contrasts with stakeholder M of the Tampa-Hillsborough Economic Development Corporation who said that PIE is not on their radar. This stakeholder explained that their focus is Hillsborough County and this may explain why PIE does not come up in their plans.

There was general acknowledgement among stakeholders that the Master Plan of Tampa International Airport is appropriate for the economic development plans they described. The familiarity with the Master Plan ranged from stakeholders knowing some of the details of the plan to knowing that the plan exists, but not being familiar with the details. My observation was that the Master Plan seemed to be regarded as more of a concern for TPA stakeholder rather than something that all stakeholders could use and have input to.
5 DISCUSSION

This chapter focuses on the different conclusions that I have drawn on the basis of artifact reviews and in-depth, semi-structured stakeholder interviews. This discussion of my results is presented in the same thematic structure used to summarize the results in Chapter 4.

5.1 Tampa Bay

From stakeholder comments on the subject, we can conclude that governance structure is one of Tampa Bay’s biggest challenges. Political and geographic boundaries are embedded in the current governing structure. This makes the job of governance from a regional perspective difficult for entities that have a regional outlook or mandate like the Tampa Bay Partnership, TBARTA, and the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council. In order for the change that these organizations are advocating to occur, there must be a significant change in the governance structure of all stakeholders involved. We can see cases where a stakeholder’s job performance is dependent upon a geographic area that is at odds with the regional outlook that they may advocate. For example, stakeholder A stated that it would be a good thing for TPA, PIE, SRQ, and MCO to plan together but then followed this statement by saying that at the end of the day their job is to increase flights at TPA, but not at PIE or at other airports. When we consider what form a regional governance structure for air transportation may take, it is possible to imagine the creation
of a “super region” airport authority that would have jurisdiction over TPA, PIE, SRQ, MCO, and SFB.

Two key conclusions can be drawn from these comments. First, geography does still matter. It is not uncommon to hear the proclamation that geography no longer matters or that “the world is flat”. If this were true, then there would be no reason for someone to move jobs or themselves to another location. Rather, the existence of internet communication and transportation technologies allow people who have access to them the means to select locations for jobs and residents based on geographic specific properties such as the cost of labor or the attraction of a location to an individual. Second, Tampa Bay stakeholders believe that Tampa Bay does not contain the intellectual capital necessary to transform Tampa Bay. This outward looking view illustrates the perceived shortcomings of Tampa Bay in the lack of ability to attract this type of demographic and also the acknowledgement of the inability to generate it from within.

From the descriptions of a future Tampa Bay that Tampa Bay stakeholders have provided, we can discern attempts to reposition Tampa Bay in the global city network. But just how Tampa Bay is to be repositioned is seen differently across stakeholders. One model of global repositioning is the global city hierarchy defined by Sassen (2002). In fact, one stakeholder (D) referenced Sassen’s ranking and stated that they believe Tampa Bay to be a second tier global city. Despite the aspirations of this stakeholder and a few others, it does not appear that upward movement on the global city hierarchy will be quickly realized. For example, there was wide acknowledgement among the Tampa Bay stakeholders that the diversification of Tampa Bay’s economy includes an increase in the presence of corporations. However, based on past performance, the reality of
stakeholders attracting enough advanced producer services that would increase Tampa Bay’s links to the world intercity relations (Derudder et al. 2009) does not seem likely, or at best a very slow process.

