BLACKROCK NEW YORK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST Form N-CSRS

April 04, 2018

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 52nd Street, New York, NY 10055

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

Date of fiscal year end: 07/31/2018

Date of reporting period: 01/31/2018

Item 1 Report to Stockholders

JANUARY 31, 2018

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.

In the 12 months ended January 31, 2018, assets with higher risk and return potential, such as stocks and high-yield bonds, continued to deliver strong performance. The equity market advanced despite geopolitical uncertainty and relatively high valuations, while bond returns were constrained by rising interest rates.

Emerging market stocks posted the strongest performance, as accelerating growth in China, the second largest economy in the world and the most influential of all developing economies, improved the outlook for corporate profits and economic growth across most developing nations. Chinese demand for commodities and other raw materials allayed concerns about the country s banking system, leading to rising equity prices and foreign investment flows.

Rising interest rates worked against high-quality assets with more interest rate sensitivity. Consequently, the 10-year U.S. Treasury a bellwether of the bond market posted a modest negative return, as rising energy prices, higher wages, and steady job growth drove expectations of higher inflation and interest rate increases by the U.S. Federal Reserve (the Fed).

The market s performance reflected reflationary expectations early in the reporting period, as investors began to sense that a global recovery was afoot. Thereafter, many countries experienced sustained and synchronized growth for the first time since the financial crisis. Growth rates and inflation are still relatively low, but they are finally rising together. Consensus expectations for global economic growth also rose, as long-anticipated fiscal stimulus and capital spending plans indicated that new sources of demand could extend the current economic cycle.

The Fed responded to these positive developments by increasing short-term interest rates three times during the year. In October 2017, the Fed also reduced its \$4.5 trillion balance sheet by \$10 billion, while setting expectations for additional modest reductions and rate hikes in 2018.

By contrast, the European Central Bank (ECB) and the Bank of Japan (BoJ) continued to expand their balance sheets despite nascent signs of sustained economic growth. Rising global growth and inflation, as well as limited bond supply, put steady pressure on other central banks to follow in the Fed s footsteps. In October 2017, the ECB announced plans to cut its bond purchases in half for 2018, while the BoJ reiterated its commitment to economic stimulus, as the country s inflation rate remained below 2.0%.

Rising consumer confidence and improving business sentiment are driving momentum for the U.S. economy. If the Fed maintains a measured pace of stimulus reduction, to the extent that inflation rises, it s likely to be accompanied by rising real growth and higher wages. That could lead to a favorable combination of moderately higher inflation, steadily rising interest rates, and improving growth in 2018. We continue to believe the primary risks to the economic expansion are trade protectionism, rapidly rising interest rates, and geopolitical tension.

In December 2017, Congress passed a sweeping tax reform bill. The U.S. tax overhaul is likely to accentuate the existing reflationary themes, including faster growth and rising interest rates. Changing the corporate tax rate to a flat 21% will create many winners and losers among high-and-low tax companies, while the windfall from lower taxes could boost business and consumer spending.

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, 2018

	6-month	12-month
U.S. large cap equities	15.43%	26.41%
(S&P 500® Index)		
U.S. small cap equities	11.23	17.18
(Russell 2000 [®] Index)		
International equities	12.14	27.60
(MSCI Europe, Australasia,		
Far East Index)		
Emerging market equities	18.51	41.01
(MSCI Emerging Markets Index)		
3-month Treasury bills	0.58	0.93
(ICE BofAML 3-Month		
U.S. Treasury Bill Index)		
U.S. Treasury securities	(2.74)	(0.47)
(ICE BofAML 10-Year		
U.S. Treasury Index)		
U.S. investment grade bonds	(0.35)	2.15
(Bloomberg Barclays U.S.		
Aggregate Bond Index)		
Tax-exempt municipal bonds	0.01	3.41
(S&P Municipal Bond Index)		
U.S. high yield bonds	1.94	6.60
(Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Corporate High Yield 2% Issuer Capped		
T. 1)		

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 IS NOT PART OF YOUR FUND REPORT

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	52
Statements of Operations	54
Statements of Changes in Net Assets	56
Statements of Cash Flows	59
Financial Highlights	60
Notes to Financial Statements	66
<u>Trustee and Officer Information</u>	76
Additional Information	77
Glossary of Terms Used in this Report	79

Municipal Market Overview For the Reporting Period Ended January 31, 2018

Municipal Market Conditions

Municipal bonds experienced positive performance during the period alongside a favorable technical backdrop and a flattening yield curve resulting from continued Fed monetary policy normalization and largely muted inflation expectations. Ongoing reassurance from the Fed that rates would be increased gradually and would likely remain low overall resulted in continued demand for fixed income investments. More specifically, investors favored the tax-exempt income, diversification, quality, and value of municipal bonds amid fiscal policy uncertainty, which saw tax reform ultimately lower the top individual tax rate just 2.6% while eliminating deductions and increasing demand for tax shelter. During the 12 months ended January 31, 2018, municipal bond funds experienced net inflows of approximately \$33 billion (based on data from the Investment Company Institute).

For the same 12-month period, total new issuance remained elevated from a historical perspective at \$394 billion (though well below the robust \$455 billion issued in the prior 12-month period). Notably, issuance in December posted the highest monthly total on record at \$56 billion, as issuers rushed deals to market ahead of the expected elimination of the tax-exemption for advanced refunding bonds and possibly private activity bonds (PABs). Ultimately, the final version of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act left PABs unchanged, though the elimination of advanced refundings will likely suppress supply going forward, providing a powerful technical.

