# BLACKROCK NEW YORK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST

Form N-CSRS April 05, 2017

#### **UNITED STATES**

#### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

#### **FORM N-CSR**

# CERTIFIED SHAREHOLDER REPORT OF REGISTERED MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Investment Company Act file number 811-10337

Name of Fund: BlackRock New York Municipal Income Trust (BNY)

Fund Address: 100 Bellevue Parkway, Wilmington, DE 19809

Name and address of agent for service: John M. Perlowski, Chief Executive Officer, BlackRock New York Municipal

Income Trust, 55 East 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, New York, NY 10055

Registrant s telephone number, including area code: (800) 882-0052, Option 4

Date of fiscal year end: 07/31/2017

Date of reporting period: 01/31/2017

Item 1 Report to Stockholders

JANUARY 31, 2017

# SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT (UNAUDITED)

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust (BFO)

BlackRock Municipal 2030 Target Term Trust (BTT)

BlackRock Municipal Income Investment Trust (BBF)

BlackRock New Jersey Municipal Income Trust (BNJ)

BlackRock New York Municipal Income Trust (BNY)

Not FDIC Insured May Lose Value No Bank Guarantee

#### The Markets in Review

Dear Shareholder,

The 12 months ended January 31, 2017 was an exceptionally strong period for risk assets (such as stocks and high yield bonds), while higher-quality assets generated muted returns after struggling in the latter part of 2016. As the period began, worries about slowing growth in China and the instability of oil prices had global equity prices sliding. However, the broad market momentum shifted in the second half of 2016 as reflationary expectations in the United States helped drive a pick-up in global growth.

Markets were remarkably resilient during the period. Big surprises such as the United Kingdom s vote to leave the European Union and the outcome of the U.S. presidential election brought spikes in equity market volatility, but they were ultimately short-lived. Instead, investors used the sell-offs to seize upon buying opportunities, allowing markets to quickly rebound. We believe this reinforces the case for taking the long view rather than reacting to short-term market noise.

The global reflationary theme rising nominal growth, wages and inflation was the dominant driver of asset returns during the period, outweighing significant political upheavals and uncertainty. This trend accelerated after the U.S. election and continued into the beginning of 2017, stoked by expectations for an extra boost to U.S. growth via fiscal policy.

Although economic momentum is gaining traction, the capacity for rapid global growth is restrained by structural factors including an aging population, low productivity growth and excess savings. A tempered economic growth trend and high valuations across most assets have set the stage for muted investment returns going forward.

Equity markets still have room to move, although the disparity between winners and losers is widening, making stock selection increasingly important. Fixed income investors are also facing challenges as bond markets recalibrate to accommodate rising rates and higher inflation expectations. And in a world where political risk and policy uncertainty abound, there is no lack of potential catalysts for higher volatility.

In this environment, investors need to think globally, extend their scope across a broad array of asset classes and be nimble as market conditions change. We encourage you to talk with your financial advisor and visit blackrock.com for further insight about investing in today s markets.

Sincerely,

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

#### Total Returns as of January 31, 2017

	6-month	12-month
U.S. large cap equities	5.96%	20.04%
(S&P 500® Index)		
U.S. small cap equities	12.43	33.53
(Russell 2000® Index)		
International equities	3.49	12.03
(MSCI Europe, Australasia,		
Far East Index)		
Emerging market equities	4.92	25.41
(MSCI Emerging Markets Index)		
3-month Treasury bills	0.20	0.37
(BofA Merrill Lynch 3-Month		
U.S. Treasury Bill Index)		

U.S. Treasury securities	(7.87)	(3.26)
(BofA Merrill Lynch		
10-Year U.S. Treasury		
Index)		
U.S. investment grade bonds	(2.95)	1.45
(Bloomberg Barclays U.S.		
Aggregate Bond Index)		
Tax-exempt municipal	(2.94)	0.24
bonds (S&P Municipal		
Bond Index)		
U.S. high yield bonds	6.09	20.77
(Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Corporate High Yield 2% Issuer		
Capped Index)		

Past performance is no guarantee of future results. Index performance is shown for illustrative purposes only. You cannot invest directly in an index

THIS PAGE NOT PART OF YOUR FUND REPORT

2

# **Table of Contents**

		Page
The Markets in Review		2
Semi-Annual Report:		
Municipal Market Overview		4
The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging		5
<u>Derivative Financial Instruments</u>		5
<u>Trust Summaries</u>		6
Financial Statements:		
Schedules of Investments		18
Statements of Assets and Liabilities		50
Statements of Operations		52
Statements of Changes in Net Assets		54
Statements of Cash Flows		57
Financial Highlights		58
Notes to Financial Statements		64
Officers and Trustees		76
Additional Information		77
SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT	JANUARY 31, 2017	3

# Municipal Market Overview

For the Reporting Period Ended January 31, 2017

#### **Municipal Market Conditions**

Municipal bonds generated modestly positive performance for the period, in spite of vastly rising interest rates as a result of generally stronger economic data, signs of inflation pressures, Fed monetary policy normalization, and market expectations for pro-growth fiscal policy. However, ongoing reassurance from the Fed that rates would be increased gradually and would likely remain low overall resulted in strong demand for fixed income investments. Investors favored the income, relative yield, and stability of municipal bonds amid bouts of interest rate volatility (bond prices rise as rates fall) resulting from the United Kingdom s decision to leave the European Union, the contentious U.S. election, and widening central bank divergence i.e., policy easing outside the United States while the Fed slowly commences policy tightening. During the 12 months ended January 31, 2017, municipal bond funds garnered net inflows of approximately \$24 billion (based on data from the Investment Company Institute).

For the same 12-month period, total new issuance remained robust from a historical perspective at \$451 billion (significantly above the \$394 billion issued in the prior 12-month period). A noteworthy portion of new supply during this period was attributable to refinancing activity (roughly 60%) as issuers continued to take advantage of low interest rates and a flatter yield curve to reduce their borrowing costs.

S&P Municipal Bond Index Total Returns as of January 31, 2017

6 months: (2.94)% 12 months: 0.24%

#### A Closer Look at Yields

From January 31, 2016 to January 31, 2017, yields on AAA-rated 30-year municipal bonds increased by 33 basis points (bps) from 2.75% to 3.08%, while 10-year rates rose by 61 bps from 1.71% to 2.32% and 5-year rates increased 63 bps from 1.00% to 1.63% (as measured by Thomson Municipal Market Data). The municipal yield curve modestly flattened over the 12-month period with the spread between 2- and 30-year maturities flattening by 9 bps and the spread between 10- and 30-year maturities flattening by 28 bps.

During the same time period, on a relative basis, tax-exempt municipal bonds broadly underperformed U.S. Treasuries with the greatest underperformance experienced in the intermediate part of the yield curve. In absolute terms, the positive performance of municipal bonds was driven largely by a supply/demand imbalance within the municipal market as investors sought income and incremental yield in an environment where opportunities became increasingly scarce. More broadly, municipal bonds came under pressure post the November U.S. election, erasing a bulk of year-to-date performance and influencing a strong pattern of mutual fund inflows to turn negative in the closing months of the period. The asset class is known for its lower relative volatility and preservation of principal with an emphasis on income as tax rates rise.

#### **Financial Conditions of Municipal Issuers**

The majority of municipal credits remain strong, despite well-publicized distress among a few issuers. Four of the five states with the largest amount of debt outstanding California, New York, Texas and Florida have exhibited markedly improved credit fundamentals during the slow national recovery. However, several states with the largest unfunded pension liabilities have seen their bond prices decline noticeably and remain vulnerable to additional price deterioration. On the local level, Chicago s credit quality downgrade is an outlier relative to other cities due to its larger pension liability and inadequate funding remedies. BlackRock maintains the view that municipal bond defaults will remain minimal and in the periphery while the overall market is fundamentally sound. We continue to advocate careful credit research and believe that a thoughtful approach to structure and security selection remains imperative amid uncertainty in a modestly improving economic environment.

The opinions expressed are those of BlackRock as of January 31, 2017, and are subject to change at any time due to changes in market or economic conditions. The comments should not be construed as a recommendation of any individual holdings or market sectors. Investing involves risk including loss of principal. Bond values fluctuate in price so the value of your investment can go down depending on market conditions. Fixed income risks include interest-rate and credit risk. Typically, when interest rates rise, there is a corresponding decline in bond values. Credit risk refers to the possibility that the bond issuer will not be able to make principal and interest payments. There may be less information on the financial condition of municipal issuers than for public corporations. The market for municipal bonds may be less liquid than for taxable bonds. Some investors may be subject to Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT). Capital gains distributions, if any, are taxable.

The Standard & Poor s Municipal Bond Index, a broad, market value-weighted index, seeks to measure the performance of the U.S. municipal bond market. All bonds in the index are exempt from U.S. federal income taxes or subject to the alternative minimum tax. Past performance is no guarantee of future results. Index performance is shown for illustrative purposes only. It is not possible to invest directly in an index.

4 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 31, 2017

# The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging

The Trusts may utilize leverage to seek to enhance the distribution rate on, and net asset value ( NAV ) of, their common shares ( Common Shares ). However, these objectives cannot be achieved in all interest rate environments.

In general, the concept of leveraging is based on the premise that the financing cost of leverage, which is based on short-term interest rates, is normally lower than the income earned by a Trust on its longer-term portfolio investments purchased with the proceeds from leverage. To the extent that the total assets of the Trusts (including the assets obtained from leverage) are invested in higher-yielding portfolio investments, the Trusts shareholders benefit from the incremental net income. The interest earned on securities purchased with the proceeds from leverage is paid to shareholders in the form of dividends, and the value of these portfolio holdings is reflected in the per share NAV.

To illustrate these concepts, assume a Trust s Common Shares capitalization is \$100 million and it utilizes leverage for an additional \$30 million, creating a total value of \$130 million available for investment in longer-term income securities. If prevailing short-term interest rates are 3% and longer-term interest rates are 6%, the yield curve has a strongly positive slope. In this case, a Trust s financing costs on the \$30 million of proceeds obtained from leverage are based on the lower short-term interest rates. At the same time, the securities purchased by a Trust with the proceeds from leverage earn income based on longer-term interest rates. In this case, a Trust s financing cost of leverage is significantly lower than the income earned on a Trust s longer-term investments acquired from leverage proceeds, and therefore the holders of Common Shares (Common Shareholders) are the beneficiaries of the incremental net income.

However, in order to benefit Common Shareholders, the return on assets purchased with leverage proceeds must exceed the ongoing costs associated with the leverage. If interest and other costs of leverage exceed the Trusts—return on assets purchased with leverage proceeds, income to shareholders is lower than if the Trusts had not used leverage. Furthermore, the value of the Trusts—portfolio investments generally varies inversely with the direction of long-term interest rates, although other factors can influence the value of portfolio investments. In contrast, the value of the Trusts—obligations under their respective leverage arrangements generally does not fluctuate in relation to interest rates. As a result, changes in interest rates can influence the Trusts—NAVs positively or negatively. Changes in the future direction of interest rates are very diffi-

cult to predict accurately, and there is no assurance that a Trust s intended leveraging strategy will be successful.

The use of leverage also generally causes greater changes in each Trust s NAV, market price and dividend rates than comparable portfolios without leverage. In a declining market, leverage is likely to cause a greater decline in the NAV and market price of a Trust s Common Shares than if the Trust were not leveraged. In addition, each Trust may be required to sell portfolio securities at inopportune times or at distressed values in order to comply with regulatory requirements applicable to the use of leverage or as required by the terms of leverage instruments, which may cause the Trusts to incur losses. The use of leverage may limit a Trust s ability to invest in certain types of securities or use certain types of hedging strategies. Each Trust incurs expenses in connection with the use of leverage, all of which are borne by Common Shareholders and may reduce income to the Common Shares. Moreover, to the extent the calculation of the Trusts investment advisory fees includes assets purchased with the proceeds of leverage, the investment advisory fees payable to the Trusts investment adviser will be higher than if the Trusts did not use leverage.

To obtain leverage, each Trust has issued Variable Rate Demand Preferred Shares ( VRDP Shares ), Variable Rate Muni Term Preferred Shares ( VMTP Shares ) and Remarketable Variable Rate Muni Term Preferred Shares ( RVMTP Shares ) (collectively, Preferred Shares ) and/or leveraged its assets through the use of tender option bond trusts ( TOB Trusts ) as described in the Notes to Financial Statements.