5.2 Beneficiaries of Development Plans

There are many claims that make up the market approach to globalization that Steger (2009) describes as an ideology. One of these is that globalization benefits everyone. From what stakeholders said in response to my interview question “who will benefit in the future Tampa Bay from the economic development plans that they have described” we can conclude that there are certain requirements that must be met for someone to benefit. However, these requirements were not explicitly acknowledged by most stakeholders. For example, we can conclude that one requirement is that one must be a productive member of the economic community as defined by the market to directly take part in the flows of globalization. The global-local connection is controlled by those who directly engage in global processes, and as they make decisions they are deciding where to direct the resources that are involved in these processes. In this process, both those who are included in these flows and excluded from these flows have the potential to be affected positively or negatively. Regarding those who will be affected negatively, or those who will be excluded from these flows of resources, stakeholder M said that it is up to the local government to see that its residents are taken care of. From this thinking, we can conclude that the most immediate demographic to be impacted by the economic development plans presented by stakeholders will be those who can be convinced to take part in the economic activities proposed by the stakeholders, or those who cannot help but be a part of the processes.
One of the demographic groups that are likely to benefit from these economic development plans in Tampa Bay comprises those who control the economic activities on which the stakeholders are focusing. These include those who own or run the businesses in the key industries that are thought to be the most appropriate industries to diversify the economies of Florida and Tampa Bay. We can draw this conclusion because when social practice creates infrastructures such as transportation infrastructures, the social relations become embedded in the transportation infrastructures and this has both positive and negative effects on the population. Accessibility to transportation infrastructures is one example of this. We can look to Lefebvre for confirmation of this as he wrote that in “spatial practice, the reproduction of social relations is predominant” (Lefebvre 1991, 50).

One notable observation I made about the stakeholders, as they described the benefits of globalization and economic development, is that they displayed a sense of sincerity in their belief of the benefits of economic development and globalization. There was an excitement expressed by several stakeholders about the idea that globalization will benefit everyone. The concept, as presented by the stakeholders, made rational sense to them and there was an appreciation for the beauty of the idea that the global processes that they described would have such far reaching effects upon a population. It did not appear to me that this view of economic development and globalization is challenged during the normal course of business for most stakeholders. However, there were a number of stakeholders, as I pointed out above, who were very willing to engage in a discussion that challenged their view of globalization. Further, in these conversations
these stakeholders were candid and up front about the challenges to the ideas of globalization and economic development that they described.

5.3 Globalization

Discussions with stakeholders show that they perceive globalization as primarily an economic phenomenon. Further, this understanding is similar to the market approach to globalization described by Steger (2009). While many stakeholders claimed that one has no choice but to use communications and transportation technologies to compete in the global marketplace lest they fall behind, many of these same stakeholders indicated that globalization very much involves choice. From these conflicting views, we can see that the reality that many of these stakeholders face in the business of economic development does not always support the claim that globalization is a one-way street with only one way of “doing” globalization or that globalization is a forgone conclusion.

Almost all stakeholders identified additional dimensions of globalization, but they did not express a consistent list of dimensions or a set of properties for commonly identified additional dimensions of globalization. This leads me to conclude that a stakeholder’s acknowledgment or understanding of globalization is not a function of their professional perspective. Both Roberston and Steger (2002, 2003) point out the part that one’s awareness plays in globalization. This is visible in how stakeholders describe their understanding of globalization that extends beyond an economic understanding. Perhaps the most literal endorsement of this idea comes from Stakeholder O who said that globalization requires a change in mindset because people must change their way of thinking and acting.
An interesting observation I had of stakeholders as they described their understanding of globalization is a difficulty in articulating their views of non-economic dimensions of globalization. All stakeholders expressed similar views of globalization from an economic perspective. It appears that they are most familiar with the popular economic view and articulation of globalization but did not have much experience in discussing other dimensions of globalization.

5.4 Space and Time

Communication and transportation technologies were the most common reason given for people’s changing perceptions of space-time. Stakeholder K said that travel changes one’s mindset and thus one’s awareness of space-time. Stakeholder C said that travel leads to more familiarity which leads to openness which leads to a reduction in mistrust. However, this experience does not extend to everyone, as noted by several stakeholders. Since stakeholders attributed communications and transportation technologies as the main reason for changes in space and time perceptions, those who do not have access to these technologies may not experience the same change in perceptions. The result is an uneven distribution of space-time perceptions across a population. This was articulated by stakeholder F who said that they believe that “people’s perception is based on their distance”.

We can see in stakeholders’ comments on time that the change in perceptions of space-time is not unidirectional. Stakeholders such as B and F described that while they have experienced an increase in the rate of the activities of their daily professional lives, they have at the same time experienced a decompression. The reason for this is that access to mobile communication technologies allows them the flexibility to maintain
threads of communications regardless of their geographic position. This allows these stakeholders additional time options to respond to communications. What results, according to stakeholders B and F, is the option to blend their professional and personal lifestyles because they do not have to make the effort to be in a certain location to have work related communications and in another location to have personal communications.