S&P Municipal Bond Index

Total Returns as of January 31, 2018

6 months: 0.01%

12 months: 3.41%

A Closer Look at Yields

From January 31, 2017 to January 31, 2018, yields on AAA-rated 30-year municipal bonds decreased by 17 basis points (bps) from 3.08% to 2.91%, while 10-year rates increased by 3 bps from 2.32% to 2.35% and 5-year rates increased by 20 bps from 1.63% to 1.83% (as measured by Thomson Municipal Market Data). The municipal yield curve flattened significantly over the 12-month period with the spread between 2- and 30-year maturities flattening by 64 bps.

During the same time period, on a relative basis, tax-exempt municipal bonds strongly outperformed U.S. Treasuries with the greatest outperformance experienced in the front and intermediate portions of the yield curve. Notably, January saw interest rates move rapidly higher alongside strong global growth and a more hawkish bias from global central banks. The relative 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. 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

4

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, 2018, 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 AMT. 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.

2018 BLACKROCK SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT TO SHAREHOLDERS

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, there is no guarantee that these objectives can 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 such 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 difficult to predict accurately, and there is no assurance that the Trusts 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), 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. BTT is permitted to use economic leverage (which includes leverage attributable to reverse repurchase agreements) of 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), then the TOB Trust is not considered a senior security and is not subject to the foregoing limitations and requirements imposed by 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 assets 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.

THE BENEFITS AND RISKS OF LEVERAGING

5

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018

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 investment 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, 2018 (\$13.34) ^(a)	4.95%
Tax Equivalent Yield ^(b)	10.78%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.0550
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.6600
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2018 ^(d)	42%

- (a) 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.
- (b) Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal U.S. federal and state tax rate of 54.10%, 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.
- (c) The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- (d) 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, 2018 were as follows:

	Returns Ba	Returns Based On		
	Market Price	NAV		
$BFZ^{(a)(b)}$	(7.06)%	0.01%		
Lipper California Municipal Debt Funds ^(c)	(5.62)	0.03		

- (a) All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions at actual reinvestment prices.
- (b) The Trust s discount to NAV widened during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on market price and performance based on NAV.
- (c) Average return. Returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions at NAV on the ex-dividend date as calculated by Lipper.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

Past performance is not indicative of future results.

The following discussion relates to the Trust s absolute performance based on NAV:

U.S. municipal bonds produced generally flat returns during the period, with income offsetting a modest decline in prices. Stronger economic growth and concerns about emerging inflation pressures fueled expectations that the Fed would continue to tighten monetary policy, dampening returns across the fixed-income market.

California underperformed the national indices due to questions about the long-term effects the Federal tax reform bill could have on the supply-and-demand profile of the state s municipal market.

Portfolio income contributed to performance by offsetting the downturn in bond prices. The use of leverage helped boost the Trust s income, but it also amplified the effect of market weakness.

Holdings that the Trust purchased when rates were higher also aided performance due to their generous income and lower sensitivity to the negative effects of rising interest rates.

The Trust s cash reserves, while minimal, helped dampen the effect market volatility as yields rose.

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.

Holdings in more highly-rated investment-grade bonds (those rated AA and AAA) lagged non-investment grade holdings, as fund flows into high yield products led to greater price appreciation for lower-rated issues. This trend was most pronounced in the beginning of the period but less so in January once high yield fund flows turned negative.

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.

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018 (continued)

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	01/31/18	07/31/17	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 13.34	\$ 14.71	(9.31)%	\$ 14.81	\$13.14
Net Asset Value	14.97	15.34	(2.41)	15.48	14.97

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

Overview of the Trust s Total Investments

SECTOR ALLOCATION

Sector	01/31/18	07/31/17
County/City/Special District/School District	28%	29%
Utilities	18	21
Transportation	18	13
Education	14	13
Health	11	12
State	6	7
Tobacco	5	5
Housing ^(b)		

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 (c)

Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2018	16%
2019	22
2020	3
2021	11
2022	3

⁽c) 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 (a)

Credit Rating	01/31/18	07/31/17
AAA/Aaa	8%	9%
AA/Aa	71	71
A	14	13
BBB/Baa	1	(b)
BB/Ba	1	1
В	4	4
N/R	1	2

^(a)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.

(b) Represents less than 1% of the Trust s total investments.

Trust Summary 7

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018

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 investment 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, 2018 (\$14.33) ^(a)	2.18%
Tax Equivalent Yield ^(b)	3.68%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.0260
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.3120
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2018 ^(d)	

- (a) 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.
- (b) Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal U.S. federal tax rate of 40.80%, 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.
- (c) The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- (d) 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, 2018 were as follows:

	Market Price	NAV
$BFO^{(a)(b)}$	(3.65)%	(0.56)%
Lipper Other States Municipal Debt Funds ^(c)	(4.74)	(0.22)

- (a) All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions at actual reinvestment prices.
- (b) The Trust moved to a discount to NAV during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on market price and performance based on NAV.
- (c) Average return. Returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions at NAV on the ex-dividend date as calculated by Lipper.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

Past performance is not indicative of future results.