Under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the 1940 Act.), each Trust is permitted to issue debt up to 33 1/3% of its total managed assets or equity securities (e.g., Preferred Shares) up to 50% of its total managed assets. A Trust may voluntarily elect to limit its leverage to less than the maximum amount permitted under the 1940 Act. In addition, a Trust may also be subject to certain asset coverage, leverage or portfolio composition requirements imposed by the Preferred Shares governing instruments or by agencies rating the Preferred Shares, which may be more stringent than those imposed by the 1940 Act.

If a Trust segregates or designates on its books and records cash or liquid assets having a value not less than the value of a Trust s obligations under the TOB Trust (including accrued interest), a TOB Trust is not considered a senior security and is not subject to the foregoing limitations and requirements under the 1940 Act.

### **Derivative Financial Instruments**

The Trusts may invest in various derivative financial instruments. These instruments are used to obtain exposure to a security, commodity, index, market, and/or other asset without owning or taking physical custody of securities, commodities and/or other referenced assets or to manage market, equity, credit, interest rate, foreign currency exchange rate, commodity and/or other risks. Derivative financial instruments may give rise to a form of economic leverage and involve risks, including the imperfect correlation between the value of a derivative financial instrument and the underlying asset, possible default of the counterparty to the

transaction or illiquidity of the instrument. The Trusts successful use of a derivative financial instrument depends on the investment adviser s ability to predict pertinent market movements accurately, which cannot be assured. The use of these instruments may result in losses greater than if they had not been used, may limit the amount of appreciation a Trust can realize on an investment and/or may result in lower distributions paid to shareholders. The Trusts investments in these instruments, if any, are discussed in detail in the Notes to Financial Statements.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017 5

### Trust Summary as of January 31, 2017

#### BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust

#### **Trust Overview**

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust s (BFZ) (the Trust ) investment objective is to provide current income exempt from regular U.S. federal income and California income taxes. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing primarily in municipal obligations exempt from U.S. federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax) and California income taxes. The Trust invests, under normal market conditions, at least 80% of its assets in municipal obligations that are investment grade quality, or are considered by the Trust s adviser to be of comparable quality, at the time of investment. The Trust may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives.

No assurance can be given that the Trust s investment objective will be achieved.

Trust Information	
Symbol on New York Stock Exchange ( NYSE )	BFZ
Initial Offering Date	July 27, 2001
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2017 (\$14.94) <sup>1</sup>	5.40%
Tax Equivalent Yield <sup>2</sup>	11.00%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.0672
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.8064
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2017 <sup>4</sup>	42%

- Yield on closing market price is calculated by dividing the current annualized distribution per share by the closing market price. Past performance does not guarantee future results.
- Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal federal and state tax rate of 50.93%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.
- <sup>3</sup> The monthly distribution per Common Share, declared on March 1, 2017, was decreased to \$0.0595 per share. The yield on closing market price, current monthly distribution per Common Share and current annualized distribution per Common Share do not reflect the new distribution rate. The new distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change in the future.
- Represents VMTP Shares and TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including any assets attributable to VMTP Shares and TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Trust, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

#### Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2017 were as follows:

	Returns Ba	Returns Based On		
	Market Price	NAV		
$\mathrm{BFZ}^{1,2}$	(8.48)%	(5.31)%		
Lipper California Municipal Debt Funds <sup>3</sup>	(8.72)%	(5.28)%		

<sup>1</sup> All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions.

- The Trust moved from a premium to NAV to a discount during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.
- 3 Average return.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The following discussion relates to the Trust s absolute performance based on NAV:

Municipal bonds lost ground in the six-month reporting period. After producing slightly positive returns in August, municipal bonds began to move lower in September and October due to a pick-up in new tax-exempt issuance and rising yields in the U.S. Treasury market. (Prices and yields move in opposite directions.) The weakness accelerated in November once Donald Trump s election victory caused investors to adjust their expectations in favor of stronger growth and tighter Fed policy. The municipal market subsequently stabilized and retraced some of its losses in December and January as the relative attractiveness of the asset class brought in new investors, but the modest rally was insufficient to make up for the earlier downturn.

California underperformed the national tax-exempt market, reflecting an unwinding of previously tight credit spreads for state and local issues, together with a larger calendar of new issuance. Despite the after-tax value provided by California muni bonds for retail investors subject to the state s high tax brackets, California funds were not immune to the redemptions experienced by both the general market and high-yield products in the latter part of the period.

The Trust s positions on the long end of the yield curve detracted from performance in the environment of rising yields. In addition, positions in lower-rated investment-grade (such as those rated A and BBB) fared worse than high-grade securities as credit spreads widened.

All sectors experienced negative returns in the period, but the Trust s positions in health care suffered the weakest performance due to uncertainty surrounding the future of the Affordable Care Act. The Trust s use of leverage, which amplifies the effect of interest rate movements, also detracted.

On the positive side, the Trust sholdings in shorter duration securities held up relatively well during periods of market volatility. (Duration is a measure of interest rate sensitivity.) The Trust sought to manage interest rate risk using U.S. Treasury futures. Given that Treasury yields rose as prices fell, this aspect of the Trust spositioning had a positive effect on returns.

The views expressed reflect the opinions of BlackRock as of the date of this report and are subject to change based on changes in market, economic or other conditions. These views are not intended to be a forecast of future events and are no guarantee of future results.

6 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust

#### Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	1/31/17	7/31/16	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 14.94	\$ 16.76	(10.86)%	\$ 16.98	\$ 14.09
Net Asset Value	\$ 15.08	\$ 16.35	(7.77)%	\$ 16.35	\$ 14.70

Market Price and Net Asset Value History For the Past Five Years

#### Overview of the Trust s Total Investments\*

Sector Allocation	1/31/17	7/31/16
County/City/Special District/School District	30%	29%
Utilities	19	23
Education	13	15
Transportation	13	9
Health	12	12
State	9	9
Tobacco	4	3

For Trust compliance purposes, the Trust s sector classifications refer to one or more of the sector sub-classifications used by one or more widely recognized market indexes or rating group indexes, and/or as defined by the investment adviser. These definitions may not apply for purposes of this report, which may combine such sector sub-classifications for reporting ease.

#### Call/Maturity Schedule<sup>3</sup>

 Calendar Year Ended December 31,
 6%

 2017
 6%

 2018
 11

 2019
 24

 2020
 4

 2021
 11

\* Excludes short-term securities.

Credit Quality Allocation <sup>1</sup>	1/31/17	7/31/16
AAA/Aaa	7%	6%
AA/Aa	74	77
A	15	14
BBB/Baa <sup>2</sup>		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Scheduled maturity dates and/or bonds that are subject to potential calls by issuers over the next five years.

BB/Ba		1	
В	3	1	
N/R	1	1	

1 For financial reporting purposes, credit quality ratings shown above reflect the highest rating assigned by either Standard & Poor s (S&P) or Moody s Investors Service (Moody s) if ratings differ. These rating agencies are independent, nationally recognized statistical rating organizations and are widely used. Investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BBB/Baa or higher. Below investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BB/Ba or lower. Investments designated N/R are not rated by either rating agency. Unrated investments do not necessarily indicate low credit quality. Credit quality ratings are subject to change.

<sup>2</sup> Represents less than 1% of the Trust s total investments.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017 7

# Trust Summary as of January 31, 2017

BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust

#### **Trust Overview**

BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust s (BFO) (the Trust) investment objectives are to provide current income exempt from regular U.S. federal income tax and Florida intangible personal property tax and to return \$15.00 per common share (the initial offering price per share) to holders of common shares on or about December 31, 2020. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objectives by investing at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds exempt from U.S. federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax) and Florida intangible personal property tax. The Trust invests at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds that are investment grade quality, or are considered by the Trust s adviser to be of comparable quality, at the time of investment. The Trust actively manages the maturity of its bonds to seek to have a dollar-weighted average effective maturity approximately equal to the Trust s maturity date. The Trust may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives. Effective January 1, 2007, the Florida intangible personal property tax was repealed.

There is no assurance that the Trust will achieve its investment objective of returning \$15.00 per share.

Trust Information	
Symbol on NYSE	BFO
Initial Offering Date	September 30, 2003
Termination Date (on or about)	December 31, 2020
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2017 (\$15.07) <sup>1</sup>	2.47%
Tax Equivalent Yield <sup>2</sup>	4.36%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.031
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.372
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2017 <sup>4</sup>	

- Yield on closing market price is calculated by dividing the current annualized distribution per share by the closing market price. Past performance does not guarantee future results.
- Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal federal tax rate of 43.4%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.
- 3 The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- Percentage is less than 1% which represents TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including any assets attributable to TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Trust, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

#### Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2017 were as follows:

	Returns Ba	sed On
	Market Price	NAV
BFO <sup>1,2</sup>	0.30%	(1.51)%
Lipper Other States Municipal Debt Funds <sup>3</sup>	(8.44)%	(5.37)%

- The Trust s discount to NAV narrowed during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.
- 3 Average return.

All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The following discussion relates to the Trust s absolute performance based on NAV:

Municipal bonds lost ground in the six-month reporting period. After producing slightly positive returns in August, municipal bonds began to move lower in September and October due to a pick-up in new tax-exempt issuance and rising yields in the U.S. Treasury market. (Prices and yields move in opposite directions.) The weakness accelerated in November once Donald Trump s election victory caused investors to adjust their expectations in favor of stronger growth and tighter Fed policy. The municipal market subsequently stabilized and retraced some of its losses in December and January as the relative attractiveness of the asset class brought in new investors, but the modest rally was insufficient to make up for the earlier downturn.

Florida municipal bonds outperformed the national market. The state s strong economic momentum contributed to a higher average credit quality for its municipal market, which was a tailwind at a time in which lower-quality issues underperformed.

The Trust is scheduled to mature on or about December 31, 2020, and it therefore holds securities that will mature close to that date. As a result of its shorter duration (interest-rate sensitivity), the Trust held up well in the environment of falling yields and underperformance for longer-term issues.

At the sector level, the health care and utilities sectors represented the largest detractors from performance due to their higher weightings. The Trust s more-seasoned holdings, while producing generous yields compared to current market rates, detracted. The prices of many of these investments declined due to the premium amortization that occurred as the bonds approached their first call dates. (A call is when an issuer redeems a bond prior to its maturity date; premium is amount by which a bond trades above its \$100 par value.)

The views expressed reflect the opinions of BlackRock as of the date of this report and are subject to change based on changes in market, economic or other conditions. These views are not intended to be a forecast of future events and are no guarantee of future results.

8 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017

BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust

#### Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	1/31/17	7/31/16	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$15.07	\$15.21	(0.92)%	\$15.37	\$14.85
Net Asset Value	\$15.08	\$15.50	(2.71)%	\$15.50	\$14.98

#### Market Price and Net Asset Value History For the Past Five Years

#### Overview of the Trust s Total Investments\*

Sector Allocation	1/31/17	7/31/16
County/City/Special District/School District	35%	34%
Health	18	18
Utilities	15	16
State	12	12
Transportation	11	11
Education	4	4
Corporate	4	4
Housing	1	1

For Trust compliance purposes, the Trust s sector classifications refer to one or more of the sector sub-classifications used by one or more widely recognized market indexes or rating group indexes, and/or as defined by the investment adviser. These definitions may not apply for purposes of this report, which may combine such sector sub-classifications for reporting ease.

#### Call/Maturity Schedule<sup>4</sup>

Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2017	12%
2018	10
2019	11
2020	57
2021	1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Scheduled maturity dates and/or bonds that are subject to potential calls by issuers over the next five years.

\* Excludes short-term securities

Excludes short term securities.		
Credit Quality Allocation <sup>1</sup>	1/31/17	7/31/16
AAA/Aaa	1%	1%
AA/Aa	59	59
A	25	25
BBB/Baa	2	

 $N/R^3$  15 15

- <sup>1</sup> For financial reporting purposes, credit quality ratings shown above reflect the highest rating assigned by either S&P or Moody s if ratings differ. These rating agencies are independent, nationally recognized statistical rating organizations and are widely used. Investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BBB/Baa or higher. Below investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BB/Ba or lower. Investments designated N/R are not rated by either rating agency. Unrated investments do not necessarily indicate low credit quality. Credit quality ratings are subject to change.
- <sup>2</sup> Represents less than 1% of the Trust s total investments.
- <sup>3</sup> The investment adviser evaluates the credit quality of unrated investments based upon certain factors including, but not limited to, credit ratings for similar investments and financial analysis of sectors and individual investments. Using this approach, the investment adviser has deemed certain of these unrated securities as investment grade quality. As of January 31, 2017 and July 31, 2016, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment adviser to be investment grade represents 4% and 13%, respectively, of the Trust stotal investments.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017 9

# Trust Summary as of January 31, 2017

BlackRock Municipal 2030 Target Term Trust

#### **Trust Overview**

BlackRock Municipal 2030 Target Term Trust s (BTT) (the Trust) investment objectives are to provide current income exempt from regular U.S. federal income tax (but which may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax in certain circumstances) and to return \$25.00 per common share (the initial offering price per share) to holders of common shares on or about December 31, 2030. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objectives by investing at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds exempt from U.S. federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax). The Trust invests at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds that are investment grade quality, or are considered by the Trust s adviser to be of comparable quality, at the time of investment. The Trust actively manages the maturity of its bonds to seek to have a dollar weighted average effective maturity approximately equal to the Trust s maturity date. The Trust may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives.