One conclusion that can be drawn on the basis of stakeholder comments on space-time perceptions is that geographic differences can become more important. Since individuals and entities can spread activities across a larger geographic scale, it makes geographic differences more meaningful because people now have more options to choose from when they decide where they wish to involve themselves. We can see this in the comments of some stakeholders. For example, stakeholder E said that we have the freedom to choose residence and employment location, stakeholder F said that we now have “freedom from geography”, stakeholders G, H, and I agreed that we are not “dependent upon a specific place because of communications and transportation technologies, and stakeholder O said that one has the option to go anywhere one wants to go. It may seem contradictory to conclude that geography has become more meaningful from some of these comments, because the stakeholders are noting the freedom from restrictions of being in a certain place. This freedom gives one the option to select a place that is more appropriate or meaningful for their activity. It also provides those with the means an alternative to remain in their current location because it does not provide opportunities that could be present at another location.

These examples illustrate the possibility of choice that stakeholders have in how they respond to the global economy. The findings are consistent with the research of
Watts (2000) who wrote about how choice was involved in the decision to deregulate the Australian dollar. Watts pointed out how stakeholders on both sides of the decision to deregulate the Australian dollar felt that they had no choice in their response to the proposal to deregulate. The views of these Australian stakeholders also support Steger’s (2003, 2009) argument that one of the characteristics of the ideology Market Globalism is that there is no choice in the matter of globalization. Yet, we see in both Watts’ (2000) case study and this thesis that although stakeholders may claim they have no choice, they clearly do.

When I consider the data on space and time perceptions that I collected in stakeholder interviews in the context of Lefebvre’s theory described in Chapter 2, it seems to challenge two of the categories of space that Lefebvre proposes. As a reminder of these categorizations, Lefebvre breaks down social space into three concepts: spatial practice, representations of space, and representational space. Spatial practice is the practice by which society creates its own social space. Representations of space are conceptualized spaces. Lefebvre defines these representations as the spaces of those who identify what is lived and what is perceived and reconcile it with what is conceived. This space is defined by planners, urbanists, technocrats, and social engineers. Representational spaces are spaces that are experienced by inhabitants and users of social space. The second and third categories are not consistently supported by the data from my interviews. This is because the information provided by stakeholders cannot be easily classified into one of these two categories. The stakeholders that I interviewed fall under the definition of those who define representations of space, since each of the stakeholders is involved in transportation and economic development or they are planners. According
to Lefebvre (1991), we must conclude that “producers of space have always acted in accordance with a representation [i.e. representation of spaces], while the ‘users’ passively experienced whatever was imposed upon them in as much as it was more or less thoroughly inserted into, or justified by, their representational space” (Lefebvre 1991, 43). However, when describing a future Tampa Bay and the economic development plans that are required to achieve this future state, the stakeholders vacillate between identifying conceptualized space and identifying lived experience.

This inconsistency can be observed in the responses of the stakeholders to one of my interview questions which ask whether transportation should lead or follow economic development. Lefebvre writes that the perceived-conceived-lived triad loses all force if it is treated as an abstract model (Lefebvre 1991, 40). Therefore, when looking at the interaction of these three elements, one sees a different level of interaction if we are looking at the case where transportation leads economic development compared to the case where it follows economic development. What this implies is that the stakeholders do not regard the social space of Tampa Bay in the way Lefebvre proposes, because the stakeholders do not draw a definite line between representations of space and representational space. When the answer to the question of whether transportation should lead or follow economic development is that it must lead, then the stakeholder relies more on representational spaces, or space as they have lived it and combine it with spatial practices that they are aware of. When the answer to the question is that transportation must follow economic development, or be a response to demand, then the stakeholder can play more of a role in developing representations of space, because the social space has already been produced in the form of demand.
5.5 Transportation

A multi-modal transportation system is seen as a necessity for Tampa Bay by all stakeholders. In order for Tampa Bay to act together as a region, it needs to be connected together as a region by multi-modal transportation. While all stakeholders acknowledged the significance of air transportation as something that must be present to compete in the global economy, air transportation cannot stand on its own. There was more emphasis and more excitement about the high speed rail mode of transportation, compared to air transportation. High speed rail was promoted as a key factor in the continued development of Tampa Bay as a region and as part of a super region with Orlando. From this observation it is possible to conclude that the successful integration of air transportation with high speed rail and light rail will have more of an impact on the economic development of Tampa Bay rather than the development of just air transportation as some stakeholders proposed.