The following discussion relates to the Trust s absolute performance based on NAV:

U.S. municipal bonds produced generally flat returns during the period, with income offsetting a modest decline in prices. Stronger economic growth and concerns about emerging inflation pressures fueled expectations that the Fed would continue to tighten monetary policy, dampening returns across the fixed-income market. At the state level, Florida s economy continued to outperform behind strong employment growth in construction, professional services and hospitality.

Since the Trust is scheduled to terminate on or about December 31, 2020, it holds securities that will mature close to that date. Short-term bonds were the weakest segment of the market during the reporting period due to expectations for additional Fed rate increases, so the Trust short-term bias detracted from performance.

While higher short-term rates were an overall headwind, the trend also allowed the Trust to reinvest the proceeds from bond calls and maturities at higher yields. The municipal market benchmark rate for 2020 moved higher by 60 basis points (0.60%) during the period.

The Trust s positions in cash and pre-refunded bonds, while limited, largely avoided the price declines that occurred in the broader market.

Positions in housing bonds, which are defensive by virtue of their continuously callable structures, added to performance.

From a ratings perspective, positions in high-grade bonds underperformed lower-rated securities due to investors continued demand for yield.

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

2018 BLACKROCK SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT TO SHAREHOLDERS

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018 (continued)

BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	01/31/18	07/31/17	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 14.33	\$ 15.05	(4.78)%	\$ 15.18	\$ 14.24
Net Asset Value	14.79	15.05	(1.73)	15.08	14.78

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

Overview of the Trust s Total Investments

SECTOR ALLOCATION

Sector	01/31/18	07/31/17
County/City/Special District/School District	27%	35%
Health	19	18
Utilities	15	16
Transportation	15	11
State	11	11
Corporate	8	4
Education	5	5
Housing ^(b)		

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 (d)

Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2018	15%
2019	11
2020	65
2021	1
2022	6

⁽d) 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 (a)

Credit Rating	01/31/18	07/31/17
AAA/Aaa	1%	1%
AA/Aa	54	56
A	31	28
BBB/Baa ^(b)		
N/R ^(c)	14	15

⁽a) 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 BB/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.

Trust Summary 9

⁽b) Represents less than 1% of the Trust s total investments.

⁽c) 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, 2018 and July 31, 2017, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment adviser to be investment grade represents 3% and 4%, respectively, of the Trust s total investments.

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018

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 investment 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, 2018 (\$21.39)(a)	4.03%
Tax Equivalent Rate ^(b)	6.81%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.0718
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share(c)	\$0.8616
Economic Leverage as January 31, 2018 ^(d)	37%

- (a) 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.
- (b) Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal U.S. federal tax rate of 40.80%, 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.
- (c) 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.
- (d) 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, 2018 were as follows:

	Returns Based On	
	Market Price	NAV
$BTT^{(a)(b)}$	(5.77)%	1.55%
Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged)(c)	(6.00)	0.50

- (a) All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions at actual reinvestment prices.
- (b) The Trust s discount to NAV widened during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on market price and performance based on NAV.
- (c) Average return. Returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions at NAV on the ex-dividend date as calculated by Lipper.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

Past performance is not indicative of future results.

The following discussion relates to the Trust s absolute performance based on NAV:

U.S. municipal bonds produced generally flat returns during the period, with income offsetting a modest decline in prices. Stronger economic growth and concerns about emerging inflation pressures fueled expectations that the Fed would continue to tighten monetary policy, dampening returns across the fixed-income market.

The Trust s position in New Jersey bonds made a meaningful contribution to performance. The state government passed legislation that redirected roughly \$1 billion annually in lottery proceeds to its pension funds, which helped stabilize its credit rating and contributed to outperformance for the state s debt.

Positions in the tax-backed and health care sectors made positive contributions to absolute performance.

The Trust s investments in lower-rated issues, which outpaced the broader market, also aided results.

The Trust s allocation to zero-coupon bonds, while limited, detracted from performance since their longer duration accentuated the negative price performance in a down market. (Duration is a measure of interest-rate sensitivity.)

Reinvestment had an adverse effect on the Trust s income, as the proceeds of higher-yielding bonds that matured or were called needed to be reinvested at lower prevailing rates.

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

2018 BLACKROCK SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT TO SHAREHOLDERS

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018 (continued)

BlackRock Municipal 2030 Target Term Trust

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	01/31/18	07/31/17	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 21.39	\$ 23.14	(7.56)%	\$23.27	\$21.06
Net Asset Value	23.74	23.83	(0.38)	24.57	23.74

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

Overview of the Trust s Total Investments

SECTOR ALLOCATION

Sector	01/31/18	07/31/17
Transportation	22%	25%
Health	20	19
County/City/Special District/School District	15	14
State	14	12
Education	10	13
Corporate	9	8
Utilities	6	6
Tobacco	2	2
Housing	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 (e)

Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2018	1%
2019	
2020	4
2021	1
2022	32

- (e) 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 (b)

Credit Rating	01/31/18	07/31/17
AAA/Aaa	4%	4%
AA/Aa	29	30
A	36	36
BBB/Baa	18	17
BB/Ba	2	2
В	2	2
CCC/Caa		(c)
N/R ^(d)	9	9

- (b) 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.
- (c) Represents less than 1% of total investments.
- (d) 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 July 31, 2017, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment adviser to be investment grade represents less than 1% of the Trust s total investments.

