

A primer on infrastructure M&A and related US tax considerations



As the requirements for US infrastructure investment continue to grow in the coming years, many investors are considering investing in this space. The following items represent key related tax considerations for those transacting in this space.

Overview

As we discuss below, a number of complex and inter-related US tax considerations arise when considering the tax implications of infrastructure transactions and investments. As the reader will note, many of the relevant US tax determinations turn on various qualitative and quantitative factors that can vary greatly by transaction. Investors should carefully consider these factors, including how they apply to their transaction, and how the various tax issues and determinations impact each other.

In planning for the transaction, it is important for the parties to consider future reporting of the tax implications of the transaction in meeting their tax compliance and financial reporting obligations. Furthermore, tax positions that may have been carefully contemplated in advance of the transaction need to be diligently monitored over the investment's lifecycle. Thus, well-advised investors—and their advisers—must work together to ensure seamless integration between preinvestment tax planning, postinvestment tax reporting, and ongoing tax planning and consulting.



Infrastructure Defined

Infrastructure generally: “Infrastructure” as an asset class represents a broad sector, and investors that are active in this space have different views on what meets the definition of infrastructure. However, it may generally be defined as facilities, structures, equipment, or similar physical assets—and the materials and services required to support these—that enable people and society to thrive.

Common attributes: Some common attributes of infrastructure investments include:

- High barriers to entry
- Substantial tangible asset(s) and large user base, generating economies of scale
- Inelastic user demand
- Long-term, secure, stable cash flows
- Lower volatility/correlation to financial markets
- Less sensitivity to macroeconomic conditions
- Low default rates
- Inflation hedging—value growth in line with economic/demographic change
- Government participation in the investment.



The infrastructure asset class may be represented by the following sectors and subsectors:

Transportation:

- Toll roads/lanes
- Bridges/tunnels
- Parking
- Ports
- Airports and aviation
- Rail/transit
- Shipping and logistics

Social infrastructure:

- Correctional facilities
- Educational institutions and student housing
- Hospitals and public health facilities
- Courthouses and civic buildings
- Sports facilities
- Housing
- Municipal utilities (water/sewer/gas/electric)
- Solid waste management
- Circular economy and recycling

Energy and natural resources:

- Power generation, transmission, storage, and distribution, including renewable energy sources
- Oil and gas extraction, storage, and transportation
- Mining (coal, metals, etc.)
- Timber, including carbon offset credit production
- Water and wastewater

Telecom and digital:

- Telecom infrastructure, including satellite communication
- Data centers and fiber
- Chip and other digital manufacturing



The infrastructure asset class may involve the following market participants:

Investors:

- Infrastructure funds
- Sovereign wealth funds
- Pension funds

- Institutional investors
- Corporate investors
- High-net-worth/family offices

Government:

- Public-private partnerships (PPP or P3)
- Seller/lessor of infrastructure assets
- Government grants and incentives

Developers/operators:

- Developers/construction companies/civil engineers
- Contractors
- Operators

Financiers/lenders:

- Traditional banks and lending syndicates
- Debt funds
- Corporate investors
- The public, through public bonds

Overview of PPPs

A PPP or P3 is a contractual arrangement between a public agency and a private sector entity structured to meet the need of the parties by optimizing the skills and resources of each party (both public and private), and allocating the risks in the delivery of the service and/or facility to the parties best able to manage them.

In a typical PPP:

- The private partner receives adequate compensation to (i) design, build, operate, and/or maintain the asset, and (ii) establish and service project debt. The public sector typically controls the asset through an operating lease agreement and may receive an up-front concession fee and transfers significant operational risk to the private sector for the lease term.

The commercial terms of these arrangements are structured carefully to manage stakeholders' risk. Therefore, these agreements are unique and give rise to an array of tax characterizations.



Common Tax Considerations in Infrastructure Investments

Given the broad nature of the infrastructure asset class and the different tax profiles of its investors and other market participants, a complete exposition of all related tax considerations is beyond the scope of this article. However, below are some US federal income tax (USFIT) issues that commonly arise in infrastructure transactions and investments.

