GUZMAN&COMPANY

AEP's Minority Sale of Transmission Assets to KKR & PSP: Potential Blueprint for Other Utilities

In January 2025 American Electric Power Company, Inc. (AEP) executed a minority stake sale to its fund growth program and bolster its capital position. In this transaction, AEP sold a 19.9% equity interest in two of its transmission subsidiaries to a partnership of private investors KKR & Co. and Public Sector Pension Investment Board (PSP Investments) for $2.82 billion in cash. This innovative financing allowed AEP to raise equity capital at a premium valuation without issuing new common equity, thus avoiding dilution and easing pressure on its balance sheet.

Guzman & Company Contacts

Ruslan Magdeev
rmagdeev@guzman.com
203-451-2375

Bill Robertson
wrobertson@guzman.com
516-768-6475

Guilherme Jacob
gjacob@guzman.com
413-379-8888

Executive Summary

In January 2025 American Electric Power Company, Inc. (AEP) executed a minority stake sale to its fund growth program and bolster its capital position. In this transaction, AEP sold a 19.9% equity interest in two of its transmission subsidiaries to a partnership of private investors KKR & Co. and Public Sector Pension Investment Board (PSP Investments) for $2.82 billion in cash. This innovative financing allowed AEP to raise equity capital at a premium valuation without issuing new common equity, thus avoiding dilution and easing pressure on its balance sheet. Key highlights include:

- *Transaction Structure*: 19.9% non-controlling stake in AEP's Ohio and Indiana-Michigan transmission companies sold to KKR/PSP (50/50 partnership). AEP retains an 80.1% ownership and full operational control of these transmission assets.

- *Premium Valuation*: The deal valued the assets at approximately 2.3× their rate base and ~30× earnings, equivalent to issuing AEP shares at ~$170 per share (versus AEP's ~$92 market price or 85% premium). This valuation arbitrage significantly exceeded AEP's trading multiples, making the sale highly accretive.

- *Financial Impact*: AEP received $2.8 billion net proceeds to fund its $54 billion, 2025–2029 capital plan and strengthen the balance sheet. The transaction is expected to add roughly $0.11–$0.12 to annual EPS (1.7% accretion) over 2025–2029 and improve credit metrics (FFO/Debt up 40–60 bps).

- *Strategic Rationale*: The minority sale provided equity financing to support grid investments and growth, while avoiding a large public equity issuance that could pressure AEP's stock. AEP unlocked capital from its transmission business at an attractive price, all while retaining ~95% of its overall transmission assets post-close.

Background on AEP and Its Transmission Business

Transmission Footprint: AEP owns and operates transmission companies ("Transcos") in multiple states, including AEP Ohio and AEP Indiana Michigan. These Transcos had approximately $10.4 billion in combined net plant as of late 2024 (OHTCo ~$6.3B, IMTCo ~$4.1B). They represent roughly 25% of AEP's total transmission rate base.

Capital Investment Plans: AEP outlined a $54 billion capital plan for 2025–2029, with roughly two-thirds earmarked for regulated transmission and distribution upgrades. This reflects significant tailwinds in transmission – aging infrastructure replacements, grid expansion for renewables, and robust customer demand growth in AEP's Midwest and Texas service areas. However, such an ambitious investment program created substantial financing needs. AEP had among the highest equity funding requirements of any U.S. utility, due in part to slightly underearning on its allowed ROEs (recent earned ROE ~9.0% vs allowed ~9.4%). By late 2024, AEP anticipated needing to issue over $3–5 billion of equity through 2029 to maintain its balance sheet while funding growth. This context set the stage for exploring alternative financing strategies, such as asset sales, to optimize capital raising and avoid dilutive stock issuance.

Transaction Overview (Structure, Timeline, Stakeholders)

In January 2025, AEP announced a definitive agreement to sell a 19.9% minority equity interest in two wholly-owned transmission subsidiaries – AEP Ohio Transco and AEP Indiana-Michigan Transco – to a consortium of infrastructure investors. The buyer consortium is a 50/50 partnership between KKR & Co. and PSP Investments. Key aspects of the transaction structure and timeline include:

- *Non-Controlled Stake:* The 19.9% stake was structured as a passive, non-controlling interest in each Transco. AEP will remain the majority owner and operator of the transmission assets post-close.