Trust Summary 11

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018

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 s investment 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	BBF
Initial Offering Date	July 27, 2001
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2018 (\$13.54) ^(a)	5.89%
Tax Equivalent Yield ^(b)	9.95%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.0665
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share(c)	\$0.7980
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2018 ^(d)	42%

- (a) 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.
- (b) Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal U.S. federal tax rate of 40.80%, 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.
- (c) The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- (d) 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, 2018 were as follows:

	Market Price	NAV
$BBF^{(a)(b)}$	(8.66)%	0.38%
Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged)(c)	(6.00)	0.50

- (a) All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions at actual reinvestment prices.
- (b) The Trust moved from a premium to NAV to a discount during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on market price and performance based on NAV.
- (c) Average return. Returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions at NAV on the ex-dividend date as calculated by Lipper.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

Past performance is not indicative of future results.

The following discussion relates to the Trust s absolute performance based on NAV:

U.S. municipal bonds produced generally flat returns during the period, with income offsetting a modest decline in prices. Stronger economic growth and concerns about emerging inflation pressures fueled expectations that the Fed would continue to tighten monetary policy, dampening returns across the fixed-income market.

Positions in longer-dated securities contributed to performance, as yields on longer-maturity bonds rose less than those of short-term issues. (Prices and yields move in opposite directions.) In addition, longer-term debt generated higher income relative to other segments of the yield curve. Conversely, the Trust s allocation to shorter-dated bonds also detracted from returns.

Positions in BBB rated and non-investment grade bonds, which outperformed higher-quality securities, added to performance. Holdings in the tax-backed state and local sectors further aided results, particularly investments in New Jersey and Illinois. However, positions in higher-quality securities underperformed relative to lower-quality issues.

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 use of leverage helped performance by augmenting portfolio income, but it exacerbated the impact of declining bond 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.

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018 (continued)

BlackRock Municipal Income Investment Trust

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	01/31/18	07/31/17	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 13.54	\$ 15.27	(11.33)%	\$ 15.43	\$13.49
Net Asset Value	14.11	14.48	(2.56)	14.58	14.11

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

Overview of the Trust s Total Investments

SECTOR ALLOCATION

Sector	01/31/18	07/31/17
County/City/Special District/School District	25%	23%
Transportation	21	21
Health	14	15
Utilities	12	14
Education	11	10
State	8	9
Tobacco	6	5
Housing	2	1
Corporate	1	2

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 (c)

Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2018	14%
2019	27
2020	10
2021	13
2022	2

- (c) 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 (a)

Credit Rating	01/31/18	07/31/17
AAA/Aaa	9%	9%
AA/Aa	47	49
A	15	16
BBB/Baa	15	14
BB/Ba	3	3
В	3	3
$N/R^{(b)}$	8	6

- (a) 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.
- (b) 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, 2018 and July 31, 2017, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment adviser to be investment grade represents 1% and less than 1%, respectively, of the Trust s total investments.

Trust Summary 13

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018

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 investment 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.

On September 6, 2017, the Boards of the Trust, BlackRock New Jersey Municipal Bond Trust (BLJ) and BlackRock MuniYield New Jersey Fund, Inc. (MYJ) approved the reorganizations of the Trust and BLJ with and into MYJ, with MYJ continuing as the surviving fund after the reorganization. The reorganizations are subject to approval by each fund s shareholders and certain other conditions.

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, 2018 (\$14.35) ^(a)	5.31%
Tax Equivalent Yield ^(b)	10.57%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.0635
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.7620
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2018 ^(d)	41%

⁽a) 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.

Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2018 were as follows:

⁽b) Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal U.S. federal and state tax rate of 49.77%, 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.

⁽c) The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.

⁽d) 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.

	Market Price	NAV
$\mathrm{BNJ}^{\mathrm{(a)(b)}}$	(7.72)%	2.04%
Lipper New Jersey Municipal Debt Funds ^(c)	(5.19)	0.79

- (a) All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions at actual reinvestment prices.
- (b) The Trust moved from a premium to NAV to a discount during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on market price and performance based on NAV.
- (c) Average return. Returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions at NAV on the ex-dividend date as calculated by Lipper.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

Past performance is not indicative of future results.

The following discussion relates to the Trust s absolute performance based on NAV:

U.S. municipal bonds produced generally flat returns during the period, with income offsetting a modest decline in prices. Stronger economic growth and concerns about emerging inflation pressures fueled expectations that the Fed would continue to tighten monetary policy, dampening returns across the fixed-income market.

New Jersey bonds outperformed the national market due in part to investors positive perception of legislation that redirected roughly \$1 billion annually in lottery proceeds to the state s pension funds. The yield spreads on New Jersey tax-backed issues compressed significantly, making it the best performing sector held in the Fund during the past six months.

Positions in longer-term securities, which strongly outpaced short-term issues, contributed positively. Conversely, the Trust s holdings in short-term and intermediate bonds which are more sensitive to Fed policy lagged due to expectations for higher rates.

The Trust s investments in lower-rated issues, which outpaced the broader market, also added value.

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 Fund s positioning had a positive effect on returns.

Reinvestment had an adverse effect on the Trust s income, as the proceeds of higher-yielding bonds that matured or were called needed to be reinvested at lower prevailing rates.