Tax ownership: Determining which party to a transaction is considered the owner of related assets for USFIT purposes is key to properly understanding and modeling the overall tax profile and implications of a transaction. For example, the tax owner of property is entitled to the tax benefits therefrom, including tax depreciation, amortization, and depletion, as well as eligibility to claim certain tax credits. Conversely, in the event that tax ownership of the assets does not transfer, investors should carefully consider the tax form of the transaction to ensure appropriate tax treatment (i.e., lease, prepaid rent, or other intangible assets).

Under USFIT standards, in general, the courts and the IRS look to the economic substance of the transaction (as opposed to its form) in determining ownership for tax purposes. A common legal form for infrastructure transactions may involve leases or concessions that provide the lessor or concessionaire access to certain property for a period of time (these are common in PPP transactions and many telecom/digital infrastructure transactions). In such a transaction, the lessor/concessionaire is generally considered the tax owner if it retains significant economic benefits and burdens of ownership even though the legal ownership of the assets may be held by another party in the transaction (e.g., a governmental authority).

Some of the relevant criteria considered in the determination of tax ownership are as follows:

- Whether legal title passes
- The intention of the parties
- The expected residual value and economic life of the leased property at the end of the lease term (significant residual value indicates a lease, while a lease term for the full economic life indicates a transfer of ownership)
- Profit from operations (ability of the concessionaire to earn “entrepreneurial” profits from third parties indicates tax ownership of the underlying assets)
- Which party bears risk of loss or damage to the property
- The presence/absence of a bargain purchase option.

Tax depreciation: While tax depreciation is a common consideration in many investments and M&A transactions, investments in the infrastructure space include some unique considerations, including:

- Qualified private activity bonds (PABs) financing—if assets are acquired through the use of PABs, they are required to be depreciated using the Alternative Depreciation System (ADS) to the extent of such financing. ADS depreciation is straight-line over generally longer recovery periods, as compared to MACRS which is accelerated over shorter recovery periods (and may be eligible for bonus depreciation).
- Tax-exempt use property (TEUP)—ADS must also be used for assets that are treated as owned by certain tax-exempt entities, generally including partnership assets to the extent of tax-exempt partners which often invest, indirectly, via infrastructure funds (as discussed further below).
- The potential application of Section 470, which could limit deductions—including depreciation—related to tax-exempt property, to the extent of income from the property.

Tax amortization: Acquired intangible assets are typically amortized straight-line over 15 years, irrespective of the economic useful life of the intangible asset. For example, a Section 197 intangible may include the right to collect fees or tolls granted by a governmental authority, with this intangible asset amortized over 15 years, without regard to the term of the agreement. Alternatively, where a taxpayer bears the up-front cost of a tangible asset, but is not the tax owner, and the transaction is not treated as a lease, the cost may be amortizable as an intangible using the economic life or a 25-year safe harbor.

Tax depletion: The owner of an economic interest in mineral property or timber is entitled to a depletion deduction. In the case of leased property, the depletion deduction is divided between the lessor and the lessee. Tax depletion may be recovered through “cost depletion” (generally a recovery of the property’s tax basis) or “percentage depletion” (based on a statutory percentage of related gross revenue).

Prepaid rent: In general, Section 467 requires the accrual of rents and the recognition of interest income and expenses under certain true leases of tangible property that provide for deferred or prepaid rents or increasing or decreasing rents over the lease term, and that have aggregate rents under the lease of at least \$250,000. In certain circumstances, the taxpayer’s upfront costs may be viewed as if such amounts were incurred as prepaid rent payments for the right to use the leased property in the future and the associated revenue streams thereof. Consideration should be given to whether the arrangement, or a portion thereof, could be viewed as prepaid rent which could impact the timing of tax deductions related to the amount so treated.