- *Purchase Price and Terms*: The consortium agreed to pay $2.82 billion in cash for 19.9% of the equity. The sale will be a direct equity investment into the subsidiaries (no debt financing. AEP will receive the proceeds and intends to upstream the cash for corporate purposes (growth investments and debt reduction).

- *Timeline*: Announced on January 9, 2025, the deal is expected to close in the second half of 2025.

Valuation and Financial Metrics
Sale Price and Implied Value: The $2.82 billion sale price for a 19.9% stake implies a attractive valuation for AEP's transmission assets. In AEP's disclosures, management highlighted that the deal equates to an "attractive valuation at ~30.3× LTM P/E and ~2.3× rate base" for the Transco businesses. This means the investors paid more than 30 times the recent earnings of the two Transcos and over double the book value of their regulated asset base – a rich price reflecting the strong demand for high-quality electric transmission infrastructure. By comparison, AEP's stock was trading at roughly 15–17× earnings in early 2025, and U.S. utility stocks typically trade around 1.3–1.5× book value.

Valuation Arbitrage: The minority stake sale valued AEP's transmission assets far above AEP's prevailing market multiples. For example, the implied $92), highlighting the premium paid by infrastructure investors.

Such pricing underscores a valuation arbitrage opportunity: AEP realized value from these assets at multiples much higher than those embedded in its overall corporate valuation. In fact, management noted the deal value is equivalent to issuing AEP common stock at ~$170 per share – a remarkable premium to the ~$92 market price on the announcement date. This comparison vividly shows how the transaction allowed AEP to raise capital on very favorable terms. By "monetizing" a minority slice of its business, AEP effectively brought in an equity investment at nearly 2× the valuation that public markets were according to the company.

Financial Metrics and Pro Forma Impact: The minority sale is expected to be immediately accretive to AEP's earnings per share and improve key financial ratios:

- *EPS Accretion*: Because the transaction fetched such a high multiple, AEP is giving up only 19.9% of the Transcos' earnings while receiving a cash infusion that reduces interest expense and funds new investments. AEP forecasts the deal will boost earnings – specifically, ~1.7% higher annual EPS on average from 2025–2029, which translates to roughly $0.11–$0.12 added to EPS per year. Analysts similarly estimate about $0.10+ EPS accretion from the deal. This accretion reflects both the high sale multiple (AEP effectively "sold" earnings at 30× P/E but can reinvest proceeds at a much lower multiple) and the avoidance of issuing new shares (which would have spread earnings among more shareholders). Notably, AEP reaffirmed its 6–8% long-term EPS growth target with greater confidence after the deal.

- *Rate Base Multiple*: At 2.3× rate base, the valuation implies that for each $1 of regulated asset (rate base) in those Transcos, investors paid $2.30. This is significantly above typical utility acquisition multiples. It suggests investors are banking on future growth (the Transcos plan ~$5.8B in capex through 2029) and/or accepting a lower immediate return for the stable long-term cashflows of transmission. For context, the 19.9% stake corresponds to roughly 5% of AEP's total transmission rate base. So, the $2.82B price for ~5% of AEP's transmission assets implies the entire transmission portfolio might be valued on the order of ~$56 billion in the eyes of these investors – a figure that greatly exceeds the value implied in AEP's stock prior to the deal.

- *Balance Sheet and Credit*: AEP indicated it would apply the $2.8B proceeds to its $54B capital plan, debt reduction, and to "eliminate a significant portion" of forecasted equity needs through 2029. In practical terms, this means AEP can now fund much of its growth with the cash from this deal instead of issuing new equity or additional debt. The immediate effect is a stronger balance sheet: AEP's net debt will be lower than planned, and FFO-to-debt (funds from operations / debt) is projected to improve by ~40–60 basis points once the transaction closes. This bolsters AEP's credit profile at a time of heavy capital spending. Company executives noted that strong 2024 results "coupled with ... the outcome of the minority interest transaction ... have enhanced our financial flexibility", allowing AEP to efficiently finance its plan while maintaining key credit metrics in the target 14–15% FFO/Debt range. Rating agencies were engaged and comforted by AEP's execution of this financing strategy.

- *Enterprise Value Considerations*: Although the deal was an equity-only sale, it's worth noting the implied enterprise value (EV) of the Transcos. Given the ~$14.2B implied equity value for 100% of the two Transcos, and assuming these regulated entities carry proportionate debt, the EV/EBITDA multiple would also be quite high (likely well above AEP's consolidated EV/EBITDA of ~10–11×). The rich valuation underscores how much investors were willing to pay for de-risked, regulated transmission assets with strong growth prospects.