There is no assurance that the Trust will achieve its investment objective of returning \$25.00 per share.

Trust Information	
Symbol on NYSE	BTT
Initial Offering Date	August 30, 2012
Termination Date (on or about)	December 31, 2030
Current Distribution Rate on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2017 (\$22.76) <sup>1</sup>	4.22%
Tax Equivalent Rate <sup>2</sup>	7.46%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.08
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.96
Economic Leverage as January 31, 2017 <sup>4</sup>	37%

- 1 Current Distribution Rate on closing market price is calculated by dividing the current annualized distribution per share by the closing market price. The current distribution rate may consist of income, net realized gains and/or a return of capital. See the financial highlights for the actual sources and character of distributions. Past performance does not guarantee future results.
- <sup>2</sup> Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal federal tax rate of 43.4%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.
- 3 The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change. A portion of the distribution may be deemed a return of capital or net realized gain at fiscal year end.
- Represents RVMTP Shares and TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including any assets attributable to RVMTP Shares and TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Trust, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

#### Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2017 were as follows:

	Returns Ba	Returns Based On		
	Market Price	NAV		
BTT <sup>1,2</sup>	(4.13)%	(8.19)%		
Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) <sup>3</sup>	(7.34)%	(5.63)%		

- The Trust s discount to NAV narrowed during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.
- 3 Average return.

All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The following discussion relates to the Trust s absolute performance based on NAV:

Municipal bonds lost ground in the six-month reporting period. After producing slightly positive returns in August, municipal bonds began to move lower in September and October due to a pick-up in new tax-exempt issuance and rising yields in the U.S. Treasury market. (Prices and yields move in opposite directions.) The weakness accelerated in November once Donald Trump s election victory caused investors to adjust their expectations in favor of stronger growth and tighter Fed policy. The municipal market subsequently stabilized and retraced some of its losses in December and January as the relative attractiveness of the asset class brought in new investors, but the modest rally was insufficient to make up for the earlier downturn.

At the sector level, the health care and transportation sectors represented the largest detractors from performance due to their higher weightings.

The Trust s longer duration profile was a negative for performance as rates were higher across the yield curve. (Duration is a measure of interest rate sensitivity.)

To the extent that the Trust held zero coupon bonds, these positions detracted since the bonds longer duration accentuated the negative price performance in a down market. Reinvestment was a further drag on results, as the proceeds of higher-yielding bonds that matured or were called needed to be reinvested at materially lower prevailing rates.

The Trust continued to employ leverage in order to increase portfolio income. Since leverage also amplifies the effect of market movements, it was a net detractor from performance at a time of falling prices.

The views expressed reflect the opinions of BlackRock as of the date of this report and are subject to change based on changes in market, economic or other conditions. These views are not intended to be a forecast of future events and are no guarantee of future results.

10 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017

BlackRock Municipal 2030 Target Term

#### Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	1/31/17	7/31/16	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 22.76	\$ 24.24	(6.11)%	\$ 24.40	\$ 21.09
Net Asset Value	\$ 22.82	\$ 25.38	(10.09)%	\$ 25.38	\$ 22.21

### Market Price and Net Asset Value History Since Inception

1 Commencement of operations.

#### Overview of the Trust s Total Investments\*

Sector Allocation	1/31/17	7/31/16
Transportation	23%	23%
Health	21	17
Education	15	14
County/City/Special District/School District	15	17
State	10	11
Corporate	8	8
Utilities	5	7
Tobacco	2	2
Housing	1	1

For Trust compliance purposes, the Trust s sector classifications refer to one or more of the sector sub-classifications used by one or more widely recognized market indexes or rating group indexes, and/or as defined by the investment adviser. These definitions may not apply for purposes of this report, which may combine such sector sub-classifications for reporting ease.

#### Call/Maturity Schedule<sup>3</sup>

 Calendar Year Ended December 31,
 1%

 2017
 1%

 2018
 1

 2019
 1

 2020
 4

 2021
 1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Scheduled maturity dates and/or bonds that are subject to potential calls by issuers over the next five years.

<sup>\*</sup> Excludes short-term securities.

Credit Quality Allocation <sup>1</sup>	1/31/17		
AAA/Aaa	3%	5%	
AA/Aa	29	24	
A	41	39	
BBB/Baa	14	18	
BB/Ba	2	3	
В	2	2	
N/R <sup>2</sup>	9	9	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For financial reporting purposes, credit quality ratings shown above reflect the highest rating assigned by either S&P or Moody s if ratings differ. These rating agencies are independent, nationally recognized statistical rating organizations and are widely used. Investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BBB/Baa or higher. Below investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BB/Ba or lower. Investments designated N/R are not rated by either rating agency. Unrated investments do not necessarily indicate low credit quality. Credit quality ratings are subject to change.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017 11

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The investment advisor evaluates the credit quality of unrated investments based upon certain factors including, but not limited to, credit ratings for similar investments and financial analysis of sectors and individual investments. Using this approach, the investment adviser has deemed certain of these unrated securities as investment grade quality. As of January 31, 2017 and July 31, 2016, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment adviser to be investment grade represents less than 1% and 2%, respectively, of the Trust s total investments.

### Trust Summary as of January 31, 2017

#### **BlackRock Municipal Income Investment Trust**

#### **Trust Overview**

BlackRock Municipal Income Investment Trust s (BBF) (the Trust ) investment objective is to provide current income exempt from regular U.S. federal income tax. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds, the interest of which is exempt from U.S. federal income taxes. The Trust invests at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds that are investment grade quality, or are considered by the Trust sadviser to be of comparable quality, at the time of investment. The Trust may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives.

No assurance can be given that the Trust s investment objective will be achieved.

Trust Information	
Symbol on NYSE	BBF
Initial Offering Date	July 27, 2001
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2017 (\$14.53) <sup>1</sup>	5.98%
Tax Equivalent Yield <sup>2</sup>	10.57%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.072375
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.868500
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2017 <sup>4</sup>	41%

- Yield on closing market price is calculated by dividing the current annualized distribution per share by the closing market price. Past performance does not guarantee future results.
- Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal federal tax rate of 43.4%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.
- <sup>3</sup> The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- Represents VRDP Shares and TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including any assets attributable to VRDP Shares and TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Trust, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

#### Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2017 were as follows:

	Returns Ba	Returns Based On		
	Market Price	NAV		
BBF <sup>1,2</sup>	(6.45)%	(4.51)%		
Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) <sup>3</sup>	(7.34)%	(5.63)%		

- 1 All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions.
- The Trust s premium to NAV narrowed during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.

3	Average	return

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The following discussion relates to the Trust s absolute performance based on NAV:

Municipal bonds lost ground in the six-month reporting period. After producing slightly positive returns in August, municipal bonds began to move lower in September and October due to a pick-up in new tax-exempt issuance and rising yields in the U.S. Treasury market. (Prices and yields move in opposite directions.) The weakness accelerated in November once Donald Trump s election victory caused investors to adjust their expectations in favor of stronger growth and tighter Fed policy. The municipal market subsequently stabilized and retraced some of its losses in December and January as the relative attractiveness of the asset class brought in new investors, but the modest rally was insufficient to make up for the earlier downturn.

Positions in bonds with longer maturities declined the most in value since they typically have longer durations (above-average interest rate sensitivity). The Trust s exposure to issues with 4% coupons also detracted from results, as lower coupons generally underperform in rising rate environments.

From a sector allocation perspective, the Trust s exposure to the transportation and tax-backed (state) sectors were the largest detractors.

Portfolio income, which was enhanced by the Trust suse of leverage, made a positive contribution during a period of falling prices. However, leverage also served to accentuate the price declines associated with rising yields.

Positions in high-quality, short-duration bonds such as pre-refunded securities held up relatively well in the down market due to their lower interest rate sensitivity. The Trust sought to manage interest rate risk using U.S. Treasury futures. Given that Treasury yields rose as prices fell, this aspect of the Trust s positioning had a positive effect on returns.

The views expressed reflect the opinions of BlackRock as of the date of this report and are subject to change based on changes in market, economic or other conditions. These views are not intended to be a forecast of future events and are no guarantee of future results.

12 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017

**BlackRock Municipal Income Investment Trust** 

#### Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	1/31/17	7/31/16	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 14.53	\$ 16.00	(9.19)%	\$ 16.16	\$ 13.46
Net Asset Value	\$ 14.34	\$ 15.47	(7.30)%	\$ 15.47	\$ 14.14

#### Market Price and Net Asset Value History For the Past Five Years

#### Overview of the Trust s Total Investments\*

Sector Allocation	1/31/17	7/31/16
County/City/Special District/School District	21%	24%
Transportation	21	22
Health	15	13
Utilities	15	16
Education	12	11
State	10	9
Tobacco	4	3
Corporate	1	1
Housing	1	1

For Trust compliance purposes, the Trust s sector classifications refer to one or more of the sector sub-classifications used by one or more widely recognized market indexes or rating group indexes, and/or as defined by the investment adviser. These definitions may not apply for purposes of this report, which may combine such sector sub-classifications for reporting ease.

#### Call/Maturity Schedule<sup>3</sup>

Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2017	2%
2018	14
2019	31
2020	11
2021	14

Scheduled maturity dates and/or bonds that are subject to potential calls by issuers over the next five years.

\* Excludes short-term securities.

Credit Quality Allocation <sup>1</sup>	1/31/17	7/31/16
AAA/Aaa	10%	11%
AA/Aa	50	52
A	23	23

BBB/Baa	9	9
BB/Ba	2	1
В	1	1
N/R <sup>2</sup>	5	3

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For financial reporting purposes, credit quality ratings shown above reflect the highest rating assigned by either S&P or Moody s if ratings differ. These rating agencies are independent, nationally recognized statistical rating organizations and are widely used. Investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BBB/Baa or higher. Below investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BB/Ba or lower. Investments designated N/R are not rated by either rating agency. Unrated investments do not necessarily indicate low credit quality. Credit quality ratings are subject to change.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017 13

The investment adviser evaluates the credit quality of unrated investments based upon certain factors including, but not limited to, credit ratings for similar investments and financial analysis of sectors and individual investments. Using this approach, the investment adviser has deemed certain of these unrated securities as investment grade quality. As of January 31, 2017 and July 31, 2016, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment advisor to be investment grade each represents less than 1% of the Trust s total investments.

### Trust Summary as of January 31, 2017

#### **BlackRock New Jersey Municipal Income Trust**

#### **Trust Overview**

BlackRock New Jersey Municipal Income Trust s (BNJ) (the Trust) investment objective is to provide current income exempt from regular U.S. federal income tax and New Jersey gross income tax. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing primarily in municipal bonds exempt from U.S. federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax) and New Jersey gross income taxes. The Trust invests at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds that are investment grade quality, or are considered by the Trust s adviser to be of comparable quality, at the time of investment. The Trust may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives.

No assurance can be given that the Trust s investment objective will be achieved.

Trust Information	
Symbol on NYSE	BNJ
Initial Offering Date	July 27, 2001
	,
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2017 (\$14.77) <sup>1</sup>	5.65%
Tax Equivalent Yield <sup>2</sup>	10.97%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.0696
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.8352
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2017 <sup>4</sup>	40%

- Yield on closing market price is calculated by dividing the current annualized distribution per share by the closing market price. Past performance does not guarantee future results.
- <sup>2</sup> Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal federal and state tax rate of 48.48%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.
- 3 The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- Represents VMTP Shares and TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including any assets attributable to VMTP Shares and TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Trust, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

#### Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2017 were as follows:

	Returns Ba	ısed On
	Market Price	NAV
BNJ <sup>1,2</sup>	(9.58)%	(6.43)%
Lipper New Jersey Municipal Debt Funds <sup>3</sup>	(9.68)%	(6.06)%

All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions.

2

The Trust moved from a premium to NAV to a discount during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.