Long-term contracts: On “greenfield” projects in which a taxpayer does not hold tax ownership (e.g., design, build, finance, operate, and maintain (DBFOM) projects), certain income and expenses from the arrangement can be subject to long-term contract accounting method rules under Section 460. Generally, under Section 460, income generated from long-term contracts must be reported under the percentage-of-completion method. This method recognizes profit on a long-term construction contract in proportion to the costs incurred and the income earned over the construction period. In general, the amount of income reported under the percentage-of-completion method is determined by multiplying the total contract income by the contract costs (inclusive of any special purpose vehicle (SPV) costs and applicable markup) incurred during the tax year over the estimated total contract costs. The costs associated with the construction are deducted in the year incurred.

Upon completion of construction, the asset is generally handed over to the governmental authority and the taxpayer is then compensated to operate and maintain the asset (e.g., through availability payments, operation and maintenance fees, or demand risk revenue). In situations in which there is not a direct or contingent cash payment for the construction, the contract income may be received in the form of a concession right, and the amount of contract revenue reported gives rise to basis in the intangible concession right. There can be differing views among tax advisors regarding whether such amounts are able to be recovered over a 15-year period (as a Section 197 intangible asset) or must be ratably amortized over the concession period (among other methods). In cases in which the concessionaire is guaranteed to receive a minimum amount of concession revenue irrespective of future services, a portion of the costs may instead be considered a loan.



Lease Versus Service Contract

The application of Section 7701(e) should be considered in determining whether an applicable agreement is characterized as a lease rather than a service contract. If the contract is characterized as a lease, the taxpayer is required to depreciate the assets over a period that equals at least 125% of the maximum lease term, inclusive of extensions, using the straight-line method. The following six factors are nonexclusive and demonstrate lease treatment:

- The service recipient is in physical control of the property.
- The service recipient controls the property.
- The service recipient has a significant economic or possessory interest in the property.

- The service provider does not bear any risk of substantially diminished receipts or substantially increased expenditures if there is nonperformance under the contract.
- The services provider does not use the property concurrently to provide significant services to entities unrelated to the recipient.
- The total contract price does not substantially exceed the rental value of the property under the contract period.



Government Funding

Increasingly, infrastructure projects rely in part on some form of federal, state, or local government funding, which may take the form of grants or expense reimbursement (e.g., milestone payments). Careful consideration should be given to the tax character and timing for recognition of such funding, including under Sections 118 and 460. In some cases, the government funding may result in an income recognition without an immediate offsetting deduction, while in other cases taxpayers may be able to either offset the funding with related construction costs or other expenses or alternatively treat the funding as a reduction to the tax basis of the property funded by the government. Additionally, investors should consider the level of participation by the government in the arrangement and the intent of the parties to ensure the arrangement does not create a partnership between the government and the investors for USFIT purposes.



Tax-Exempt Use Property

TEUP generally: Broadly, under Section 168(h) and related regulations, TEUP is tangible depreciable property leased to “tax-exempt” entities. It also includes tangible depreciable property owned by a partnership with tax-exempt owners, to the extent of the tax-exempt ownership. As noted above, TEUP is generally required to be depreciated using the ADS rather than MACRS (accelerated) depreciation. Furthermore, property otherwise qualifying for certain investment tax credits (ITCs) may be disqualified, to the extent treated as TEUP.

For these purposes, tax-exempt entities are defined to include not only “traditional” tax-exempt entities, such as those that are exempt under Section 501(c)(3), but also the US government, its states and political subdivisions and agencies/instrumentalities (including so-called “super tax-exempts”) as well as certain foreign persons and entities.

Foreign investors: For purposes of these rules, a foreign entity is considered tax exempt if no more than 50% of the gross income (after taking into account “exclusions and exemptions”) from the property is subject to USFIT.

For this purpose, “exclusions and exemptions” do not appear to include customary deductions against gross income (e.g., operating expenses or depreciation), with the result that foreign investors that report the related gross income for USFIT purposes (e.g., via Form 1120F) would not cause the property to be TEUP, even if more than 50% of the gross income is offset by deductions.