In summary, the transaction's pricing was highly favorable to AEP – turning a fraction of its asset base into a significant source of capital at valuations that the public market typically reserves for premium tech stocks rather than utilities. This financial outcome is a central benefit of the deal, enabling AEP to accelerate its investment plans with minimal dilution and solid financial metrics.

Strategic Rationale for AEP

AEP pursued the minority sale as a strategic move to raise equity capital efficiently, capitalize on valuation disparities, and support its long-term growth – all while keeping control of its critical assets. The rationale can be broken down into several key drivers:

- *Equity Capital Infusion without Dilution*: AEP faced a multibillion-dollar equity need to fund its grid expansion and clean energy investments. Rather than issuing new common stock at ~$90–100 per share (which would dilute existing shareholders and potentially put pressure on the stock price), AEP found a partner willing to invest at an effective price of ~$170 per share. By doing so, AEP sidestepped the "parent stock overhang" that a large equity offering might have created. Executing this transaction "allows AEP to efficiently finance a growing segment of our business" while avoiding a traditional equity raise. In essence, AEP raised nearly $2.8B in equity capital without issuing a single new share of AEP stock, a very attractive outcome for the company and its shareholders.

- *Valuation Arbitrage / Unlocking Hidden Value*: AEP's management recognized that private infrastructure investors were valuing its transmission business more generously than the public market. By selling a minority stake, AEP unlocked value from a high-multiple business (electric transmission) that was buried within its consolidated utility valuation. This valuation arbitrage is evident in the high P/E and rate base multiples achieved. Essentially, AEP sold a portion of an asset at 2x+ the valuation multiple of AEP's overall enterprise – a smart way to realize value for shareholders. The proceeds can be redeployed into projects earning regulated returns or into debt reduction, both of which likely yield returns higher than the effective cost of capital in this deal. This kind of arbitrage improves overall corporate value; as CEO Julie Sloat (hypothetically) might say, it's like "selling $1 for $2.30 and investing it back into the business.

- *Use of Proceeds – Funding Growth and Debt Reduction*: The strategic use of the $2.8B cash was a major factor. AEP will channel the funds into its $54B five-year growth plan (2025–29), which includes substantial investments in transmission, distribution, and regulated renewables. By injecting this capital, AEP can avoid issuing roughly $2–3B of planned equity through 2029 and also reduce borrowing needs. In a presentation to investors, AEP indicated the minority sale proceeds would eliminate a “significant portion” of forecasted equity financing needs and thereby “offset some of AEP’s $5.35 billion equity financing needs through 2029”. Additionally, strengthening the balance sheet with this equity helps keep AEP’s credit metrics on track (important given rising interest rates and rating agency focus). In short, the deal provides dry powder for AEP’s ambitious capital projects – new transmission lines, grid hardening, and clean energy – while keeping its capital structure balanced.

- *Retaining Control and Future Upside*: AEP was careful to structure the deal so that it retains operational control and the majority of economics of its transmission business. Post-transaction, AEP will still own ~95% of its total transmission network (the 19.9% stake equates to ~5% of AEP’s system). AEP remains the operator of the Transcos and will consolidate their results in financial reporting. This means AEP shareholders retain the bulk of the upside from future transmission growth, while a minority of that upside is shared with KKR/PSP in exchange for the upfront $2.8B. Crucially, the partners will also fund 19.9% of future capital expenditures in those Transcos, reducing AEP’s future cash outlays. This structure spreads the burden of funding growth and aligns the investors with AEP’s long-term expansion (they’ve committed capital for new projects pro-rata). By selling a non-controlling stake, AEP achieved a “have your cake and eat it too” outcome – getting needed capital now but keeping control and the lion’s share of future value creation in a business expected to grow significantly.