The expected roles of TPA and PIE that were articulated by stakeholders are representative of the economic development situation for Tampa Bay. There was acknowledgement that TPA is a well-run and well positioned airport with an appropriate Master Plan to meet the area’s air transportation needs. The consideration of PIE in Tampa Bay’s future was not acknowledged by all stakeholders. Some of the stakeholders said that their focus is only Hillsborough County, which may explain why PIE is not part of their plans. This is indicative of the scope of the plans of these stakeholders concerning air transportation for the Tampa Bay area since these are designed to be comprehensive transportation plans. This suggests that one must understand the geographic area to which these plans apply, because it cannot be assumed that they cover more than the
stakeholders’ jurisdiction even though the stakeholder may advocate an expanded geographic outlook. The fact that there are numerous plans covering different geographic areas indicates the lack of a regional cohesiveness among stakeholders within the counties that comprise the service area of Tampa International Airport. This can be seen most clearly in the comments of the representatives of TPA who said that TPA and PIE are competitors at the end of the day. These stakeholders made these statements and also expressed the view that TPA and PIE complement each other and they do cooperate with PIE stakeholders when possible. Further, stakeholder A said that it would be beneficial if TPA, PIE, MCO, and SRQ worked together on regional air transportation planning. This stakeholder concluded, however, that they do not see a single airport authority being formed for this purpose. This contradiction displays one of the limiting factors of economic development and air transportation in Tampa Bay. The governing structure does not support the regional cooperation that the stakeholders have stated in one form or another needs to exist for Tampa Bay to restructure its economy and become the future Tampa Bay that each of these stakeholders have described.

We can see in the master plans of both TPA and PIE, a delineation of responsibility for identifying demand versus generating demand. Both plans have identified demand scenarios, although the Master Plan-TPA is much more specific in this area. However, neither plan includes a program to reach out to the economic development stakeholders in Tampa Bay to attempt to bring the demand scenarios to fruition. It appears that TPA and PIE stakeholders see their role as identifying demand and then providing the infrastructure to meet the demand. This contradicts the statement from stakeholder A of TPA who said that the philosophy of “build it and they will come”
no longer works. While this may be the opinion of representative A, this opinion does not appear to be present at the time the Master Plan-TPA was updated in 2005. It appears that this cooperation of transportation stakeholders and economic development stakeholders is a challenge for Tampa Bay, because the two groups have not yet figured out how to complement each other.
6 CONCLUSIONS

The intent of my thesis research was to examine the role of air transportation in globalization, for which a case study was conducted in Tampa Bay, Florida. In this thesis, I have attempted to document how stakeholders are imagining the economic development of Tampa Bay in a globally connected economy. In order to investigate the role of air transportation and globalization, I have explored the role that air transportation will play in their economic development of Tampa Bay. Having presented and analyzed the data that I gathered in in-depth, semi-structured, and open-ended research interviews, I can now respond to the research questions that guided this work.

My first research question is “What vision of Tampa Bay is driving the economic development plans of stakeholders of Tampa International Airport and St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport?” The Tampa Bay economy is perceived by stakeholders as being in the process of a fundamental restructuring. The previous economic drivers of the Florida and Tampa Bay economies have been tourism and home construction, due to residential population growth. The consensus among stakeholders is that these two activities will still remain part of the economy of Tampa Bay but they will no longer be the primary drivers. It is necessary to identify and develop new industries that will diversify the Tampa Bay economy so that future downturns in one or two industries will not have the devastating effect that the recession that began in 2008 has had on the Tampa Bay economy.
Stakeholders universally responded that everyone will benefit in the future Tampa Bay from the economic development plans proposed by the stakeholders. However, as I explored this view with a number of stakeholders who were willing to discuss the issue, it became apparent that there are limits to who will benefit. There was a definite delineation of responsibility between who would be responsible for those who did not benefit, or receive the ill-effects of globalization. It was said directly and indirectly by many stakeholders that it was not the responsibility of economic development stakeholders to see that all will benefit from economic development and globalization despite their proclamations that everyone will benefit.