Investment via US taxable corporate blockers: In general, otherwise taxable US corporate blockers are treated as “tax-exempt” for purposes of determining whether a partnership has tax-exempt partners, if 50% or more of the value of the stock is held by tax-exempt (but excluding foreign) entities or persons. The effect of this “tax-exempt controlled entity” rule is that foreign investors may invest in property through US blockers without causing the property to be TEUP, while other tax-exempt investors can only do so if more than 50% of the value of the stock of the blocker is held by taxable or foreign investors. Thus, fund or consortium investors may find that by having the right proportionate “mix” of investors invest in property via the same blocker, the property will not be TEUP.

Cleansing election: Otherwise tax-exempt controlled entities can make an irrevocable “cleansing election” pursuant to which the blocker will not be treated as a tax-exempt controlled entity (and thus will not cause property it owns or uses to be TEUP). The “cost” of this election is that tax-exempt shareholders are required to treat gains, dividends from previously untaxed income, and interest income with respect to the blocker as unrelated business taxable income (UBTI), which may render this option unfeasible for many such investors.

“Super” tax-exempt investors: So-called super tax-exempt investors may seek to avail themselves of the cleansing election by investing through a wholly-owned blocker that makes the election, given that such investors generally don’t pay tax on UBTI, and thus would not increase their tax burden by making the cleansing election. In implementing such an investment structure, such investors should consider the risk that a wholly-owned blocker is itself treated as a subdivision or instrumentality of a US federal, state, or local government and thus is itself a tax-exempt entity, rather than an electing taxable blocker, with the effect that the cleansing election is ineffective and the property is TEUP.



FIRPTA generally: Broadly, the Foreign Investment in Real Property Tax Act of 1980 (FIRPTA) rules treat gains on disposal of a United States Real Property Interest (USRPI) as Effectively Connected Income (ECI) for a nonresident individual or foreign corporation. A USRPI generally includes a direct

interest in real property located in the US or Virgin Islands and an interest in a corporation that is or was a US real property holding corporation (USRPHC) during the relevant look-back period. A direct interest in real property is defined as an interest other than solely as a creditor in (i) land and unsevered natural products of the land; (ii) improvements on land (e.g., buildings, inherently permanent structures, and structural components); and (iii) certain personal property associated with the use of real property (e.g., property used in mining, farming, improving real property, operating a building, etc.). Certain Section 197 intangible assets may also be considered USRPIs depending on the nature of the intangible asset and whether its value is economically derived from an underlying USRPI.

Many infrastructure investments involve some exposure to USRPIs, and a careful analysis of the specific facts and circumstances is required to determine if a given investment is a USRPI.

Given that non-US pension funds frequently invest in infrastructure assets, the potential for these investors to avail themselves to the exception from FIRPTA for qualified foreign pension funds (QFPFs) should be fully considered. Furthermore, certain institutional investors such as sovereign wealth funds and foreign pension funds may qualify under Section 892 for an exemption to FIRPTA for investments in (or held through) U.S. corporations.

Section 163(j) Interest Limitations and Exceptions

Section 163(j) generally: Generally, the business interest expense deduction allowed for a tax year is limited to the sum of business interest income and 30% of the adjusted taxable income (which is approximately equal to EBIT for tax years 2022—2024, and EBITDA for tax years beginning after 2024 under current law). If the Section 163(j) limitation applies, generally the amount of any business interest expense that is not allowed as a deduction under Section 163(j) for the tax year is carried forward to the following year as a disallowed business interest expense carryforward. Two exceptions to Section 163(j) that often arise in infrastructure investments are discussed below.

The regulated utility exception: The Section 163(j) limitation does not apply to interest expense incurred in connection with the trade or business of furnishing or sale of electrical energy, water, or sewage disposal services, gas or steam through a local distribution system or the transportation of gas or steam by pipeline, if the rates for such furnishing or sale have been established or approved by a state or political subdivision thereof, by any agency, or instrumentality of the United States, by a public service or public utility commission, or other similar body of any state

or political subdivision thereof, or by the governing ratemaking body of an electric cooperative.