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

Fund Summary as of January 31, 2018 (continued)

BlackRock New Jersey Municipal Income Trust

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	01/31/18	07/31/17	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 14.35	\$ 15.97	(10.14)%	\$ 16.05	\$ 14.30
Net Asset Value	15.29	15.39	(0.65)	15.70	15.29

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

Overview of the Trust s Total Investment

SECTOR ALLOCATION

Sector	01/31/18	07/31/17
Transportation	35%	36%
County/City/Special District/School District	22	22
Education	16	16
State	9	9
Corporate	7	6
Health	6	6
Housing	2	2
Tobacco	2	2
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 (d)

2018	15%
2019	9
2020	5
2021	17
2022	9

⁽d) 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 (a)

Credit Rating	01/31/18	07/31/17
AAA/Aaa	4%	4%
AA/Aa	35	36
A	21	25
BBB/Baa	27	22
BB/Ba	9	10
В	1	(b)
N/R	3 ^(c)	3

- (a) 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.
- (b) Represents less than 1% of total investments.
- (c) 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, 2018, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment adviser to be investment grade represents less than 1% of the Trust s total investments.

Fund Summary 15

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018

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 investment 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, 2018 (\$13.62) ^(a)	4.45%
Tax Equivalent Yield ^(b)	8.83%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.0505
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.6060
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2018 ^(d)	40%

⁽a) 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.

Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2018 were as follows:

	Returns Ba	Returns Based On		
	Market Price	NAV		
$BNY^{(a)(b)}$	(9.28)%	0.26%		
Lipper New York Municipal Debt Funds ^(c)	(4.98)	(0.20)		

⁽b) Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal U.S. federal and state tax rate of 49.62%, 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.

⁽c) The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.

⁽d) 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.

- (a) All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions at actual reinvestment prices.
- (b) The Trust moved from a premium to NAV to a discount during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on market price and performance based on NAV.
- (c) Average return. Returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions at NAV on the ex-dividend date as calculated by Lipper.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

Past performance is not indicative of future results.

The following discussion relates to the Trust s absolute performance based on NAV:

U.S. municipal bonds produced generally flat returns during the period, with income offsetting a modest decline in prices. Stronger economic growth and concerns about emerging inflation pressures fueled expectations that the U.S. Federal Reserve would continue to tighten monetary policy, dampening returns across the fixed-income market.

New York municipal bonds underperformed the national market. New issuance in the state was relatively robust compared to the nation as a whole, which contributed to the weaker performance. Unfortunately, much of the new issuance was concentrated in several large issuers in which the Fund already had positions, thereby limiting the opportunity set. New York s overall economic trends continued to improve, albeit at a rate slightly below the national level. However, the state continued to enjoy a broad and diverse economic base. One area of potential concern was the capping of deductibility of state and local taxes due to recently enacted Federal tax reform policies, which may reduce New York s ability to raise taxes in the future.

Portfolio income, enhanced by leverage, made the largest positive contribution to performance at a time in which bond prices fell. However, the use of leverage also exacerbated the effect of market weakness.

Exposure to lower-rated issues (those rated A and below) helped results as this market segment outperformed higher-rated bonds.

From a sector perspective, the Trust s allocations to the education and transportation sectors were beneficial.

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 Trust s positions in shorter-term bonds proved detrimental as rates increased the most in the two- to five-year portion of the yield curve. This allocation is largely comprised of advance-refunded bonds purchased in a higher-yield environment. Conversely, the Trust s exposure to the long end of the yield curve was beneficial as rates increased less in this area.

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.

2018 BLACKROCK SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT TO SHAREHOLDERS

Fund Summary as of January 31, 2018 (continued)

BlackRock New York Municipal Income Trust

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	01/31/18	07/31/17	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 13.62	\$ 15.37	(11.39)%	\$ 15.50	\$ 13.55
Net Asset Value	14.73	15.04	(2.06)	15.20	14.73

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

Overview of the Trust s Total Investments

SECTOR ALLOCATION

Sector	01/31/18	07/31/17
County/City/Special District/School District	22%	20%
Transportation	22	23
Education	19	20
Utilities	12	12
State	10	10
Health	8	9
Tobacco	3	2
Corporate	2	2
Housing	2	2

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 (c)

Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2018	4%
2019	7
2020	5
2021	15
2022	14

⁽c) 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 (a)

Credit Rating	01/31/18	07/31/17
AAA/Aaa	17%	16%
AA/Aa	40	40
A	24	28
BBB/Baa	10	6
BB/Ba	2	1
В	1	1
$N/R^{(b)}$	6	8

- (a) 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.
- (b) 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, 2018 and July 31, 2017, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment adviser to be investment grade represents 2% and 4%, respectively, of the Trust s total investments.