The answer to the second research question “What understanding of globalization do Tampa Bay economic development and air transportation stakeholders have?” is that stakeholders view and understand globalization from an economic perspective. This is not unexpected due to the fact that all of the stakeholders are involved in economic development in some form. However, all stakeholders acknowledged directly or indirectly other dimensions of globalization. The dimensions that each stakeholder identified and how they described it seemed to be driven more by the personal experience of the stakeholder rather than from a professional perspective which framed their view of globalization as an economic phenomenon.

Perceptions of space-time have and are changing for stakeholders. However, they are not changing uniformly for all stakeholders so this illustrates the uneven experience of space-time. All stakeholders could relate to the vernacular expressions such as “the world is getting smaller” and “time passes more quickly than it used to”. However, a number of stakeholders had insights into these observations that identified the bi-
directional nature of these perceptions. This means that time does appear to pass more quickly but it can also appear to expand because of access to internet communications technologies (e.g., Blackberry) can allow one to have more flexibility in how and when they conduct their communications and structure their professional and personal time. A change in the perception of space in the geographic sense was strongly observed by all stakeholders. They pointed for the need to think and act from a regional perspective when making economic development decisions for Tampa Bay. This ranged from the view that various air transportation authorities within the TPA service area should work together to Tampa Bay air transportation and economic development stakeholders working with Orlando stakeholders to achieve economic development goals. Despite these opinions, the stakeholders were mixed in their view on the ability of stakeholders to make profound changes in the governance structure of Tampa bay and the region to realize a need to act within the regional framework that they said was now necessary.

To answer the first part of research question 3 which asks *how air transportation fits into the economic development plans of Tampa Bay* we must look at transportation in its entirety. There was uniform consensus among all stakeholders that transportation is a very important issue for Tampa Bay. All stakeholders held the view that it is necessary to develop a multi-modal transportation system to tie together the counties that make up Tampa Bay and also to link Tampa Bay to the region of Central Florida and the rest of the world. It is ironic since the transportation focus of this research is air transportation but air transportation was not a main focus of stakeholders as a group. All stakeholders acknowledged that air transportation is significant in Tampa Bay’s economic development, but as stakeholder E said, air transportation cannot stand by itself. It must
be integrated into the transportation system of Tampa Bay. During my research interviews, the majority of high speed rail had been recently funded and there was a lot of focus and excitement on this mode of transportation. This was to be a “game changer” for Tampa Bay’s and Florida’s economies and repositioning in the regional and global marketplace. Many stakeholders believed that high speed rail had the potential to link air transportation into the local and regional flows of transportation. However, what this would mean for the role that Tampa International Airport and to a lesser extent St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport would play is up in the air. The opinions of stakeholders on this issue varied. Some argued that TPA should be developed into a large international airport that would rival Orlando International Airport and would lead economic development in Tampa Bay. While others held the opinion that the dynamics of Tampa Bay demand do not currently support this need nor would it need to meet this demand and economic development in the future. There was also a middle opinion in which public-private partnerships between airlines and businesses would be used to develop non-stop international air service at TPA.

From the information provided by stakeholders, we can answer the second part of research question 3 which asks what role with both TPA and PIE will play in the economic development activities of Tampa Bay. These two airports have and will continue to play complementary roles for Tampa Bay. TPA is and will continue to be the primary air passenger service airport for the community. As for cargo, this is split between TPA and PIE because FedEx and DHL server TPA and UPS serves PIE. PIE’s passenger traffic, while much smaller in volume compared to TPA is more varied. PIE supports multiple low-cost carriers such as Allegiant, USA 3000, and Frontier Airlines.
PIE, as was described by several stakeholders, is a good candidate for the continued development of low-cost air service and charters. While the two airports are not operated under the same airport authority, the cooperation that TPA stakeholders said exists when possible is evident in the complementary services that each airport provides Tampa Bay.