The real property trade or business (RPToB) exception generally:

exception generally: This exception exempts any interest incurred by an “electing real property trade or business”—meaning “any real property development, redevelopment, construction, reconstruction, acquisition, conversion, rental, operation, management, leasing, or brokerage trade or business” that elects to avail itself of the RPToB exception. Businesses making the RPToB election cannot benefit from the temporary full expensing (“bonus depreciation”) and will need to utilize the ADS method for certain assets (generally nonresidential real property, residential rental property, and qualified improvement property).

RPToB infrastructure safe harbor: Revenue Procedure 2018-59 provides a safe harbor that allows taxpayers to treat certain infrastructure trades or businesses as real RPToBs for purposes of qualifying as an electing RPToB. The revenue procedure applies to a taxpayer with a trade or business that fits within the revenue procedure’s definitional framework:

A “specified infrastructure arrangement” means a contract or contracts with a term in excess of five years between a government and a private trade or business under which a private trade or business has contractual responsibility to provide one or more of the functions of designing, building, constructing, reconstructing, developing, redeveloping, managing, operating, or maintaining “qualified public infrastructure property.”

“Qualified infrastructure property” means infrastructure property if it is either owned by a government or is owned by a private trade or business that operates under an arrangement in which rates charged for the use of services provided by the infrastructure property are subject to regulatory or contractual control by a government, or government approval; and the infrastructure property

is, or will be available for use by the general public or the services provided by the infrastructure property are made available to members of the general public. “Infrastructure property” includes specifically listed types of infrastructure assets, including:

- Airports
- Docks and wharves
- Maritime and inland waterways and ports
- Mass commuting facilities
- Facilities for the furnishing of water
- Sewage facilities
- Solid waste disposal facilities
- Facilities for the local furnishing of electrical energy or gas
- Local district heating or cooling facilities
- Qualified hazardous waste facilities
- High-speed intercity rail facilities
- Hydroelectric generating facilities
- Qualified public educational facilities
- Flood control and stormwater facilities
- Surface transportation facilities
- Rural broadband service facilities
- Environmental remediation costs on Brownfield and Superfund sites

While this revenue procedure provided welcome guidance, it does not explicitly address a number of businesses commonly considered as infrastructure, and applying the revenue procedure to a given investment may require significant analysis.



REIT Considerations

Certain states adopt “captive REIT” provisions and generally disallow the dividend paid deduction (or mandate combined reporting) depending on the REIT’s ownership structure. In addition, certain states may impose a franchise or other non-income-based tax generally computed based on net worth apportioned to—or real and tangible property located in—the state. Accordingly, REITs may incur state and local income and/or franchise tax liabilities depending on the location of the real property, notwithstanding a qualified REIT is generally not subject to US federal corporate income tax.

Regulated Utilities—Tax in Ratemaking

Investments in regulated utilities involve unique tax considerations, including:

Tax in ratemaking—considering whether the “regulatory books” for purposes of making the utility’s rate case reflect the proper taxes

Tax normalization requirements—considering whether the utility meets the normalization requirements of Section 168(i)(10).

Tax Credits

Investments in infrastructure assets may qualify for a number of USFIT credits, including those pursuant to the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (IRA) as they were modified by the One Big Beautiful Bill Act of 2025 (OBBA). In some cases, these credits may be refundable or transferrable. The impact of these credits should be properly modeled and considered when analyzing the tax implications of an infrastructure investment.

CAMT

The IRA introduced a 15% corporate alternative minimum tax (CAMT), which under this regime’s aggregation rules may impact many large investors that are not traditionally thought of as “corporate” taxpayers. This should be considered when analyzing and modeling the tax impact of a potential infrastructure investment.