3 Average return.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The following discussion relates to the Trust s absolute performance based on NAV:

Municipal bonds lost ground in the six-month reporting period. After producing slightly positive returns in August, municipal bonds began to move lower in September and October due to a pick-up in new tax-exempt issuance and rising yields in the U.S. Treasury market. (Prices and yields move in opposite directions.) The weakness accelerated in November once Donald Trump s election victory caused investors to adjust their expectations in favor of stronger growth and tighter Fed policy. The municipal market subsequently stabilized and retraced some of its losses in December and January as the relative attractiveness of the asset class brought in new investors, but the modest rally was insufficient to make up for the earlier downturn.

New Jersey underperformed the broader U.S. municipal bond market. The state scredit rating remained under pressure due to continuing budgetary issues, lagging job growth versus the national averages, continued population out-migration and concerns about its pension-funding difficulties.

At the sector level, exposure to the state tax-backed, transportation and education sectors detracted from performance. Holdings in longer-duration bonds, which were more sensitive to rising yields, also detracted. (Duration is a measure of interest-rate sensitivity.) Credit spreads widened during the period, so the Trust sholdings in lower-rated investment-grade bonds were a further detractor.

Portfolio income, which was enhanced by the Trust suse of leverage, made a positive contribution during a period of falling prices. However, leverage also served to accentuate the price declines associated with rising yields.

At a time when lower-quality, longer-dated bonds experienced the largest underperformance, the Trust spositions in high-quality, short-dated issues performed relatively well and helped mitigate the impact of the market decline. The Trust sought to manage interest rate risk using U.S. Treasury futures. Given that Treasury yields rose as prices fell, this aspect of the Trust spositioning had a positive effect on returns. The views expressed reflect the opinions of BlackRock as of the date of this report and are subject to change based on changes in market, economic or other conditions. These views are not intended to be a forecast of future events and are no guarantee of future results.

14 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017

BlackRock New Jersey Municipal Income Trust

#### Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	1/31/17	7/31/16	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 14.77	\$ 16.79	(12.03)%	\$ 16.94	\$ 14.12
Net Asset Value	\$ 14.94	\$ 16.41	(8.96)%	\$ 16.44	\$ 14.76

### Market Price and Net Asset Value History For the Past Five Years

#### Overview of the Trust s Total Investments\*

Sector Allocation	1/31/17	7/31/16
Transportation	35%	33%
County/City/Special District/School District	22	23
Education	17	17
State	9	12
Health	8	5
Corporate	6	6
Housing	2	3
Utilities	1	1

For Trust compliance purposes, the Trust s sector classifications refer to one or more of the sector sub-classifications used by one or more widely recognized market indexes or rating group indexes, and/or as defined by the investment adviser. These definitions may not apply for purposes of this report, which may combine such sector sub-classifications for reporting ease.

#### Call/Maturity Schedule<sup>3</sup>

2017	4%
2018	11
2019	10
2020	6
2021	18

<sup>3</sup> Scheduled maturity dates and/or bonds that are subject to potential calls by issuers over the next five years.

\* Excludes short-term securities.

Credit Quality Allocation <sup>1</sup>	1/31/17	7/31/16
AAA/Aaa	1%	1%
AA/Aa	44	45
A	36	34
BBB/Baa	10	10
BB/Ba	8	9

N/R 1 1 2

<sup>1</sup> For financial reporting purposes, credit quality ratings shown above reflect the highest rating assigned by either S&P or Moody s if ratings differ. These rating agencies are independent, nationally recognized statistical rating organizations and are widely used. Investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BBB/Baa or higher. Below investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BB/Ba or lower. Investments designated N/R are not rated by either rating agency. Unrated investments do not necessarily indicate low credit quality. Credit quality ratings are subject to change.

<sup>2</sup> The investment advisor evaluates the credit quality of unrated investments based upon certain factors including, but not limited to, credit ratings for similar investments and financial analysis of sectors and individual investments. Using this approach, the investment adviser has deemed certain of these unrated securities as investment grade quality. As of July 31, 2016, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment adviser to be investment grade each represents 1% of the Trust s total investments.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017 15

# Trust Summary as of January 31, 2017

BlackRock New York Municipal Income Trust

#### **Trust Overview**

BlackRock New York Municipal Income Trust s (BNY) (the Trust) investment objective is to provide current income exempt from regular U.S. federal income tax and New York State and New York City personal income taxes. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing primarily in municipal bonds exempt from U.S. federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax) and New York State and New York City personal income taxes. The Trust invests at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds that are investment grade quality, or are considered by the Trust s adviser to be of comparable quality, at the time of investment. The Trust may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives.

No assurance can be given that the Trust s investment objective will be achieved.

Trust Information	
Symbol on NYSE	BNY
Initial Offering Date	July 27, 2001
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2017 (\$14.26) <sup>1</sup>	5.05%
Tax Equivalent Yield <sup>2</sup>	10.22%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.06
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.72
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2017 <sup>4</sup>	40%

- Yield on closing market price is calculated by dividing the current annualized distribution per share by the closing market price. Past performance does not guarantee future results.
- <sup>2</sup> Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal federal and state tax rate of 50.59%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.
- <sup>3</sup> The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- Represents VMTP Shares and TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including any assets attributable to VMTP Shares and TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Trust, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

#### Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2017 were as follows:

	Returns Bas	sed On
	Market Price	NAV
BNY <sup>1,2</sup>	(12.56)%	(5.96)%
Lipper New York Municipal Debt Funds <sup>3</sup>	(9.25)%	(5.24)%

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions.

- <sup>2</sup> The Trust moved from a premium to NAV to a discount during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.
- 3 Average return.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The following discussion relates to the Trust s absolute performance based on NAV:

Municipal bonds lost ground in the six-month reporting period. After producing slightly positive returns in August, municipal bonds began to move lower in September and October due to a pick-up in new tax-exempt issuance and rising yields in the U.S. Treasury market. (Prices and yields move in opposite directions.) The weakness accelerated in November once Donald Trump s election victory caused investors to adjust their expectations in favor of stronger growth and tighter Fed policy. The municipal market subsequently stabilized and retraced some of its losses in December and January as the relative attractiveness of the asset class brought in new investors, but the modest rally was insufficient to make up for the earlier downturn. The New York municipal market faced the added challenge of elevated new-issue supply in late 2016.

At the sector level, exposure to the transportation, local general obligation and education sectors detracted from performance. Holdings in longer-duration bonds, which were more sensitive to rising yields, also detracted. (Duration is a measure of interest-rate sensitivity.) Credit spreads widened during the period, so the Trust sholdings in lower-rated investment-grade bonds were a further detractor.

Portfolio income, which was enhanced by the Trust suse of leverage, made a positive contribution during a period of falling prices. However, leverage also served to accentuate the price declines associated with rising yields.

At a time when lower-quality, longer-dated bonds experienced the largest underperformance, the Trust spositions in high-quality, short-dated issues performed relatively well and helped mitigate the impact of the market decline. The Trust sought to manage interest rate risk using U.S. Treasury futures. Given that Treasury yields rose as prices fell, this aspect of the Trust spositioning had a positive effect on returns. The views expressed reflect the opinions of BlackRock as of the date of this report and are subject to change based on changes in market, economic or other conditions. These views are not intended to be a forecast of future events and are no guarantee of future results.

16 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017

BlackRock New York Municipal Income Trust

#### Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	1/31/17	7/31/16	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 14.26	\$ 16.71	(14.66)%	\$ 16.84	\$ 13.49
Net Asset Value	\$ 14.63	\$ 15.94	(8.22)%	\$ 15.95	\$ 14.35

Market Price and Net Asset Value History For the Past Five Years

#### Overview of the Trust s Total Investments\*

Sector Allocation	1/31/17	7/31/16
County/City/Special District/School District	24%	23%
Transportation	20	20
Education	19	20
Utilities	13	12
Health	10	9
State	8	8
Corporate	2	5
Housing	2	2
Tobacco	2	1

For Trust compliance purposes, the Trust s sector classifications refer to one or more of the sector sub-classifications used by one or more widely recognized market indexes or rating group indexes, and/or as defined by the investment adviser. These definitions may not apply for purposes of this report, which may combine such sector sub-classifications for reporting ease.

#### Call/Maturity Schedule<sup>3</sup>

Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2017	11%
2018	5
2019	4
2020	6
2021	21

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Scheduled maturity dates and/or bonds that are subject to potential calls by issuers over the next five years.

<sup>\*</sup> Excludes short-term securities.

Credit Quality Allocation <sup>1</sup>	1/31/17	7/31/16	
AAA/Aaa	19%	15%	
AA/Aa	41	43	

A	24	24
BBB/Baa	8	7
BB/Ba	2	3
В	1	
$N/R^2$	5	8

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For financial reporting purposes, credit quality ratings shown above reflect the highest rating assigned by either S&P or Moody s if ratings differ. These rating agencies are independent, nationally recognized statistical rating organizations and are widely used. Investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BBB/Baa or higher. Below investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BB/Ba or lower. Investments designated N/R are not rated by either rating agency. Unrated investments do not necessarily indicate low credit quality. Credit quality ratings are subject to change.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017 17

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The investment advisor evaluates the credit quality of unrated investments based upon certain factors including, but not limited to, credit ratings for similar investments and financial analysis of sectors and individual investments. Using this approach, the investment adviser has deemed certain of these unrated securities as investment grade quality. As of January 31, 2017 and July 31, 2016, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment adviser to be investment grade represents 1% and 3%, respectively, of the Trust s total investments.

# Schedule of Investments January 31, 2017 (Unaudited)

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

(Percentages shown are based on Net Assets)

	Par		
Municipal Bonds	(000)	Value	
California 91.5%	, í		
County/City/Special District/School District 23.6%			
Butte-Glenn Community College District, GO, Election of 2002, Series C, 5.50%, 8/01/30	\$ 8,425	\$ 9,207,176	
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37	2,000	2,072,040	)
City of San Jose California Hotel Tax, RB, Convention Center Expansion & Renovation Project:	500	571,765	•
6.13%, 5/01/31 6.50%, 5/01/36	1,210	1,404,483	
6.50%, 5/01/42	2,225	2,577,774	
County of Kern California, COP, Capital Improvements Projects, Series A (AGC), 6.00%, 2/01/19	2,220	2,077,77	
(a)	2,000	2,192,120	)
County of Orange California Water District, COP, Refunding, 5.25%, 8/15/19 (a)	2,000	2,201,680	)
County of Riverside California Public Financing Authority, RB, Capital Facilities Project, 5.25%, 11/01/45	8,990	10,253,724	1
County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A:			
6.00%, 3/01/36	2,880	3,332,592	2
5.50%, 3/01/41	5,270	5,993,097	
County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Series L, 5.25%, 5/15/18			
(a)	20,000	21,106,800	)
Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%, 8/01/33	2,500	2,709,675	
Evergreen School District, GO, Election of 2014, 4.00%, 8/01/41	5,365	5,457,922	
Foothill-De Anza Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/40	4,000	4,157,160	
Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 7/01/40	8,500	8,664,220	
Modesto Irrigation District, COP, Capital Improvements, Series A, 5.75%, 10/01/29 Oak Grove School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 8/01/33	3,035 1,315	3,284,174 1,439,346	
Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 5.75%, 9/01/19 (a)	2,000	2,230,060	
San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A,	2,000	2,230,000	,
5.00%, 6/01/32	3,375	3,815,606	ó
San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 8/01/41	3,060	3,497,274	1
Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 8/01/19 (a)	4,000	4,470,800	)
Turlock Irrigation District, Refunding RB, 1st Priority, 5.00%, 1/01/33	500	575,945	5
Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/21 (a)	3,445	4,004,537	7
	Par		
Municipal Bonds	(000)	Value	
California (continued)			
County/City/Special District/School District (continued)			
West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:			
Election of 2010 (AGM), 5.25%, 8/01/32	\$ 4,960	\$ 5,595,17	
Election of 2012, 5.50%, 8/01/39	2,500	2,906,67	/5
		113,721,82	23
Education 5.2% California Educational Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, San Francisco University, 6.13%,			
10/01/36	6,280	7,349,79	
California Municipal Finance Authority, RB, Emerson College, 5.75%, 1/01/33	2,500	2,797,47	/5
California State University, Refunding RB, Systemwide, Series A: 5.00%, 11/01/33	4,640	5,404,90	М
5.00%, 11/01/41	3,225	3,694,78	
University of California, Refunding RB, Series AR, 5.00%, 5/15/41	5,000	5,731,00	
	2,000		
IIlab. 11 461		24,977,96	03
Health 11.4%  ARAG Finance Authority for Nonprofit Corns Defunding PR Sharp Healthcare Series R			
ABAG Finance Authority for Nonprofit Corps., Refunding RB, Sharp Healthcare, Series B, 6.25%, 8/01/39	4,975	5,521,60	13
California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB:	+,273	3,321,00	JJ
Adventist Health System West, Series A, 5.75%, 9/01/19 (a)	6,710	7,465,47	79
Children s Hospital, Series A, 5.25%, 11/01/41	8,500	9,391,90	
•			