The existing governing structure of Tampa Bay is based on historical geographic boundaries. The current structure rewards the stakeholders for conducting their activities within the historical geographic boundaries within which a given institution operates. For example, the Hillsborough County Aviation Authority, the Tampa Hillsborough – Economic Development Corporation, the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Commission, and the economic development departments at the county and city level are constrained by spatial boundaries that prevent them from conducting their activities on a geographic scale that is appropriate for the processes of a globally integrated economy.

This research shows that as city stakeholders attempt to reposition a city in the global economy, they engage in the reproduction of social space. This attempt to reproduce social space puts pressure on existing governance structures. Tampa Bay stakeholders indicated in one form or another that a different governance structure is necessary for Tampa Bay to compete in the global economy. This was mentioned indirectly by stakeholders when they said that a regional outlook is necessary for Tampa Bay. Several stakeholders such as TPA representative A directly stated that a regional airport authority would be a good thing for Tampa Bay and the Tampa-Orlando “super-region”. This research has demonstrated in Tampa Bay how economic development forces referred to by Freidman (1995) influence the formation of a city as it attempts to reposition itself in the hierarchy of world cities.
6.1 Significance of Research

The academic significance of this research is the application of space-time awareness as a method of researching the reproduction of social space in the context of economic development. The investigation of space-time awareness in this study exposed the personal social spaces of the stakeholders and illustrated their complexities. The results demonstrate that social space cannot always be delineated into the three concepts of Lefebvre (1991). The social spaces of stakeholders in this research clarify that while they are conceivers of spaces of representation because they are urban planners, they are also users of space who live in the space they have described.

The knowledge produced about Tampa Bay by this research is relevant for at least two reasons. First, it could benefit the stakeholders who participated in this research by offering them an additional view of the positions of their colleagues within the economic development realm in Tampa Bay. It is possible that this research could stimulate additional discussion among these stakeholders. Second, this research is relevant because it offers insight into a transportation issue that is one of the first to develop in the U.S. At issue is the relationship between air transportation and high speed rail that connects two metropolitan areas with airports. As stakeholders pointed out in this research, air transportation is significant for Tampa Bay but cannot stand on its own. All stakeholders hold the view that a multi-modal transportation system is needed to reposition Tampa Bay in the global economy. The outcome of the relationship between these two transportation modes and how they are used in the process of economic development will be an indication of possibilities in other U.S. regions.
This knowledge of Tampa Bay is relevant to the global events of the expansion of the Panama Canal and the easing of U.S. trade and travel restrictions on Cuba. A number of stakeholders pointed to these events as being relevant for Tampa Bay economic development. In fact, the Master Plan of Tampa International Airport includes the possibility of trade with Cuba as a demand scenario for air services at TPA. This relevance was confirmed in January of 2011 when the U.S. government expanded the possible cities that can provide air service to Cuba. Up to this point, only three airports in Miami, New York, and Los Angeles have been allowed to provide air service to Cuba (Leary, A. and B. Varian, 2011). TPA now meets the new requirements and there is the possibility for Tampa Bay stakeholders to connect Tampa Bay to Cuba through trade and travel.

6.2 Future Research

The findings from this thesis provide an important foundation for future research. As described earlier, this research focuses on capturing the view of Tampa Bay from transportation and economic development stakeholders in the counties of Hillsborough and Pinellas, which are the counties that are home to Tampa International Airport (TPA) and St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport (PIE), respectively. The scope of this research can be extended by expanding the list of stakeholders to include those in the other counties in TPA’s service area. These would include the air transportation stakeholders at airports such as Sarasota/Bradenton International Airport (SRQ) in Manatee County, Tampa Executive Airport (VDF), Plant City Municipal Airport (PCM) in Hillsborough County, and Lakeland Linder Regional Airport (LAL) in Polk County which lies to the East of Hillsborough County. There are additional sea port stakeholders
within Tampa Bay in Port Manatee, which is located on the south side of Tampa Bay in Manatee County. Governmental and non-profit economic development stakeholders in the other five counties can also be included.