Fund Summary 17

Schedule of Investments (unaudited)

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

January 31, 2018

(Percentages shown are based on Net Assets)

Security County Of Sar Prancisco California Redevelopment Agency, Tax Allocation Bonds Sar Prancisco California Hotel Tax, RB, Convention Center Expansion & Renovation Sar Prancisco California Hotel Tax, RB, Convention Center Expansion & Renovation Sar Project Sar Proje		Par	** *
California 92.9% County/City/Special District/School District, 22.2% County of San Francisco California Redevelopment Agency, Tax Allocation Bonds, Mission Bay North Redevelopment Project, Series A, 5.00%, 08/01/41 1,185 1,341,657 City & County of San Francisco California Redevelopment Agency, Tax Allocation Bonds, Mission Bay North Redevelopment Project, Series A, 5.00%, 08/01/41 1,185 1,341,657 City of San Jose California Hotel Tax, RB, Convention Center Expansion & Renovation Project. 5,00%, 05/01/31 500 566,035 6,13%, 05/01/36 1,210 1,384,022 6,50%, 05/01/36 2,225 2,254,000 2,225 2,254,000 2,000 2,000 2,000 0,000 2,000 0	Security	(000)	Value
County/City/Special District/School District, 22.2%	•		
Butte-Glenn Community College District, GO, Election of 2002, Series C, 5.50%, 08/01/19 ⁶⁰ S 8,425 8,933,701 City & County of San Francisco California Redevelopment Agency, Tax Allocation Bonds, Mission Bay North Redevelopment Project, Series A, 5.00%, 08/01/41 1,185 1,341,657 City of San Jose California Hotel Tax, RB, Convention Center Expansion & Renovation Project: 6.13%, 05/01/31 500 566,035 5.50%, 05/01/36 1,210 1,384,022 5.50%, 05/01/36 1,210 2,845,000 2,092,020 2,092/01/19 ⁶⁰ 2,000 2,092,020 2,001/19 ⁶⁰ 2,000 2,002/01/19 ⁶⁰ 2,000 2,002/020 2,001/19 ⁶⁰ 2,000 2,002/020 2,002/01/19 ⁶⁰ 2,000 2,002/020			
08/01/19(a) \$ 8,425 \$ 8,933,701 City & County of San Francisco California Redevelopment Agency, Tax Allocation Bonds Mission Bay North Redevelopment Project, Series A, 5.00%, 08/01/41 1,185 1,341,657 City of San Jose California Hotel Tax, RB, Convention Center Expansion & Renovation Project: 500 566,035 6.13%, 05/01/31 500 566,035 6.50%, 05/01/42 2,225 2,545,000 6.50%, 05/01/46 2,000 2,000 2,000 2,000 2,000 2,017,860 County of Kern California, COP, Capital Improvements Projects, Series A (AGC), 6.00%, 02/01/19(a) 2,000 2,0092,020 2,000 2,117,860 County of Grange California Water District, COP, Refunding, 5.25%, 08/15/19(a) 2,000 2,017,860 2,000 2,117,860 County of Riverside California Public Financing Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A(a) 8,990 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10,446,110 10	• • •		
City & County of San Francisco California Redevelopment Agency, Tax Allocation Bonds, Mission Bay North Redevelopment Project, Series A, 5.00%, 08/01/41 1,185 1,341,657 City of San Jose California Hotel Tax, RB, Convention Center Expansion & Renovation Project: 500 566,035 6.13%, 05/01/31 500 566,035 6.50%, 05/01/42 2,225 2,545,000 County of Kern California, COP, Capital Improvements Projects, Series A (AGC), 6.00%, 02/02/01/19 ^(a) 2,000 2,092,020 County of Orange California Water District, COP, Refunding, 5.25%, 08/15/19 ^(a) 2,000 2,092,020 County of Riverside California Public Financing Authority, RB, Capital Facilities Project, 5.25%, 110/145 8,990 10,446,110 County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A(a): 5,270 5,885,325 5.09%, 03/01/21 5,270 5,885,325 6.00%, 03/01/21 2,800 2,250 County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Series L, 5,25%, 03/01/21 2,500 2,629,100 Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5,13%, 08/01/33 2,500 2,629,100 Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 08/01/33 1,31	·	¢ 0.425	¢ 0.022.701
Mission Bay North Redevelopment Project, Series A, 5.00%, 08/01/41 1,185 1,341,657 City of San Jose California Hotel Tax, RB, Convention Center Expansion & Renovation Project: 500 566,035 6.13%, 05/01/31 500 566,035 6.50%, 05/01/36 1,210 1,384,022 6.50%, 05/01/19 2,025 2,545,000 County of Kern California, COP, Capital Improvements Projects, Series A (AGC), 6.00%, 02/01/19(a) 2,000 2,092,020 County of Orange California Water District, COP, Refunding, 5.25%, 08/15/19(a) 2,000 2,117,860 County of Kiverside California Public Financing Authority, RB, Capital Facilities Project, 5.25%, 11/01/45 8,990 10,446,110 County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A (a): 5,500 3,250 5,885,325 5.00%, 03/01/21 5,270 5,885,325 6,00%, 03/01/21 5,270 5,885,325 05/15/18(a) 2,000 20,225,600 Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5,13%, 08/01/33 2,500 2,629,100 Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4,00%, 07/01/40 8,000 8,360,080 Modesto Irrigati		•	\$ 6,933,701
City of San Jose California Hotel Tax, RB, Convention Center Expansion & Renovation Project: 500 566,035 6.13%, 05/01/31 500 566,035 6.50%, 05/01/36 1,210 1,384,022 6.50%, 05/01/42 2,225 2,545,000 County of Kern California, COP, Capital Improvements Projects, Series A (AGC), 6.00%, 02/001/19 ^(a) 2,000 2,092,020 County of Orange California Water District, COP, Refunding, 5.25%, 08/15/19 ^(a) 2,000 2,117,860 County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, RB, Capital Facilities Project, 5.25%, 110/145 8,990 10,446,110 County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A ^(a) : 5,270 5,885,325 5.50%, 03/01/21 2,880 3,259,382 County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Series L, 5.25%, 05/15/18 ^(a) 2,880 3,259,382 County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Series L, 5.25%, 05/15/18 ^(a) 2,000 20,225,600 Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%, 08/01/33 2,500 2,629,100 Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 8,000 8,360,080 <td></td> <td></td> <td>1 241 657</td>			1 241 657