- *Avoiding Regulatory Drawbacks*: Selling a minority stake (versus a full asset sale or spin-off) helped AEP avoid many potential regulatory and stakeholder issues. The transaction still requires federal approvals (FERC, CFIUS) but no state utility commission approvals or complex customer rate proceedings were needed, since there is no change in control of the utility assets. Customers should see no change, and AEP’s ability to plan and operate the grid is unaffected. This was likely an important consideration: AEP could raise capital without risking regulatory pushbacks or lengthy proceedings that might accompany a larger divestiture. Furthermore, keeping ownership above 80% means AEP can continue consolidating these subs for tax purposes and operational coordination

- *Enhancing Shareholder Value*: AEP’s management framed the deal as an element of disciplined portfolio management to maximize shareholder value. By recycling capital from a mature (yet growing) asset, AEP can invest in other areas with higher needs or return potential, while the transaction itself immediately boosts earnings. In 2024, AEP also announced sales of some non-core businesses (e.g. selling its unregulated renewables unit and a distributed energy business for ~$315M). The common theme is strategic capital rotation – divesting pieces of the business at strong valuations and reinvesting in core regulated operations. This minority sale was the largest such move, and AEP highlighted it as an “exceptional value proposition to our shareholders” that “further boosts our earnings and credit profile and helps reduce near-term equity needs”. In other words, it was a win-win for AEP’s growth plans and its investors’ financial interests

In summary, AEP’s rationale centered on strengthening its financial capacity for growth (transmission build-out) by bringing in a partner at an attractive price, all while maintaining control. The deal exemplifies how a utility can proactively manage its capital structure and seize market opportunities (high private valuations for infrastructure) to benefit customers and shareholders. AEP was able to bolster its equity base significantly without the typical downsides of an equity issuance or loss of control, thus positioning the company for continued investment in grid reliability and the energy transition.

Benefits and Considerations for Treasury Teams

AEP's minority stake sale offers several important insights for utility treasury and finance teams as they consider capital allocation and financing strategies:

- *Innovative Capital Raising Alternatives*: The transaction highlights a creative equity financing alternative – selling a minority interest in a subsidiary – as opposed to traditional methods like issuing common stock or mandatory convertibles. For treasury teams, this illustrates that utility assets can attract infrastructure investors at premium valuations, providing a way to raise large amounts of equity capital efficiently. Especially when a utility's stock is undervalued or equity needs are large, asset-level equity sales can be a viable tool. In AEP's case, tapping private capital allowed it to avoid issuing new shares at ~$92 and instead effectively brought in equity at $170/share. This kind of valuation arbitrage can significantly lower the utility's cost of capital and benefit existing shareholders (who experience less dilution). Treasury professionals should evaluate if parts of their business (e.g. transmission, gas pipelines, renewables) could be monetized at higher multiples than the parent company's valuation – a lever to unlock hidden value.

- *Capital Allocation and Portfolio Optimization*: From a capital allocation perspective, AEP effectively recycled capital from a lower-risk, steady-return asset (transmission) to fund a broader growth portfolio. This shows the benefit of active portfolio management by utility finance teams. By periodically evaluating which assets could be partially sold or joint-ventured, a treasury team can optimize the balance sheet – directing capital where it's most needed and reducing investment where external partners can step in. AEP's deal demonstrates that even core utility assets need not be off-limits to partial sale if the strategic and financial benefits are compelling. The key is that AEP retained control and secured partner funding for future growth, thus augmenting its capital resources. Treasury teams should consider how such partnerships can stretch their capital: every dollar received from an investor is a dollar that doesn't have to be raised via debt or equity markets. This can help utilities undertake large capital programs (like grid modernization) without over-leveraging or overissuing stock.

- *Strengthening Financial Metrics*: One immediate benefit of the minority sale was improving AEP's credit and coverage metrics, which is a critical concern for treasury teams managing credit ratings. The infusion of equity helped keep AEP's FFO/Debt in the 14–15% target range and reduced its debt financing needs. Utility treasury departments can take note that asset equity sales can support balance sheet health, providing an equity cushion that bolsters credit ratios (much like issuing new equity would) but potentially on better terms. In AEP's case, the transaction lowered net debt and avoided incremental interest costs, contributing to stronger interest coverage and debt ratios. Maintaining a strong balance sheet in the face of heavy capex is crucial – this deal offers a template for doing so via strategic asset monetization. Of course, treasury teams must weigh the trade-off: AEP gives up a slice of future earnings from the Transcos, which could modestly reduce long-term earnings growth from those assets. However, the proceeds reduce the need for dilutive equity and support more investment, likely yielding a net positive outcome. It's a balancing act between immediate financial strength and future earnings participation, requiring rigorous modeling by finance teams. In AEP's judgment, the accretion and risk reduction outweighed the loss of a minority share of future Transco earnings.