Future research can be expanded even further to the East to include Orlando and beyond to the East Coast of Florida. Within this extended “super region” is Orlando International Airport (MCO) which was mentioned a number of times in stakeholder interviews as TPA’s greatest competitor. Another significant airport that should be included in future research is Orlando Sanford International Airport (SFB). This airport is very close to MCO and provides service for a large volume of international charter flights and, according to Vowels and Mertens (2005), was the largest U.S. gateway for international charter flights in 2000. Economic development stakeholders outside the TPA service area include the Central Florida Partnership, which is the sister organization to the Tampa Bay Partnership, and Orlando, Inc., which is the Orlando Regional Chamber of Commerce. Getting the input from these stakeholders and government stakeholders in what was often described as the Tampa-Orlando “super region” would allow one to develop a sense of how Tampa Bay and Orlando stakeholders are working and not working together to develop these two metropolitan areas as a region and what part air transportation may play in this process.

Another interesting direction for future research is the origin of the key industries which are the focus of economic development for many stakeholders. There seems to be a collective conscious that has formed and is continuing to develop. Stakeholders that I interviewed may or may not be able to trace how they came to see these industries as viable targets for development, but the idea started somewhere and is now infused not
only at the Tampa Bay level but also at the state level according to stakeholder M. Future research could investigate this collective conscious to discover why these industries were selected.

The subject of high speed and light rail deserves much attention in future research. As this research has shown, rail as a mode of transportation for Tampa Bay and Central Florida has the potential to impact the economic development of Tampa Bay and Central Florida. Future research could examine whether rail really is important, whether it is politically important, or whether it is just the topic of the day. One component of this research is the apparent disconnect between the stakeholders who participated in my research and the Florida state officials who were elected in the November 2010 election. Both the stakeholders and the newly elected officials can be described as pro-business and pro-economic development, but there are differing opinions on the effectiveness of high speed rail between the groups. Further monitoring of the evolution of this political situation has the potential to provide insights into the subtler motivations of pro-economic development and pro-business stakeholders not only in Tampa Bay but in the state of Florida. This can lead to a much improved understanding of the role played by multi-modal transportation systems in the U.S. in the context of a globally connected economy.
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Appendix A: Interviewee Consent Statement

I, Clint Elbow, am conducting research on what part air transportation is playing in the economic development of Tampa Bay in the context of globalization. I have contacted you to ask for your participation in this research because of your unique perspective on this subject. You have agreed to participate in this research by being interviewed by me. Further, if this interview is being conducted at your place of employment, then you state that your place of employment supports your participation in this interview as well as it being conducted at your place of employment’s site.

While conducting this research, please know that I am committed to conducting and completing this research in a way that will respect your right of privacy. I will take every effort to keep the information you provide in this interview process anonymous unless you state that you would like to be identified by name. Please be aware that while I will keep all information you provide anonymous there is always the chance that someone may be able to derive your identity based on the information you provide and how I write this information up in my research. As I stated above I will never use this information in a way that directly reveals your identity. However, due to the nature of this subject in the context of a case study of the Tampa Bay area there is always the possibility for one to make connections to events and knowledge that are outside my research process to information you have provided to me in the interview process which may lead to one to conclude your identity.

Please know that you have the right as a research participant to review any information that you have provided to me in the interview process. This can take the form of recorded material or written material. Please know too that you have the right to request a copy of my final research document once I have completed it and it has been approved by the University of South Florida.

Please know that you have the right to change your mind about your participation in my research. If at some point you change your mind about providing any information at all or just certain information you have already provided you may contact me to discuss its removal from my research. Also realize that here will be a point of no return for this option. Once I reach the point in my research where I defend my research and submit it for approval by the University of South Florida it will become a document that will be available in the University of South Florida library system and I will not be able to retract it. If at any time during the time of your participation you have concerns about your participation please contact me at the following contact points:

Email: elbow@mail.usf.edu
Phone: 727.692.5334

Please know that it is your right to decide if the interview(s) you agree to participate in will be recorded.