Project: 6.13%, 05/01/31 500 566,035 6.50%, 05/01/36 1,210 1,384,022 6.50%, 05/01/42 2,225 2,545,000 County of Kern California, COP, Capital Improvements Projects, Series A (AGC), 6.00%, 02/01/19(a) 2,000 2,092,020 County of Orange California Water District, COP, Refunding, 5.25%, 08/15/19(a) 2,000 2,117,860 County of Riverside California Public Financing Authority, RB, Capital Facilities Project, 5.25%, 11/01/45 8,990 10,446,110 County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A(a): 5,270 5,885,325 5,00%, 03/01/21 2,880 3,259,382 County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Series L, 5.25%, 03/15/18(a) 20,000 20,225,600 Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%, 08/01/33 2,500 2,629,100 Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 8,000 8,360,080 Modesto Irrigation District, COP, Capital Improvements, Series A, 5.75%, 10/01/29 3,035 3,179,952 Oak Grove School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 8,000 2,133,220 Oak Grove School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 08/01/33 1,315 1,392,388 Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 5,75%, 09/01/19(a) 2,000 2,133,220 San Leandro California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 5.00%, 06/01/32 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 600%, 08/01/19(a) 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5,25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5,25%, 08/01/21(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5,50%, 08/01/21 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Seri	•	1,163	1,341,037
6.13%, 05/01/31 6.50%, 05/01/36 6.50%, 05/01/42 County of Kern California, COP, Capital Improvements Projects, Series A (AGC), 6.00%, 02/01/19 ^(a) 2.000 County of Kern California Water District, COP, Refunding, 5.25%, 08/15/19 ^(a) 2.000 County of Riverside California Public Financing Authority, RB, Capital Facilities Project, 5.25%, 11/01/45 County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A ^(a) : 5.50%, 03/01/21 5.50%, 03/01/20 Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%, 08/01/33 5.50% Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 5.50%, 08/01/33 5.50% 6.50%, 08/01/29 6.50%,			
6.50%, 05/01/36 6.50%, 05/01/42 2.225 2.545,000 County of Kern California, COP, Capital Improvements Projects, Series A (AGC), 6.00%, 02/01/19(a) 2.000 2.092,020 County of Orange California Water District, COP, Refunding, 5.25%, 08/15/19(a) 2.000 2.017,860 County of Riverside California Public Financing Authority, RB, Capital Facilities Project, 5.25%, 11/01/45 County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A(a): 5.50%, 03/01/21 5.50%, 03/01/21 5.50%, 03/01/21 5.50%, 03/01/21 5.50%, 03/01/21 5.50%, 03/01/21 6.00%, 03/01/21 6.00%, 03/01/21 6.00%, 03/01/33 6.00%, 03/01/33 6.00% Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%, 08/01/33 6.00%, 03/01/33 6.00% Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 6.00%, 03/01/29 6.00% Modesto Irrigation District, COP, Capital Improvements, 08/01/33 6.00% Foreign A, 5.75%, 10/01/29 6.00% County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 5.75%, 10/01/29 6.00% County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, RB, 5.75%, 09/01/19(a) 6.00% 6.00		500	566 035
County of Kern California, COP, Capital Improvements Projects, Series A (AGC), 6.00%, 02/01/19 ^(a)			·
County of Kern California, COP, Capital Improvements Projects, Series A (AGC), 6.00%, 02/01/19 ^(a) 2,000 2,092,020 (County of Orange California Water District, COP, Refunding, 5.25%, 08/15/19 ^(a) 2,000 2,117,860 (County of Riverside California Public Financing Authority, RB, Capital Facilities Project, 5.25%, 11/01/45 (Sp. 11/01/45) (Sp. 10,446,110 (County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A ^(a) : 5.50%, 03/01/21 (Sp. 10,000) (Sp.		•	· ·
02/01/19 ^(a) 2,000 2,092,020 County of Orange California Water District, COP, Refunding, 5.25%, 08/15/19 ^(a) 2,000 2,117,860 County of Riverside California Public Financing Authority, RB, Capital Facilities Project, 5.25%, 11/01/45 8,990 10,446,110 County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A ^(a) :		2,223	2,545,000
County of Orange California Water District, COP, Refunding, 5.25%, 08/15/19 ^(a) 2,000 2,117,860 County of Riverside California Public Financing Authority, RB, Capital Facilities Project, 5.25%, 11/01/45 8,990 10,446,110 County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A ^(a) : 5.50%, 03/01/21 5,280 3,259,382 County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Series L, 5.25%, 05/15/18 ^(a) 20,000 20,225,600 Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%, 08/01/33 2,500 2,629,100 Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 8,000 8,360,080 Modesto Irrigation District, COP, Capital Improvements, Series A, 5.75%, 10/01/29 3,035 3,179,952 Oak Grove School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 08/01/33 1,315 1,392,388 Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 5.75%, 09/01/19 ^(a) 2,000 2,133,220 San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 5.00%, 06/01/32 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 08/01/41 3,000 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 08/01/19 ^(a) 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Series A, 5.55%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Series B, 5.55%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Series B, 5.55%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Series B, 5.55%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764		2.000	2.092.020
County of Riverside California Public Financing Authority, RB, Capital Facilities Project, 5.25%, 11/01/45 County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A ^(a) : 5.50%, 03/01/21 5.270 5.885,325 6.00%, 03/01/21 2,880 3,259,382 County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Series L, 5.25%, 05/15/18 ^(a) Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%, 08/01/33 Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 8,000 8,360,080 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%, 08/01/33 Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 5.75%, 09/01/19 ^(a) San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 5.00%, 06/01/32 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 08/01/41 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 San Marcos School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 08/01/19 ^(a) San Marcos School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 08/01/19 ^(a) Torrance Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/38 Nest Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/38 Nest Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		,	
10,446,110	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_,000	_,,,,,,,,,