Tax Profiles of Investors

Given the various types of investors that invest in infrastructure assets, understanding the unique tax profile of each investor is critical to understanding the tax implications to the investment and their investors. Some examples include:

- Section 892 investors (e.g., sovereign wealth funds and some foreign pension funds), USFIT controlled commercial activity rules and local-country restrictions on taking controlling stakes in assets
- QFPF investors
- Tax-exempt investors
- Large, CAMT-sensitive investors

State and Local Tax (“SALT”) Considerations

All states and local governments impose and/or administer taxes that generate revenue for states and localities to provide services (e.g., education, healthcare, infrastructure, etc.). In general, state tax regimes vary by state, and no one state tax code is exactly the same as another state tax code. Local tax regimes typically rely on personal and/or real property taxes, but some localities impose other forms of taxation as sources of revenue. Accordingly, the state and local tax consequences of an infrastructure investment can vary significantly depending on the location of the investment and should be evaluated on an investment-by-investment basis.

State and Local Income Tax

State and Local Income Tax Generally: States generally adopt the Internal Revenue Code (“IRC”) as a starting point to determine state taxable income. The starting point is increased by state-specific addition modifications and decreased by state-specific subtraction modifications, both of which adjust for differences in the application of the IRC and state income tax law (commonly referred to as “conformity”). The resulting amount is apportioned to the state based on a statutory apportionment formula. Post-apportioned income is multiplied by the corporate income tax rate to determine the tax liability. It is important to note states may apply NOLs on a pre- or post-apportioned basis.

Conformity to the IRC: States vary in their adoption of the provisions of the IRC for purposes of computing state taxable income. In general, states conform to the IRC on a “rolling” or “static” basis. “Rolling” conformity states generally adopt the provisions of the IRC in effect for the current year (unless otherwise provided). “Static” or “fixed date” conformity states generally conform to the IRC as of a specific date and are generally required to update their conformity date to incorporate federal changes. Depending on a state’s conformity to the IRC, there can be significant differences in the computation of federal and state taxable income and related income tax liabilities during the course of an infrastructure investment. For example, many states decouple from

certain IRC sections, including bonus depreciation under IRC Section 168(k) and/or business interest expense limitations under IRC Section 163(j). In addition, certain states may not conform to the tax provisions related to the sale and use of IRA credits and include income related to the sale of IRA credits in the state income tax base and may not conform to certain provisions of the OBBBA.

Financial Modeling Considerations

States may impose an entity-level income, franchise, or gross receipts-based tax on passthrough entities, including multi-member limited liability companies treated as partnerships for US federal income tax purposes, either in lieu of or in addition to tax at the investor/member level. In addition, given their nature, infrastructure assets may incur significant real and/or personal property tax expenses. These expenses are typically treated as operating expenses for purposes of computing earnings before interest tax depreciation and amortization ("EBITDA"). The impact of these taxes should be considered when analyzing and modeling the tax impact of a potential infrastructure investment.

Real Estate Transfer Tax ("RETT")

States and/or localities within a state may impose RETT when the direct or indirect ownership of real property is transferred from one party to another, including deed transfers and transfers of an economic or controlling interest (e.g., 50% or more, etc.) in an entity with a direct or indirect real property interest in the state. The applicability of RETT, available exemptions, and RETT rates varies greatly and depends on the location, value, and type of real property interest, as well as the transaction steps and how the real property is held. In addition, depending on the transaction steps, internal reorganizations or restructurings may create RETT reporting obligations and/or RETT due (on one or more steps) if a state or locality within the state does not provide an applicable exemption (e.g., exemption for mere change in form of ownership). Further, RETT is typically due within 30 days of closing of a transaction, and some jurisdictions require RETT returns to be filed and payment remitted at or near the time of closing. The impact of RETT (and associated compliance costs), as well as any RETT structuring opportunities, should be considered when analyzing and modeling the tax impact of a potential infrastructure investment.