- *Managing Regulatory and Structural Complexity*: AEP's approach also underscores important regulatory considerations when bringing in outside investors. By selling <20% and keeping the transaction at the subsidiary level, AEP avoided triggering many regulatory hurdles. Treasury and legal teams should design transactions to minimize regulatory friction – e.g. maintain utility control to avoid reclassification of the utility or the need for state commission approval of change in ownership. Federal approvals (FERC, CFIUS) in this case were manageable within the deal timeline. Utilities considering similar deals must ensure compliance with affiliate transaction rules, securities laws, and any franchise requirements, but minority passive stakes are generally well-received if they don't harm customers. Another consideration is partner selection: KKR and PSP were acceptable investors (knowledgeable in infrastructure, with long-term capital), and AEP included provisions that the partnership will fund ongoing capex pro-rata. Treasury teams should ensure any equity partner is aligned with the utility's investment timeline and risk profile. Additionally, partnership agreements often contain governance terms, buy/sell rights, and restrictions (for example, on transfer of the minority stake or on investments in competitors) – these must be structured carefully to protect the utility's interests. Overall, AEP's case shows that with proper structuring, a utility can bring in external equity without disrupting operations or regulatory status, an outcome very relevant to finance teams aiming to maintain stability while raising capital.

- *Avoiding Market Overhang and Enhancing Shareholder Value*: From an investor relations standpoint, AEP's treasury and executive team turned a potential negative (large equity issuance) into a positive (accretive deal). Announcing a big equity need can put downward pressure on a utility's stock (an "equity overhang"). Instead, AEP's announcement of the KKR/PSP investment was taken as bullish – it removed the overhang of a possible share offering and confirmed AEP's commitment to shareholder value. In fact, the deal was viewed as affirming AEP's growth outlook and financing plan, allowing the company to reaffirm earnings guidance with more confidence. Utility treasury teams can learn that transparent communication of using alternative equity sources is key: AEP openly stated the sale would offset equity needs and strengthen the balance sheet, thereby reassuring analysts and investors that dilution would be limited. The stock market often reacts favorably when a company addresses financing needs creatively and on strong terms – in AEP's case, effectively selling equity at a much higher price. Thus, a well-structured deal can improve market sentiment, whereas a traditional secondary stock offering might have been viewed less favorably. The case also signals to shareholders that management is willing to monetize assets at the right price, which can bolster confidence that capital is not being raised at shareholders' expense but rather to their benefit.

- *Broader Trend and Peer Considerations*: AEP's minority stake sale is part of a broader trend of infrastructure funds investing in utility networks. Other utilities have executed or explored similar transactions (e.g., NiSource's 19.9% sale of a gas utility stake, FirstEnergy's sale of a transmission stake to Brookfield, etc.), indicating a robust investor appetite for minority positions in regulated assets. Treasury teams in the industry should monitor these precedents: such deals can set valuation benchmarks and provide deal structure templates. The 19.9% model has become a common pattern to gain equity capital while avoiding control issues. As infrastructure investors (pension funds, global PE funds) seek long-duration, stable returns, they are willing to pay high multiples – utilities can leverage this to their advantage as AEP did. However, utilities must also consider the long-term partnership aspect: the investor will be a stakeholder for potentially decades. Therefore, due diligence on the partner and clear alignment on governance are essential. AEP's successful partnership with KKR/PSP (both well-regarded, long-term investors) demonstrates how choosing the right investors can add credibility and support to the utility's strategy.

In conclusion, AEP's case provides a valuable playbook for utility finance executives: it shows how a minority asset sale can serve as a strategic financing tool to optimize capital structure, fund growth, and enhance shareholder value. By thoughtfully structuring the transaction, aligning with reputable partners, and communicating the benefits, AEP achieved a result that strengthened its financial position and strategic flexibility. Treasury teams can draw from this example when considering how to meet large capital demands – sometimes the best solution lies not in public markets, but in private capital partnerships that unlock value. AEP has set a precedent that others in the sector are likely to study and emulate, as the industry balances massive investment needs with the imperative to maintain financial health and affordable capital

Sources: Detailed information was drawn from AEP's investor disclosures and analyst coverage of the transaction, including AEP's announcement and investor presentation on the minority stake sale, the Q4 2024 earnings call transcript, industry news reporting, and equity research analyses. These sources provide a comprehensive view of the deal's structure, valuation, and strategic implications as discussed above.

DISCLAIMER