Copper: Technology and Competitiveness

September 1988

NTIS order #PB89-138887



CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT Recommended Citation:

U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, *Copper: Technology and Competitive-ness*, OTA-E-367 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 1988).

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 87-619893

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402-9325 (order form can be found in the back of this report)

Foreword

The discovery of copper by primitive people provided a transition from the Stone Age to the Metal Ages (Copper, Bronze, and Iron). For thousands of years, copper remained important for making tools, weapons, jewelry, and objets d'art. It was not until the Industrial Revolution and the age of electricity, however, that copper's excellent electrical conductivity stimulated a demand for a highly developed copper industry. The ancient mines were completely swamped by the increased world demand. But the westward expansion in North America led to the discovery of copper deposits that met much of this demand and made the United States the world leader in copper production for over a century.

Although copper markets historically have been volatile, exhibiting wide swings in supply and price with the opening of new mines and with general economic conditions, the U.S. industry had always managed to maintain its leadership. During the early 980s, however, the global economic recession combined with the opening of numerous mines throughout the world to create oversupplies and low prices that called into question the survival of the domestic copper industry. Many U.S. mines and plants closed or cutback production. Over 28,000 jobs were eliminated. Producers sustained heavy financial losses and had to adopt aggressive cost-cutting programs.

This report responds to a request from the Technology Assessment Board—the congressional oversight body for the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA)–prompted by the balance-of-trade and other economic implications of these events. The report describes the conditions the domestic and world copper industry faced during the early 1980s. It documents the steps U.S. copper companies took to improve their position so dramatically in the mid-980s, and evaluates the industry's present and possible future status, including relative costs of production and the elements of those costs.

The report concludes that the revitalized U.S. copper industry can compete in all but the worst foreseeable markets. Notably, the industry's turnaround came entirely from its own efforts; the Federal government rendered little assistance. The U.S. industry is now smaller, but it is still the world leader in smelter and refinery production, and ranks second in mine production. Its costs, though not the lowest in the world, are now low enough to weather most price swings. However, should the adverse conditions of the early 1980s recur, copper prices might fall to levels at which some domestic producers will again be unable to compete. The Report analyzes options available to the Federal government (and industry) to enhance the industry's competitive position.

Substantial assistance was received from many organizations and individuals in the course of this study. We would like to express special thanks to the OTA advisory panel, the project's consultants, the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and the many reviewers whose comments helped to ensure the completeness and accuracy of the report.

John H fibbou

JOHN H-. GIBBONS Director

OTA Copper Advisory Panel

George S. Ansell, *Chairman* President, Colorado School of Mines

Richard Ayres Senior Staff Attorney Natural Resources Defense Council

Paul Biderman Secretary, Department of Energy and Minerals State of New Mexico

Corale L. Brierley president Advanced Mineral Technologies Inc.

Erling Brostuen² Secretary, Department of Energy and Minerals State of New Mexico

Henry Cole Senior Staff Scientist Clean Water Action Project

Robert Dimock Vice President, Gold Division³ BP Minerals America

William H. Dresher president International Copper Research Association

John A. Hansen Department of Economics State University of New York at Fredonia

James G. Hascall president Olin Brass

John Kelly^₄ General Motors Corp.

¹Until January 1987. ²After January 1987. ³Formerly Vice President, Technology ⁴Retired 1987. ⁵Until October 1986. ⁶After October 1986. Robert H. Lesemann president CRU Consultants Inc. Larry G. Lewallen^s president AT&T Nassau Metals Robert J. Muth Vice President

Asarco, Inc.

William G. Pariseau Department of Mining Engineering University of Utah

Michael Rieber Deparment of Mining Engineering University of Arizona

Thomas D. Schlabach Department Head AT&T Bell Laboratories

Joel Secoy^b AT&T Nassau Metals

Jack E. Thompson Tucson, Arizona

Mikon Wadsworth Dean, School of Mines University of Utah

Russell L. Wood President Copper Range Co.

NOTE: OTA appreciates and is grateful for the valuable assistance and thoughtful critiques provided by the advisory panel members. The panel does not, however, necessarily approve, disapprove, or endorse this report. OTA assumes full responsibility for the report and the accuracy of its contents.

iv

OTA Copper Project Staff

Lionel S. Johns, Assistant Director, OTA Energy, Materials, and International Security Division

Peter D. Blair, Energy and Materials Program Manager

Jenifer Robison, Project Director

Project Staff

Vickie Basinger Boesch, Industry and Market Structure John Newman, Production Costs Margaret Passmore, Environment/ Aspects and Energy Use

Consultant

Curtis Seltzer

Administrative Staff

Lillian Chapman, *Administrative Assistant* Linda Long, *Administrative Secretary* Phyllis Brumfield, *Secretary*

v

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the many individuals who shared their special knowledge, expertise, and information about the copper industry, copper markets, and production technology with the OTA Staff in the course of this study. Others provided critical evaluation and review during the compilation of the report. These individuals are listed in Appendix C of this report.

Special thanks go to the government organizations, corporations, and academic institutions with whom these experts are affiliated. These include:

American Mining Congress Arizona Mining Association Asarco, Inc. BP Minerals America Colorado School of Mines Copper Range Co. Cyprus Minerals, Inc. Inspiration Consolidated Copper Co. Phelps Dodge Corp. Resource Strategies Inc. Robison Clipping Service State of Arizona, Department of Mineral Resources State of Montana, Bureau of Mining and Geology
State of New Mexico, Department of Energy and Minerals
State of Utah, Department of Natural Resources and Energy
U.S. Bureau of Mines
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
U.S. Geological Survey
University of Arizona, College of Mines
University of Utah, School of Mines