Real Property Tax Reassessment

Real property tax is generally imposed by the locality where the real property is located (e.g., county, city, school district, etc.). Certain infrastructure assets (e.g., public utilities, etc.) that span multiple counties within a state may be subject to central

assessment. Generally, taxing jurisdictions reassess the value of real property on a periodic basis that varies depending on the state and locality. However, in certain jurisdictions, a change in ownership of real property, including the direct or indirect ownership change of a legal entity with a real property interest, may result in reassessment to current fair market value unless an exemption applies. Such events can result in an increase to real property tax liabilities and corresponding EBITDA impact. The potential increase of real property tax assessments should be considered when analyzing and modeling the tax impact of a potential infrastructure investment.

Tax Credits and Negotiated Incentives

Investments in infrastructure assets may qualify for state and local tax credits and/or negotiated incentives (e.g., property tax abatements, etc.), or in certain instances public grants, depending on various factors, including location of the assets, capital expenditure, and job creation and retention commitments (among others). The availability and type of tax credits and negotiated incentives can vary significantly by state and local jurisdiction. In many cases, negotiated incentives are required to be secured in advance of a public announcement to proceed with a proposed investment. The impact of these tax credits and negotiated incentives should be properly modeled and considered when analyzing the tax implications of an infrastructure investment.

Industry-Specific Taxes

Depending on the investment, certain infrastructure assets may be subject to industry-specific taxes imposed in addition to or in lieu of taxes generally imposed on business entities. For example, some states may subject telecommunications services to state and local sales tax, while other states may exclude telecommunications services from the sales tax base and instead tax telecommunications services under a separate tax. Other states may impose both a sales tax and a telecommunications tax on such services. The application of these taxes is often facts and circumstances specific and varies by state and local jurisdiction.

Infrastructure—Tax Work Streams

The following is a list of some common tax work streams in infrastructure transactions:

- Tax due diligence assistance
- Tax analysis of the relevant legal agreements, including concessions agreements, leases, purchase agreements, etc.
- Structuring assistance related to the transaction and its funding and tax planning for upstream investors and investment vehicles

- Consideration of tax ownership related to the transaction
- Reviewing and commenting on the tax calculation and assumptions in the transaction model, including:
 - Character and timing of revenue and expense recognition
 - Tracking and utilization of tax attributes, including net operating losses and investment and production tax credits
 - Applicable tax depreciation and amortization
 - Treatment of interest expense, including under Section 163(j) and applicable exceptions
 - Applicability of state and local taxes, and related incentives and abatements
 - FIRPTA considerations and analysis during hold period and upon future exit

- Valuation assistance, including related to FIRPTA, purchase price allocations, and cost segregation studies
- Transfer pricing assistance related to related-party transactions, including loans (debt capacity and interest rate benchmarking)
- Tax treaty considerations and qualifications and QFPP certification.
- Assistance with employee and management compensation arrangements
- Tax reporting for project companies and upstream structures.

For more information, contact:



Larry Piccola
Partner, M&A Tax – Infrastructure

T: 212-872-3605
C: 610-739-7764
E: lpiccola@kpmg.com



Israel Tarshish
Principal, M&A Tax – Infrastructure

T: 713-319-2176
C: 832-758-1150
E: itarshish@kpmg.com



James Shatz
Partner, Business Tax Services – Infrastructure

T: 212-909-5274
C: 267-496-8170
E: jshatz@kpmg.com



Fiona Donovan
Managing Director, M&A Tax – Infrastructure

T: 212-954-6407
C: 860-371-8704
E: fdonovan@kpmg.com



Kyle Chandler
Managing Director, M&A Tax – Infrastructure

T: 703-286-6766
C: 804-519-4550
E: kylechandler@kpmg.com



John Ferrarella
Partner, Tax State and Local Tax, M&A

T: 212-872-3332
C: 332-999-7893
E: jferrarella@kpmg.com

Some or all of the services described herein may not be permissible for KPMG audit clients and their affiliates or related entities.

Learn about us:  kpmg.com

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavor to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act upon such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.

© 2025 KPMG LLP, a Delaware limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organization of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organization. USCS032932