Sutter Health, Series B, 6.00%, 8/15/42	6,015	6,850,724	
California Health Facilities Financing Authority, Refunding RB, Series A (a):			
Catholic Healthcare West, 6.00%, 7/01/19	5,550	6,167,104	
Dignity Health, 6.00%, 7/01/19	4,520	5,022,579	
California Statewide Communities Development Authority, Refunding RB:			
Catholic Healthcare West, Series B, 5.50%, 7/01/17 (a)	2,880	2,936,160	
Catholic Healthcare West, Series E, 5.50%, 7/01/17 (a)	5,065	5,163,768	
Trinity Health Credit Group Composite Issue, 5.00%, 12/01/41	4,000	4,437,080	
Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 8/01/38	1,625	1,859,650	
		54,816,052	
State 9.3%			
Orange County Community Facilities District, Special Tax Bonds, Village of Esencia, Series A,			
5.25%, 8/15/45	2,500	2,681,125	
State of California, GO, Various Purposes, 6.00%, 4/01/38	14,000	15,358,420	

#### Portfolio Abbreviations

ACA	American Capital Access Holding	COP	Certificates of Participation	ISD	Independent School District
AGC	Ltd. Assured Guarantee Corp.	EDA	Economic Development Authority	LRB	Lease Revenue Bonds
AGM	Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp.	EDC	Economic Development Corp.	M/F	Multi-Family
AMBAC	American Municipal Bond	ERB	Education Revenue Bonds	MRB	Mortgage Revenue Bonds
	Assurance Corp.	****		NTT C C	
AMT	Alternative Minimum Tax (subject to)	FHA	Federal Housing Administration	NPFGC	National Public Finance Guarantee Corp.
ARB	Airport Revenue Bonds	GARB	General Airport Revenue Bonds	PILOT	Payment in Lieu of Taxes
BAM	Build America Mutual Assurance Co.	GO	General Obligation Bonds	PSF-GTD	Permanent School Fund Guaranteed
BARB	Building Aid Revenue Bonds	HFA	Housing Finance Agency	RB	Revenue Bonds
ВНАС	Berkshire Hathaway Assurance Corp.	IDA	Industrial Development Authority	S/F	Single-Family
CAB	Capital Appreciation Bonds	IDB	Industrial Development Board	SONYMA	State of New York Mortgage Agency
CIFG	CDC IXIS Financial Guaranty				

See Notes to Financial Statements.

18 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

Municipal Bonds		Par		
California (continued)   State of California Public Works Bourd, LRB:		(0.00)		
State (Cultifornia Public Works Board, LRB:		(000)	Value	
State of California Public Works Board, LRB:				
Department of Education, Riverside Campus Project, Series B, 5.59%, 40/1/34   49/40   5.252.149				
Various Capital Projects, Scries 1, 5.50%, 1100/19 (a) 5.025 5.759.706		\$ 9,000	\$ 9,956,700	
Various Capital Projects, Sub-Series I-1, 6.38%, 11001/19 (a)	· ·			
State of California Public Works Board, RB, Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation, Series F, 25%, 90/133   44,625,608				
1,000   1,00		3,023	3,723,700	
Tobacco   5.7%   Colden State Tobacco Securitization Corp., Refunding RB, Asset-Backed, Senior, Series A-1, 5.75%, 601447   28.035   27.542,705	•	4.335	5.074.508	
Tobacco   5.7%   Golden State Tobacco Securitization Corp., Refunding RB, Asset-Backed, Senior, Series A-1,   28,035   27,542,705   7.542,705   7.578, 601147   7.5788, 601147   7.		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	2,0.1.,0.0	
Tobacco   5.7%   Golden State Tobacco Securitization Corp., Refunding RB, Asset-Backed, Senior, Series A-1,   28,035   27,542,705   7.542,705   7.578, 601147   7.5788, 601147   7.			44 625 608	
Golden State Tobacco Securitization Corp., Refunding RB, Asset-Backed, Senior, Series A.1, 575%, 60/147   28,035   27,542,705   275%, 60/147   28,035   27,542,705   27,542,	Tobacca 57%		44,023,008	
5.75%, 6.01/47 Transportation 16.6% City & County of San Francisco California Airports Commission, ARB, Series E, 6.00%, 501/39				
Transportation   16.6%		28 035	27 542 705	
City & County of San Francisco California Airports Commission, ARB, Series E, 6,00%, 501/39   6,750   7,342,258		20,033	27,512,700	
City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, RRB, Series A, AMT, 5,00%, 5/15/42   8,980   9,882,759	•	6.750	7,424,258	
City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles				
International Airport, Senior Series A:		2,7 2 2	,,,,,,,	
5.00%, 5/15/34 5.00%, 5/15/34 5.00%, 5/15/40 5.247,281 City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT: 5.75%, 3/01/34 2.650 3.042,889 5.25%, 3/01/34 2.650 3.042,889 5.200,000, yof Orange California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/34 2.650 5.000,000, yof Sacramento California, ARB, Series R, 5.75%, 7/01/34 2.650 5.000,000, yof Sacramento California, ARB, Series R, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2.500 5.13,939,625 County of Sacramento California, ARB, Series R, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2.500 5.000, yof Sacramento California, ARB, Series R, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2.500 5.000, yof Sacramento California, ARB, Series R, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2.500 5.000, yof Sacramento California, ARB; FC/Grant, Sub-Series D, 6.00%, 7/01/35 3.000 3.186,540 5.000, yof Sacramento California, ARB; FC/Grant, Sub-Series D, 6.00%, 7/01/35 5.000, yof Sacramento California, ARB; FC/Grant, Sub-Series D, 6.00%, 7/01/35 5.000, yof Sacramento California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 8.000 8.185,000 8.18				
5.00%, \$15  5.00%, \$15\text{  5.00\%, \$15\text{  5.00\%, \$15\text{  5.00\%, \$15\text{  5.00\%, \$15	•	6,650	7,187,852	
5.75%, 3001/34 2.650 3.042.889 County of Orange California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/34 2.650 3.042.889 County of Sacramento California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/34 County of Sacramento California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/34 County of Sacramento California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/35 County of Sacramento California, ARB:  PFC/Grant, Sub-Series D, 6.00%, 7/01/35 3.000 3.186,540 Senior Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/39 1.850 1.956,967 Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 8/01/44 San Francisco City & County Airport Commission, San Francisco International Airport, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 5/01/46  Utilities 19.7% Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 1/001/36 City of Chula Vista California, Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series D, 5.88%, 1/01/34 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Power System:  Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46 Sub-Series A, 1, 5.25%, 7/01/38 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/36 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/30 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/30 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/30 Cuemnoga Valley Water District, Ref		4,760	5,247,281	
6.25%, 3/01/34 County of Orange California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/34 County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 12,500 13,939,625 County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 12,500 13,939,625 County of Sacramento California, ARB:  PEC/Crant, Sub-Series D, 6.00%, 7/01/35 Senior Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/39 Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 8/01/44 San Francisco City & County Airport Commission, San Francisco International Airport, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 5/01/46  Utilities 19.7% Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 1/001/36 City of Los Angeles California Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series D, 5.88%, 1/01/34 City of Chula Vista California, Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series D, 5.88%, 1/01/34 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Power System:  Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46 1,000 1,136,990 Sub-Series A-1, 5.25%, 7/01/38 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31  Municipal Bonds (000) Value  Municipal Bonds (000) Value  Lillities (continued) Utilities (Continued) Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 6,00%, 6/01/30 Ea, 24,25 San 2,794,328 Eas Bay California Department of Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A, 6,635,045 El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Ag	City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT:			
County of Orange California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/34   8,000	5.75%, 3/01/34	3,820	4,312,513	
County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41   12,500   13,939,625	6.25%, 3/01/34	2,650	3,042,889	
Country of Sacramento California, ARB:		8,000		
PFC/Grant, Sub-Series D, 6.00%, 7/01/35   3,000   3,186,540   1,956,967	•	12,500	13,939,625	
Senior Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/39   1,850   1,956,967	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 8/01/44				
8/01/44 San Francisco City & County Airport Commission, San Francisco International Airport, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 5/01/46  10,000 10,960,700  10,96		1,850	1,956,967	
San Francisco City & County Airport Commission, San Francisco International Airport, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 5/01/46  79,821,094  Utilities 19.7%  Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/36  City of Chula Vista California, Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series D, 5.88%, 1/01/34  City of Chula Vista California Department of Water & Power, RB, Power System:  Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46  Sub-Series A-1, 5.25%, 7/01/38  City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39  Sub-Series A-1, 5.25%, 7/01/38  City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39  City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39  City of Los Angeles California Wastewater Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39  City of Pouluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39  City of Pouluma California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.00%  City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.000  Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31  Municipal Bonds  (000) Value  Municipal Bonds  (000) Value  Municipal Bonds  (000) Value  California (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36  Sat Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36  Sat Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		4.504.550	
RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 5/01/46  10,000  10,960,700  79,821,094  Utilities 19.7%  Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/36  City of Chula Vista California, Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series D, 5.88%, 1/01/34  City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Power System:  Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46  Sub-Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46  City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Power System:  Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/48  1,000  1,136,990  Sub-Series A, 1, 5.25%, 7/01/38  2,000  2,149,620  City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39  4,000  4,519,560  City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39  2,000  2,149,620  City of Petaluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 5/01/36  5,625  6,502,444  City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.000  1,101/37  Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31  4,320  4,948,171  Par  Municipal Bonds  (000) Value  California (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramono Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36  5,745  6,353,625  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39  10,000  11,337,200		4,135	4,526,750	
Utilities 19.7%  Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/36 7,690 8,646,251 City of Chula Vista California, Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series D, 5.88%, 1/01/34 6,555 7,160,158 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Power System:  Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46 1,000 1,136,990 Sub-Series A-1, 5.25%, 7/01/38 9,000 9,511,110 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39 4,000 4,519,560 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 2,000 2,149,620 City of Petaluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 2,000 2,149,620 City of Petaluma California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.00%, 11/01/37 5,000 5,636,400 Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31 4,320 4,948,171 Par  Municipal Bonds (000) Value  California (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5,00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625 El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5,25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200		10,000	10.060.700	
Utilities 19.7% Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/36 7,690 8,646,251 City of Chula Vista California, Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series D, 5.88%, 1/01/34 6,555 7,160,158 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Power System: Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46 1,000 1,136,990 Sub-Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/38 9,000 9,511,110 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39 4,000 4,519,560 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 2,000 2,149,620 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 2,000 2,149,620 City of Petaluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 5/01/36 5,625 6,502,444 City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.000 5,636,400 Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31 4,320 4,948,171 Par  Municipal Bonds (000) Value  Municipal Bonds (000) Value  Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Tuilities (continued) Tuiliti	KD, Series A, Aivi1, 3.00%, 3/01/40	10,000	10,960,700	
Utilities 19.7% Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/36 7,690 8,646,251 City of Chula Vista California, Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series D, 5.88%, 1/01/34 6,555 7,160,158 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Power System: Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46 1,000 1,136,990 Sub-Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/38 9,000 9,511,110 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39 4,000 4,519,560 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 2,000 2,149,620 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 2,000 2,149,620 City of Petaluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 5/01/36 5,625 6,502,444 City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.000 5,636,400 Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31 4,320 4,948,171 Par  Municipal Bonds (000) Value  Municipal Bonds (000) Value  Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Tuilities (continued) Tuiliti				
Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5,38%, 10/01/36 7,690 8,646,251  City of Chula Vista California, Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series D, 5.88%, 1/01/34 6,555 7,160,158  City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Power System:  Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46 1,000 1,136,990  Sub-Series A-1, 5.25%, 7/01/38 9,000 9,511,110  City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39 4,000 4,519,560  City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 2,000 2,149,620  City of Los Angeles California Wastewater, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 2,000 2,149,620  City of Petaluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 5/01/36 5,625 6,502,444  City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.000 5,636,400  Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31 4,320 4,948,171  Par  Municipal Bonds (000) Value  Municipal Bonds (000) Value  California (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41 \$2,425 \$2,794,328  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625  EI Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200	Y10111 40 Mg		79,821,094	
5.38%, 10/01/36 City of Chula Vista California, Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series D, 5.88%, 1/01/34 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Power System:  Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46 1,000 1,136,990 Sub-Series A-1, 5.25%, 7/01/38 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 City of Petaluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.000 5,000, 11/01/37 Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31 A,320 4,948,171 Par  Municipal Bonds (000) Value  California (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200				
City of Chula Vista California, Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series D, 5.88%, 1/01/34 6,555 7,160,158 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Power System:  Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46 1,000 1,136,990 Sub-Series A-1, 5.25%, 7/01/38 9,000 9,511,110 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39 4,000 4,519,560 City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39 2,000 2,149,620 City of Petaluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 5/01/36 5,625 6,502,444 City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.00%, 11/01/37 5,000 5,636,400 Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31 4,320 4,948,171 Par  Municipal Bonds (000) Value  California (continued) Utilities (continued) Utilities (continued) Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41 \$ 2,425 \$ 2,794,328 East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625 EI Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7.600	0.646.251	
City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Power System:  Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46  Sub-Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/38  City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39  City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39  City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39  City of Petaluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 5/01/36  City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.00%, 11/01/37  Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31  Municipal Bonds  Culifornia (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39  10,000  11,337,200				
Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46		0,333	7,100,138	
Sub-Series A-1, 5.25%, 7/01/38  City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39  4,000  4,519,560  City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39  2,000  2,149,620  City of Petaluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 5/01/36  5,625  6,502,444  City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.00%, 11/01/37  Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31  Municipal Bonds  (000)  Value  California (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39  10,000  11,337,200		1.000	1 136 990	
City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 7/01/39				
7/01/39		2,000	7,311,110	
City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/39  City of Petaluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 5/01/36  City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.00%, 11/01/37  Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31  Municipal Bonds  California (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39  10,000  11,337,200		4.000	4.519.560	
City of Petaluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 5/01/36  City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.00%, 11/01/37  Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31  Municipal Bonds  (000)  Value  California (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39  City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36  5,000  5,636,400  4,948,171  Par  Value  California (continued)  5,425  \$ 2,794,328  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.745  6,353,625  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39  10,000  11,337,200				
City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB, Sub-Series A, 5.00%, 11/01/37 5,000 5,636,400 Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31 4,320 4,948,171  Par  Municipal Bonds (000) Value  California (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41 \$ 2,425 \$ 2,794,328  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200		· ·		
Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31  Municipal Bonds  (000)  Value  California (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39  10,000  11,337,200	·	,	, ,	
Municipal Bonds (000) Value  California (continued)  Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41 \$ 2,425 \$ 2,794,328  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200	5.00%, 11/01/37	5,000	5,636,400	
Municipal Bonds California (continued) Utilities (continued) Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41 \$ 2,425 \$ 2,794,328 East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625 El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200	Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 9/01/31	4,320	4,948,171	
California (continued) Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41 \$ 2,425 \$ 2,794,328  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200		Par		
California (continued) Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41 \$ 2,425 \$ 2,794,328  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200				
California (continued) Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41 \$ 2,425 \$ 2,794,328  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200	Municipal Bonds	(000)	Value	
Utilities (continued)  Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41 \$ 2,425 \$ 2,794,328  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200		()		
Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 8/01/41 \$ 2,425 \$ 2,794,328  East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625  El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
East Bay California Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625 El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200		\$ 2,425	\$ 2,794,328	
5.00%, 6/01/36 5,745 6,353,625 El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200				
5.25%, 3/01/39 10,000 11,337,200		5,745	6,353,625	
	El Dorado Irrigation District / El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM),			
Los Angeles Department of Water, Refunding RB, Series B, 5.00%, 7/01/38 2,000 2,295,680	•			
	Los Angeles Department of Water, Refunding RB, Series B, 5.00%, 7/01/38	2,000	2,295,680	