Has the interviewee agreed to have this and other interviews conducted with Clint Elbow to support his Master’s research conducted under the guidance of Dr. Jayajit Chakraborty at the University of South Florida recorded?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Does the interviewee’s place of employment support the execution of this interview or other interviews at their site?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ N/A

Interviewee’s Entity: ____________________
Interviewee’s Position in Entity: ____________________
Interviewer Name: ____________________ Signature: ____________________ Date: ____________
Appendix B: Interview Checklist

Pre-Interview Process:
1) ☐ Schedule interview
   a. ☐ Interviewee:
   b. ☐ Date/Time:
   c. ☐ Location:
2) ☐ Arrange work schedule
3) ☐ Familiarize myself with interviewee. (who they are, general information relevant to my research)
4) ☐ Prepare recording equipment:
   a. ☐ Recorder
   b. ☐ Batteries
   c. ☐ Memory card
   d. ☐ Back-up recorder

Interview Questions:
(see Appendix C for list)

Post Interview Process:
1) ☐ Record post-interview thoughts
   a. ☐ Interview (questions, processes, techniques)
   b. ☐ Theory
   c. ☐ Reflexivity
2) ☐ Send thank you email to interviewee
3) ☐ Transfer recording to computer and convert format
   a. ☐ Make backup of recording
4) ☐ Transcribe interview
Appendix C: Interview Questions

1) What is your vision of a future Tampa Bay?

2) What economic development plans do you think need to be put into place to achieve this vision?

3) Does air transportation fit into your plans for economic development?

4) If yes, should transportation lead or follow economic development?

5) What is your understanding of globalization?

6) Are you aware that TIA has a Master Plan?
   a. If so, are you familiar with its contents?
   b. If so, do you think that it is appropriate considering your economic development goals for Tampa Bay?

7) How is Tampa Bay connected to the global economy?

8) It is not uncommon to hear people say that the world is getting smaller or that the world moves much faster today than it used to. Do you ever find yourself thinking this?
   a. If so, what does it mean to you?
   b. Do you believe you now behave differently, or take different actions, or think differently in regards to matters of economic development in Tampa Bay because of these perceptions?

9) How was the TIA Master Plan conceived and by whom?

10) What economic opportunities is transportation linked to in Tampa Bay?

11) Are the synergies of multi-modal transportation being used in Tampa Bay?

12) How does air transportation in TB integrate with the local, regional, and global transportation systems?

13) Who will benefit from the economic development plans and air transportation infrastructures that your entity promotes?
Appendix D: Multimodal Shriveling Time-Space Relief Map of the USA
### Table 7.1: Transportation Stakeholders Interview List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Interview Date (2010)</th>
<th>Length (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Tampa International Airport</td>
<td>September 10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tampa International Airport</td>
<td>June 17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Port of Tampa</td>
<td>October 20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7.2: Government Stakeholders Interview List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Interview Date (2010)</th>
<th>Length (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tampa City Council</td>
<td>September 10</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Hillsborough County Department of Economic Development</td>
<td>June 23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>City of St. Petersburg Economic Development Department</td>
<td>June 25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>St. Petersburg City Council</td>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>The Planning Commission (Hillsborough County)</td>
<td>August 24</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>The Planning Commission (Hillsborough County)</td>
<td>August 24</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>The Planning Commission (Hillsborough County)</td>
<td>August 24</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Tampa Bay and Company</td>
<td>September 7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council</td>
<td>August 10</td>
<td>¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council</td>
<td>August 10</td>
<td>¾</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3: Non-Profit/Private Business Interest Stakeholder Interview List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Interview Date (2010/*2011)</th>
<th>Length (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Partnership</td>
<td>August 12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tampa-Hillsborough Economic Development Corporation</td>
<td>June 18</td>
<td>1 ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Tampa-Hillsborough Economic Development Corporation</td>
<td>June 18</td>
<td>1 ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Indo-US Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Caribbean-American US Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>1 ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Chinese American Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>September 9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>French-American Business Council of West Florida</td>
<td>August 17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>French-American Business Council of West Florida</td>
<td>August 17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Scandanavian and Baltic Trade Association</td>
<td>August 19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Scandanavian and Baltic Trade Association</td>
<td>August 19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Westshore Business Alliance</td>
<td>October 14</td>
<td>¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Private Citizen</td>
<td>January 6 *</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>