Los Angeles Department of Water & Power, RB, Series B:			
5.00%, 7/01/37	1,000	1,145,330	
5.00%, 7/01/38	5,010	5,729,686	
5.00%, 7/01/45	1,000	1,137,820	
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/32	2,500	2,942,075	
San Diego Public Facilities Financing Authority Sewer, Refunding RB, Senior Series A,			
5.25%, 5/15/19 (a)	10,000	10,932,000	
		94,878,448	
Total Municipal Bonds in California		440,383,693	
Total Municipal Bonds in Camorina		440,363,073	
Multi-State 0.5%			
Housing 0.5%			
Centerline Equity Issuer Trust (b)(c):			
Series A-4-2, 6.00%, 5/15/19	1,000	1,084,050	
Series B-3-2, 6.30%, 5/15/19	1,000	1,090,620	
Total Municipal Bonds in Multi-State	1,000	2,174,670	
Total Municipal Bonds 92.0%		442,558,363	
Total Municipal Bonus 72.0 %		442,336,363	
Municipal Bonds Transferred to			
Municipal Bonds Transferred to Tender Ontion Rond Trusts (d)			
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d)			
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79,2%			
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8%	11 620	12 909 704	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41	11,620 3,400	12,909,704 3 522 468	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37	11,620 3,400	12,909,704 3,522,468	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37 Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2008, Series A (a):	3,400	3,522,468	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37 Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2008, Series A (a): Election of 2001 (AGM), 5.00%, 8/01/17	3,400 8,000	3,522,468 8,170,240	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37 Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2008, Series A (a): Election of 2001 (AGM), 5.00%, 8/01/17 Series C, 5.25%, 8/01/20 (e)	3,400 8,000 12,902	3,522,468 8,170,240 14,615,655	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37 Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2008, Series A (a): Election of 2001 (AGM), 5.00%, 8/01/17 Series C, 5.25%, 8/01/20 (e) Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Refunding, , 6.00%, 8/01/19 (a)	3,400 8,000 12,902 20,131	3,522,468 8,170,240 14,615,655 22,511,102	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37 Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2008, Series A (a): Election of 2001 (AGM), 5.00%, 8/01/17 Series C, 5.25%, 8/01/20 (e) Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Refunding, , 6.00%, 8/01/19 (a) Los Angeles Unified School District California, GO, Series I, 5.00%, 1/01/34	3,400 8,000 12,902 20,131 5,000	3,522,468 8,170,240 14,615,655 22,511,102 5,408,850	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37 Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2008, Series A (a): Election of 2001 (AGM), 5.00%, 8/01/17 Series C, 5.25%, 8/01/20 (e) Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Refunding, , 6.00%, 8/01/19 (a) Los Angeles Unified School District California, GO, Series I, 5.00%, 1/01/34 Palomar California Community College District, GO, Election of 2006, Series C, 5.00%, 8/01/44	8,000 12,902 20,131 5,000 15,140	3,522,468 8,170,240 14,615,655 22,511,102 5,408,850 17,034,165	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37 Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2008, Series A (a): Election of 2001 (AGM), 5.00%, 8/01/17 Series C, 5.25%, 8/01/20 (e) Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Refunding, , 6.00%, 8/01/19 (a) Los Angeles Unified School District California, GO, Series I, 5.00%, 1/01/34 Palomar California Community College District, GO, Election of 2006, Series C, 5.00%, 8/01/19 (a)	3,400 8,000 12,902 20,131 5,000	3,522,468 8,170,240 14,615,655 22,511,102 5,408,850	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37 Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2008, Series A (a): Election of 2001 (AGM), 5.00%, 8/01/17 Series C, 5.25%, 8/01/20 (e) Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Refunding, , 6.00%, 8/01/19 (a) Los Angeles Unified School District California, GO, Series I, 5.00%, 1/01/34 Palomar California Community College District, GO, Election of 2006, Series C, 5.00%, 8/01/19 (a) San Joaquin California Delta Community College District, GO, Election of 2004, Series C,	3,400 8,000 12,902 20,131 5,000 15,140 10,484	3,522,468 8,170,240 14,615,655 22,511,102 5,408,850 17,034,165 11,527,956	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37 Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2008, Series A (a): Election of 2001 (AGM), 5.00%, 8/01/17 Series C, 5.25%, 8/01/20 (e) Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Refunding, , 6.00%, 8/01/19 (a) Los Angeles Unified School District California, GO, Series I, 5.00%, 1/01/34 Palomar California Community College District, GO, Election of 2006, Series C, 5.00%, 8/01/19 (a) San Joaquin California Delta Community College District, GO, Election of 2004, Series C, 5.00%, 8/01/39	8,000 12,902 20,131 5,000 15,140	3,522,468 8,170,240 14,615,655 22,511,102 5,408,850 17,034,165	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37 Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2008, Series A (a): Election of 2001 (AGM), 5.00%, 8/01/17 Series C, 5.25%, 8/01/20 (e) Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Refunding, , 6.00%, 8/01/19 (a) Los Angeles Unified School District California, GO, Series I, 5.00%, 1/01/34 Palomar California Community College District, GO, Election of 2006, Series C, 5.00%, 8/01/44 San Diego Community College District California, GO, Election of 2002, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a) San Joaquin California Delta Community College District, GO, Election of 2004, Series C, 5.00%, 8/01/39 San Jose Unified School District Santa Clara County California, GO:	3,400 8,000 12,902 20,131 5,000 15,140 10,484 14,505	3,522,468 8,170,240 14,615,655 22,511,102 5,408,850 17,034,165 11,527,956 16,223,341	
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d) California 79.2% County/City/Special District/School District 27.8% California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 11/15/41 Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/37 Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2008, Series A (a): Election of 2001 (AGM), 5.00%, 8/01/17 Series C, 5.25%, 8/01/20 (e) Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Refunding, , 6.00%, 8/01/19 (a) Los Angeles Unified School District California, GO, Series I, 5.00%, 1/01/34 Palomar California Community College District, GO, Election of 2006, Series C, 5.00%, 8/01/19 (a) San Joaquin California Delta Community College District, GO, Election of 2004, Series C, 5.00%, 8/01/39	3,400 8,000 12,902 20,131 5,000 15,140 10,484	3,522,468 8,170,240 14,615,655 22,511,102 5,408,850 17,034,165 11,527,956	

133,651,975

See Notes to Financial Statements.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017 19

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

		Par			
Municipal Bonds Transferred to					
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d)		(000)		Value	
California (continued)					
Education 17.4%  Consequent Union High School District CO. Floation of 2004, 5,00%, 8/01/18 (c)	¢	12.005	¢	12 001 070	
Grossmont Union High School District, GO, Election of 2004, 5.00%, 8/01/18 (a) University of California, RB:	\$	13,095	\$	13,881,978	
Series AM, 5.25%, 5/15/44		5,000		5,784,550	
Series O, 5.75%, 5/15/19 (a)		12,303		13,574,104	
University of California, Refunding RB:					
5.00%, 5/15/38		4,250		4,882,442	
Series A, 5.00%, 11/01/43		11,792		13,409,351	
Series AI, 5.00%, 5/15/38		14,225		16,052,415	
Series I, 5.00%, 5/15/40		14,065		15,938,559	
				83,523,399	
Health 8.8%				00,020,077	
California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%, 8/15/52		9,695		10,444,034	
California Statewide Communities Development Authority, RB, Kaiser Permanente, Series A,		7,073		10,777,037	
5.00%, 4/01/42		18,960		20,610,278	
Regents of the University of California Medical Center Pooled Revenue, Refunding RB, Series L,		10,700		20,010,270	
5.00%, 5/15/47		10,290		11,564,314	
3.00%, 3/13/4/		10,290		11,304,314	
				42,618,626	
State 6.7%					
State of California, GO, Refunding, Various Purposes:					
4.00%, 9/01/34		13,790		14,290,163	
5.00%, 9/01/35		10,115		11,589,240	
State of California, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 9/01/37		6,090		6,265,879	
				32,145,282	
Transportation 5.6%				52,1 15,262	
City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Series D, AMT, 5.00%, 5/15/41		18,632		20,655,081	
County of San Diego Regional Transportation Commission, Refunding RB, Series A,		,		_0,000,000	
5.00%, 4/01/48		5,740		6,569,717	
		-,		-,,	
				27 22 4 700	
		D.		27,224,798	
		Par			
Municipal Bonds Transferred to					
Tender Option Bond Trusts (d)		(000)		Value	
California (continued)					
Utilities 12.9%					
County of Orange California Water District, COP, Refunding, 5.00%, 8/15/19 (a)	\$	10,480	\$	11,471,408	
County of San Diego California Water Authority Financing Corp., COP, Refunding, Series A					
(AGM) (a):					
5.00%, 5/01/18		1,670		1,754,535	
5.00%, 5/01/18		8,370		8,793,689	
Eastern Municipal Water District, COP, Series H, 5.00%, 7/01/18 (a)		18,002		19,012,437	
Los Angeles Department of Water, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/46		6,412		7,317,220	
San Diego Public Facilities Financing Authority Sewer, Refunding RB, Senior Series A,					
5.25%, 5/15/19 (a)		12,460		13,621,272	
				61,970,561	
Total Municipal Bonds Transferred to				01,770,301	
Tender Option Bond Trusts 79.2%				381,134,641	
Total Long-Term Investments				201,127,071	
(Cost \$788,260,370) 171.2%				823,693,004	
(COSE #1009#009010) 1111# /U				523,073,00 <del>1</del>	

Short-Term Securities Shares

BlackRock Liquidity Funds, MuniCash, Institutional Class, 0.50% (f)(g)	563,095	563,151
Total Short-Term Securities		
(Cost \$563,151) 0.1%		563,151
Total Investments (Cost \$788,823,521) 171.3%		824,256,155
Other Assets Less Liabilities 1.4%		7,050,567
Liability for TOB Trust Certificates, Including Interest Expense and Fees Payable (37.1)%		(178,894,257)
VMTP Shares, at Liquidation Value (35.6)%		(171,300,000)
Net Assets Applicable to Common Shares 100.0%		\$ 481,112,465

#### Notes to Schedule of Investments

- (a) U.S. Government securities, held in escrow, are used to pay interest on this security, as well as to retire the bond in full at the date indicated, typically at a premium to par.
- (b) Security exempt from registration pursuant to Rule 144A under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended. These securities may be resold in transactions exempt from registration to qualified institutional investors.
- (c) Represents a beneficial interest in a trust. The collateral deposited into the trust is federally tax-exempt revenue bonds issued by various state or local governments, or their respective agencies or authorities. The security is subject to remarketing prior to its stated maturity.
- (d) Represent bonds transferred to a TOB Trust in exchange of cash and residual certificates received by the Trust. These bonds serve as collateral in a secured borrowing. See Note 4 of the Notes to Financial Statements for details.
- (e) All or a portion of security is subject to a recourse agreement. The aggregate maximum potential amount the Trust could ultimately be required to pay under the agreement, which expires on August 1, 2018, is \$6,798,086. See Note 4 of the Notes to Financial Statements for details.
- (f) During the six months ended January 31, 2017, investments in issuers considered to be an affiliate of the Trust for purposes of Section 2(a)(3) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, were as follows:

							Change
							in
	Shares Held		Shares Held	Value at			Unrealized
	at July 31,	Net	at January 31,	January 31,		Net Realized	Appreciation
Affiliate	2016	Activity	2017	2017	Income	Gain <sup>1</sup>	(Depreciation)
BlackRock Liquidity Funds, MuniCash,							
Institutional Class	3,771,908	(3,208,813)	563,095	\$ 563,151	\$ 3,326	\$ 2,739	

Includes net capital gain distributions.

(g) Current yield as of period end.

See Notes to Financial Statements.

20 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

For Trust compliance purposes, the Trust s sector classifications refer to one or more of the sector sub-classifications used by one or more widely recognized market indexes or rating group indexes, and/or as defined by the investment adviser. These definitions may not apply for purposes of this report, which may combine such sector sub-classifications for reporting ease.

#### Derivative Financial Instruments Outstanding as of Period End

#### **Futures Contracts**

Contracts		Notional	Unrealized
Short	Issue	<b>Expiration</b> Value	Depreciation
(64)	5-Year U.S. Treasury Note	March 2017 \$ 7,543,500	\$ (19,960)
(193)	10-Year U.S. Treasury Note	March 2017 \$ 24,022,469	(87,176)
(124)	Long U.S. Treasury Bond	March 2017 \$ 18,704,625	(39,579)
(21)	Ultra U.S. Treasury Bond	March 2017 \$ 3,374,438	(7,052)
Total	·		\$ (153,767)

#### Derivative Financial Instruments Categorized by Risk Exposure

As of period end, the fair values of derivative financial instruments located in the Statements of Assets and Liabilities were as follows:

					Foreign				
					Currency	Interest			
		Commodity	Credit	Equity	Exchange	Rate	Other		
Liabilities	<b>Derivative Financial Instruments</b>	Contracts	Contracts	Contracts	Contracts	Contracts	Contracts	Total	
Futures con	tracts Net unrealized depreciation	$n^1$				\$ 153,767		\$ 153,767	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Includes cumulative (depreciation) on futures contracts, if any, as reported in the Schedule of Investments. Only current day s variation margin is reported within the Statements of Assets and Liabilities.

For the six months ended January 31, 2017, the effect of derivative financial instruments in the Statements of Operations was as follows:

	Commodity		Equity	Foreign Currency Exchange	Interest Rate	Other	
Net Realized Gain (Loss) From:	Contracts	Contracts	Contracts	Contracts	Contracts	Contracts	Total
Futures contracts					\$ 2,105,216		\$ 2,105,216
<b>Net Change in Unrealized Appreciation (Depreciation)</b>							
on:							
Futures contracts					\$ (71,894)		\$ (71,894)

#### **Average Quarterly Balances of Outstanding Derivative Financial Instruments**

#### Futures contracts:

Average notional value of contracts short

\$ 38,694,305

For more information about the Trust s investment risks regarding derivative financial instruments, refer to the Notes to Financial Statements.

#### Fair Value Hierarchy as of Period End

Various inputs are used in determining the fair value of investments and derivative financial instruments. For information about the Trust s policy regarding valuation of investments and derivative financial instruments, refer to the Notes to Financial Statements.

The following tables summarize the Trust s investments and derivative financial instruments categorized in the disclosure hierarchy:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total
Assets:				
Investments:				
Long-Term Investments <sup>1</sup>		\$ 823,693,004		\$ 823,693,004
Short-Term Securities	\$ 563,151			563,151
Total	\$ 563,151	\$ 823,693,004		\$ 824,256,155
	+,	+,,		+,,

Derivative Financial Instruments <sup>2</sup>		
Liabilities:		
Interest rate contracts	\$ (153,767)	\$ (153,767)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See above Schedule of Investments for values in each sector.

See Notes to Financial Statements.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017

21

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Derivative financial instruments are futures contracts which are valued at the unrealized appreciation (depreciation) on the instrument.

## Schedule of Investments (concluded)

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

The Trust may hold assets and/or liabilities in which the fair value approximates the carrying amount for financial statement purposes. As of period end, such assets and/or liabilities are categorized within the disclosure hierarchy as follows:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total
Liabilities:				
TOB Trust Certificates		\$ (178,458,032)		\$ (178,458,032)
VMTP Shares at Liquidation Value		(171,300,000)		(171,300,000)
Total		\$ (349,758,032)		\$ (349,758,032)

During the six months ended January 31, 2017, there were no transfers between levels.

See Notes to Financial Statements.

22 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 31, 2017

## Schedule of Investments January 31, 2017 (Unaudited)

BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust (BFO)

(Percentages shown are based on Net Assets)

M. Chain at	Par	¥7.1
Municipal Bonds Florida 97.8%	(000)	Value
Corporate 3.9%		
County of Hillsborough Florida IDA, Refunding RB, Tampa Electric Co. Project, Series A,		
5.65%, 5/15/18	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,052,960
County of Palm Beach Florida Solid Waste Authority, Refunding RB, 5.00%, 10/01/20	2,000	2,241,160
or rain beach roran sond wase rainviry, retaining res, 5000 %, 1000 %,	2,000	2,2 11,100
County/City/Special District/School District 34.3%		3,294,120
City of Jacksonville Florida, Refunding RB:		
Better Jacksonville Sales Tax, 5.00%, 10/01/20	4,000	4,471,720
Brooks Rehabilitation Project, 5.00%, 11/01/20	400	441,704
County of Broward Florida School Board, COP, Refunding, Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/20	2,000	2,218,140
County of Broward Florida School Board, COP, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/18 (a)	2,500	2,647,600
County of Hillsborough Florida, RB (AMBAC), 5.00%, 11/01/17 (a)	5,545	5,716,729
County of Miami-Dade Florida School Board, COP, Refunding, Series B (AGC), 5.25%, 5/01/18 (a)	4,000	4,210,440
County of Northern Palm Beach Florida Improvement District, Refunding, Special Assessment Bonds,	·	
Water Control & Improvement District No. 43, Series B (ACA), 4.50%, 8/01/22	1,000	996,340
Florida State Board of Education, GO, Refunding, Capital Outlay, Series B, 5.00%, 6/01/20	485	532,093
ndian River County School Board, COP, Refunding, Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/20	1,000	1,111,540
Miami-Dade County School Board Foundation, Inc., COP, Refunding, Series A, 5.00%, 5/01/20	1,250	1,380,837
Palm Beach County School District, COP, Refunding Series B, 5.00%, 8/01/20	3,000	3,341,130
Stevens Plantation Florida Imports Project Dependent Special District, RB, 6.38%, 5/01/13 (b)(c)	2,425	1,696,312
		28,764,585
Education 4.2%		
City of Tampa Florida, Refunding RB, Florida Revenue The University of Tampa Project, 5.00%,		
1/01/20	795	870,891
County of Orange Florida Educational Facilities Authority, RB, Rollins College Project (AMBAC),		
5.25%, 12/01/17 (a)	725	751,122
Florida State Board of Governors, Refunding RB, University of Central Florida, Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/18	400	419,952
Florida State Higher Educational Facilities Financial Authority, Refunding RB, University of Tampa		
Project, Series A, 5.00%, 4/01/20	1,000	1,094,490
Volusia County School Board, COP, Refunding Series A, 5.00%, 8/01/20	350	390,176
		3,526,631
Health 17.6%		
County of Brevard Florida Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, 5.00%, 4/01/20	500	545,710
County of Highlands Florida Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, Hospital, Adventist Health, Series I, 5.00%, 11/15/20	2,155	2,359,359
County of Marion Florida Hospital District, Refunding RB, Health System, Munroe Regional,	2,133	2,007,007
5.00%, 10/01/17 (a)	1,500	1,541,220
County of Orange Florida Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, Mayflower Retirement Center:	1,500	1,5 11,220
.00%, 6/01/17	190	190,878
3.25%, 6/01/18	195	198,442
3.50%, 6/01/19	200	206,354
	Par	
Municipal Bonds	(000)	Value
Florida (continued)	, ,	
Health (continued)		
County of Palm Beach Florida Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB:		
Acts Retirement-Life Communities, Inc., 5.00%, 11/15/22	\$ 4,735	\$ 5,354,243
Bethesda Healthcare System Project, Series A (AGM), 5.00%, 7/01/20	1,285	1,421,544
County of Palm Beach Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, Acts Retirement-Life Communities,		
nc., 4.00%, 11/15/20	2,000	2,119,840
Halifax Hospital Medical Center, Refunding RB, 5.00%, 6/01/20	590	650,428
Miami Beach Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, 5.00%, 11/15/20	150	164,896
		14.752.014
Jouring 0.8%		14,752,914

County of Lee Florida HFA, RB, S/F Housing, Multi-County Program, Series A-2, AMT (Ginnie Mae), 6.00%, 9/01/40	110	111,071	
County of Manatee Florida HFA, RB, S/F Housing, Series A, AMT (Ginnie Mae, Fannie Mae & Freddie	110	111,071	
Mac), 5.90%, 9/01/40	150	152,093	
Florida Housing Finance Corp., RB, Homeowner Mortgage, Series 2, AMT (Ginnie Mae, Fannie Mae &		,	
Freddie Mac), 4.70%, 7/01/22	420	427,136	
		690,300	
State 11.7%			
Florida Municipal Loan Council, RB, Series D (AGM):			
5.00%, 10/01/19	1,050	1,144,101	
4.00%, 10/01/20	1,105	1,180,903	
4.00%, 10/01/21	500	537,965	
Florida Municipal Loan Council, Refunding RB:			
CAB, Series A (NPFGC), 0.00%, 4/01/20 (d)	3,185	2,917,683	
Series B-2 (AGM), 4.00%, 10/01/20	655	700,712	
State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/20	3,000	3,344,160	
		9,825,524	
Transportation 10.6%		- , ,-	
City of Jacksonville Florida Port Authority, Refunding RB, AMT, 4.00%, 11/01/20	865	909,539	
County of Broward Florida Fuel System, RB, Lauderdale Fuel Facilities, Series A (AGM), AMT,			
5.00%, 4/01/20	160	174,885	
County of Broward Florida Port Facilities, Refunding RB, Series B, AMT, 5.00%, 9/01/20	2,500	2,756,200	
County of Miami-Dade Florida, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 10/01/20	1,375	1,526,786	
County of Miami-Dade Florida Expressway Authority, Refunding RB, Toll System, Series A,			
5.00%, 7/01/20	1,500	1,664,670	
County of Miami-Dade Florida Transit System Sales Surtax, Refunding RB, 5.00%, 7/01/20	550	612,122	
Greater Orlando Aviation Authority, Refunding RB, Series C, 5.00%, 10/01/20	1,130	1,263,261	
		8,907,463	
Utilities 14.7%		, ,	
City of Fort Lauderdale Florida Water & Sewer Revenue, Refunding RB, 5.00%, 9/01/20	2,970	3,339,735	
City of Miami Beach Florida, RB, 5.00%, 9/01/20	250	279,233	
City of North Miami Florida Beach Water Revenue, RB, 5.00%, 8/01/20	1,200	1,322,736	
County of Miami-Dade Florida Water & Sewer System, Refunding RB, Series B (AGM), 5.25%,			
10/01/19	4,000	4,403,800	

See Notes to Financial Statements.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017 23

### BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust (BFO)

	Par		
Municipal Bonds	(000)	Value	
Florida (continued)			
Utilities (continued)			
Florida Governmental Utility Authority, RB, Golden Gate Utility System (AGM), 5.00%, 7/01/19	\$ 510	\$ 551,315	
Florida Governmental Utility Authority, Refunding RB:			
4.00%, 10/01/20	500	537,835	
Lehigh Utility (AGM), 5.00%, 10/01/20	635	705,453	
Florida Municipal Power Agency, RB, 5.00%, 10/01/20	500	558,965	
Town of Davie Florida, Refunding RB, Nova Southeastern University Project, Series B, 5.00%, 4/01/20	530	577,345	
		12,276,417	
Total Municipal Bonds in Florida		82,037,954	
Guam 0.6%			
Utilities 0.6%	100	110.000	
Guam Government Waterworks Authority, RB, 5.25%, 7/01/20	100	110,088	
Guam Power Authority, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.00%, 10/01/20	310	340,749	
Total Municipal Bonds in Guam		450,837	
Total Municipal Bonds			
(Cost \$80,422,345) 98.4%		82,488,791	
Short-Term Securities	Shares	Value	
BlackRock Liquidity Funds, MuniCash, Institutional Class, 0.50% (e)(f)	658,296	\$ 658,362	
Total Short-Term Securities			
(Cost \$658,296) 0.8%		658,362	
Total Investments (Cost \$81,080,641) 99.2%		83,147,153	
Other Assets Less Liabilities 0.8%		707,497	
Net Assets Applicable to Common Shares 100.0%		\$ 83,854,650	

### **Notes to Schedule of Investments**

- (a) U.S. Government securities, held in escrow, are used to pay interest on this security, as well as to retire the bond in full at the date indicated, typically at a premium to par.
- (b) Non-income producing security.
- (c) Issuer filed for bankruptcy and/or is in default.
- (d) Zero-coupon bond.
- (e) During the six months ended January 31, 2017, investments in issuers considered to be an affiliate of the Trust for purposes of Section 2(a)(3) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, were as follows:

Affiliate	Shares Held	Net	Shares Held	Value at	Income	Net Realized	Change in
	at July 31,	Activity	at January 31,	January 31,		Gain <sup>1</sup>	Unrealized
	2016		2017	2017			Appreciation

(Depreciation) BlackRock Liquidity Funds, MuniCash, Institutional 1,836,731 658,296

\$ 658,362

\$ 1,043 \$

396

66

### (f) Current yield as of period end.

For Trust compliance purposes, the Trust s sector classifications refer to one or more of the sector sub-classifications used by one or more widely recognized market indexes or rating group indexes, and/or as defined by the investment adviser. These definitions may not apply for purposes of this report, which may combine such sector sub-classifications for reporting ease.

(1,178,435)

#### Fair Value Hierarchy as of Period End

Various inputs are used in determining the fair value of investments. For information about the Trust spolicy regarding valuation of investments, refer to the Notes to Financial Statements.

The following table summarizes the Trust s investments categorized in the disclosure hierarchy:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total
Assets:				
Investments:				
Long-Term Investments <sup>1</sup>		\$ 82,488,791		\$ 82,488,791
Short-Term Securities	\$ 658,362			658,362
Total	\$ 658,362	\$ 82,488,791		\$ 83,147,153

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See above Schedule of Investments for values in each sector.

During the six months ended January 31, 2017, there were no transfers between levels.

See Notes to Financial Statements.

24 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017

Includes net capital gain distributions.

Schedule of Investments January 31, 2017 (Unaudited)

BlackRock Municipal 2030 Target Term Trust (BTT)

(Percentages shown are based on Net Assets)

	Par		
Municipal Bonds	(000)	Value	
Alabama 0.9%			
County of Jefferson Alabama, RB, Limited Obligation School, Series A:			
5.25%, 1/01/19	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,004,113	
5.25%, 1/01/20	1,000	1,004,070	
5.50%, 1/01/21	1,200	1,204,884	
5.50%, 1/01/22	1,105	1,109,497	
County of Jefferson Alabama Sewer Revenue, Refunding RB, CAB, Senior Lien-Warrants, Series			
B (AGM) (a):	7.275	2 570 220	
0.00%, 10/01/31	7,375	3,570,238	
0.00%, 10/01/32	6,295	2,826,392	
0.00%, 10/01/33	1,275	535,424	
University of South Alabama, Refunding RB, AGM:			
5.00%, 11/01/29	1,105	1,277,413	
5.00%, 11/01/30	2,000	2,299,980	
		14,832,011	
Alaska 0.4%		1.,00=,011	
Northern Tobacco Securitization Corp., Refunding RB, Tobacco Settlement, Asset-Backed, Series			
A, 4.63%, 6/01/23	6,130	6,160,527	
Arizona 2.3%	.,	-,,	
Arizona Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, Phoenix Children s Hospital:			
Series A, 5.00%, 2/01/34	6,340	6,727,945	
Series B, 5.00%, 2/01/33	1,810	1,933,569	
City of Phoenix Arizona IDA, RB, Facility:	1,010	1,755,507	
Candeo Schools, Inc. Project, 6.00%, 7/01/23	575	628,607	
Eagle College Preparatory Project, Series A, 4.50%, 7/01/22	575	588,857	
Eagle College Preparatory Project, Series A, 4.50%, 7/01/22  Eagle College Preparatory Project, Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/33	1,000	1,005,140	
	750		
Legacy Traditional Schools Project, Series A, 5.75%, 7/01/24 (b)		821,895	
County of Maricopa IDA, Refunding RB, Banner Health, Series A, 5.00%, 1/01/31	16,280	18,857,775	
County of Pima Arizona IDA, Refunding RB, Tucson Electric Power Co. Project, Series A,	6,000	6 200 500	
4.00%, 9/01/29	6,000	6,209,580	
		36,773,368	
California 11.8%		22,112,222	
Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, CAB, Sub-Lien, Series A (AMBAC),			
0.00%, 10/01/30 (a)	10,530	5,737,586	
Azusa Unified School District, GO, Refunding (AGM):			
4.00%, 8/01/30	4,420	4,755,876	
4.00%, 8/01/31	4,825	5,126,852	
California Municipal Finance Authority, RB:	,, ,	, , , ,	
Biola University, 4.00%, 10/01/27	750	777,405	
Biola University, 5.00%, 10/01/29	660	725,584	
Biola University, 5.00%, 10/01/29	500	547,185	
Biola University, 4.00%, 10/01/33	2,500	2,511,525	
Senior, S/F Housing, Caritas Affordable Housing, Inc. Project, Series A, 5.00%, 8/15/30	1,000	1,104,900	
California Pollution Control Financing Authority, RB, Poseidon Resources Desalination Project,	1,000	1,104,500	
AMT, 5.00%, 7/01/30 (b)	13,845	14,350,343	
California State Public Works Board, RB, Judicial Council Projects, Series A, 5.00%, 3/01/33 California Statewide Communities Development Authority, RB, American Baptist Homes of the	5,220	5,821,031	
West, Series A, 5.00%, 10/01/23	1,500	1,692,915	
California Statewide Communities Development Authority, Refunding RB, Eskaton Properties,			
Inc., 5.25%, 11/15/34	2,500	2,661,250	
	Par		
	,		
Municipal Bonds California (continued)	(000)	Value	
California (continued)			

City & County of San Francisco California Redevelopment Agency, Refunding, Special Tax Bonds, No. 6 Mission Bay South Public Improvements, Series A:

T 0.007 0.004 0.0	<b>*</b> 4.000	D 4 05 4 25 0	
5.00%, 8/01/28	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,074,370	
5.00%, 8/01/29	1,300	1,391,026	
5.00%, 8/01/33	1,335	1,408,078	
El Camino Community College District, GO, CAB, Election of 2002, Series C (a):			
0.00%, 8/01/30	9,090	5,518,175	
0.00%, 8/01/31	12,465	7,232,068	
0.00%, 8/01/32	17,435	9,668,928	
Golden Empire Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, Kern High School District Projects,			
1.16%, 5/01/17 (c)	8,590	8,590,000	
Los Angeles Regional Airports Improvement Corp., Refunding RB, LAXFuel Corp., Los Angeles			
International, AMT:			
4.50%, 1/01/27	5,000	5,335,650	
5.00%, 1/01/32	4,110	4,393,796	
Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 7/01/33	3,000	3,128,490	
M-S-R Energy Authority, RB, Series C, 6.13%, 11/01/29	2,500	3,082,900	
Monterey Peninsula Community College District, GO, Refunding, CAB (a):	,		
0.00%, 8/01/30	3,500	2,066,400	
0.00%, 8/01/31	5,940	3,331,627	
Oakland Unified School District/Alameda County, GO, Series A:	3,710	3,331,027	
5.00%, 8/01/30	1,000	1,162,790	
5.00%, 8/01/32	1,100	1,264,879	
5.00%, 8/01/33	1,000	1,144,240	
Poway Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A (a):	1,000	1,144,240	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	10,000	7,032,700	
0.00%, 8/01/27			
0.00%, 8/01/30	10,000	5,974,800	
0.00%, 8/01/32	12,500	6,796,500	
Riverside Public Financing Authority, Tax Allocation Bonds, University Corridor/Sycamore	10.000	10.122.000	
Canyon Merged Redevelopment Project, Series C (NPFGC), 4.50%, 8/01/30	10,000	10,122,800	
San Bernardino Community College District, GO, Refunding, Series A:	10.660	11 100 012	
4.00%, 8/01/31	10,660	11,188,843	
4.00%, 8/01/32	12,010	12,555,494	
4.00%, 8/01/33	5,665	5,898,681	
San Diego Community College District, GO, CAB, Election of 2006, 0.00%, 8/01/30 (a)	5,000	2,736,550	
State of California, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 9/01/34	16,000	16,580,160	
Union City Community Redevelopment Agency, Refunding, Tax Allocation Bonds, Community			
Redevelopment Agency Projects, Series A:			
5.00%, 10/01/32	1,355	1,529,524	
5.00%, 10/01/33	3,000	3,371,940	
		189,393,861	
Colorado 3.3%		107,373,001	
Central Platte Valley Metropolitan District, GO, Series A:			
5.13%, 12/01/29	700	769,867	
5.50%, 12/01/29 5.50%, 12/01/29	750	843,052	
5.38%, 12/01/33	1,500	1,658,505	
City of Lakewood Colorado Plaza Metropolitan District No. 1, Refunding, Tax Allocation Bonds,	1.000	1 000 750	
4.00%, 12/01/23 (b)	1,000	1,002,750	

See Notes to Financial Statements.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2017 25

BlackRock Municipal 2030 Target Term Trust (BTT)

	Par		
Municipal Bonds Colorado (continued)	(000)	Value	
Colorado Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB:			
Covenant Retirement Communities, Series A, 4.50%, 12/01/33	\$ 4,595	\$ 4,648,348	
Covenant Retirement Communities, Series A, 5.00%, 12/01/33	3,000	3,141,840	
NCMC, Inc. Project, 4.00%, 5/15/30	2,860	3,010,179	
The Evangelical Lutheran Good Samaritan Society Project, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/29	3,455	3,744,771	
The Evangelical Lutheran Good Samaritan Society Project, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/30	3,140	3,356,283	
The Evangelical Lutheran Good Samaritan Society Project, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/31	2,250	2,386,710	
The Evangelical Lutheran Good Samaritan Society Project, Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/32	1,500	1,581,405	
Copperleaf Metropolitan District No. 2, GO, Refunding, 5.25%, 12/01/30	500	505,105	
Denver Convention Center Hotel Aut			