County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A ^(a) : 5.50%, 03/01/21 6.00%, 03/01/21 County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Series L, 5.25%, 05/15/18 ^(a) 20,000 Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%, 08/01/33 Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 Rose Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 Rose Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 Rose Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 Rose Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 08/01/33 Rose Rose A, 5.75%, 10/01/29 Oak Grove School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 08/01/33 Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 5.75%, 09/01/19 ^(a) San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 5.00%, 06/01/32 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 08/01/41 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 08/01/19 ^(a) 4,000 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/38 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		8,990	10,446,110
Measure K, Series A(a): 5.50%, 03/01/21 5,270 5,885,325 5.00%, 03/01/21 2,880 3,259,382 County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Series L, 5.25%, 05/15/18(a) 20,000 20,225,600 Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%, 08/01/33 2,500 2,629,100 Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 8,000 8,360,080 Modesto Irrigation District, COP, Capital Improvements, Series A, 5.75%, 10/01/29 3,035 3,179,952 Oak Grove School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 08/01/33 1,315 1,392,388 Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 5.75%, 09/01/19(a) 2,000 2,133,220 San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 5.00%, 06/01/32 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 08/01/14 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 08/01/19(a) 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election		- ,	-, -,
5.50%, 03/01/21 5,270 5,885,325 6.00%, 03/01/21 2,880 3,259,382 County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Series L, 5.25%, 05/15/18 ^(a) 20,000 20,225,600 Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%, 08/01/33 2,500 2,629,100 Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 8,000 8,360,080 Modesto Irrigation District, COP, Capital Improvements, 3,035 3,179,952 Oak Grove School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 08/01/33 1,315 1,392,388 Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 2,000 2,133,220 San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764			
County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Series L, 5.25%, 05/15/18(a) 20,000 20,225,600		5,270	5,885,325
Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%, 08/01/33 2,500 2,629,100		2,880	3,259,382
Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%, 08/01/33 2,500 2,629,100 Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 8,000 8,360,080 Modesto Irrigation District, COP, Capital Improvements, Series A, 5.75%, 10/01/29 3,035 3,179,952 Oak Grove School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 08/01/33 1,315 1,392,388 Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 5.75%, 09/01/19(a) 2,000 2,133,220 San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 5.00%, 06/01/32 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 08/01/41 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 08/01/19(a) 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/38 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:	County of Santa Clara California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Series L, 5.25%,		
08/01/33 2,500 2,629,100 Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 8,000 8,360,080 Modesto Irrigation District, COP, Capital Improvements, 3,035 3,179,952 Oak Grove School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 08/01/33 1,315 1,392,388 Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 2,000 2,133,220 San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A: 1,625 1,921,026	05/15/18 ^(a)	20,000	20,225,600
Los Angeles Unified School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 4.00%, 07/01/40 8,000 8,360,080 Modesto Irrigation District, COP, Capital Improvements, 3,035 3,179,952 Series A, 5.75%, 10/01/29 3,035 1,315 1,392,388 Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 2,000 2,133,220 San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A: 5.006,08/01/38 1,625 1,921,026	Evergreen Elementary School District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B (AGC), 5.13%,		
Modesto Irrigation District, COP, Capital Improvements, 3,035 3,179,952 Series A, 5.75%, 10/01/29 3,035 3,179,952 Oak Grove School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 08/01/33 1,315 1,392,388 Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 2,000 2,133,220 San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		•	· ·
Series A, 5.75%, 10/01/29 3,035 3,179,952 Oak Grove School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 08/01/33 1,315 1,392,388 Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 2,000 2,133,220 San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		8,000	8,360,080
Oak Grove School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.50%, 08/01/33 1,315 1,392,388 Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 2,000 2,133,220 5.75%, 09/01/19 ^(a) 2,000 2,133,220 San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:			
Pico Rivera Public Financing Authority, RB, 5.75%, 09/01/19 ^(a) 2,000 2,133,220 San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 5.00%, 06/01/32 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 08/01/41 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 08/01/19 ^(a) 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/38 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		•	· ·
5.75%, 09/01/19(a) 2,000 2,133,220 San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		1,315	1,392,388
San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A, 5.00%, 06/01/32 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 08/01/41 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 08/01/19 ^(a) 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/38 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		2 000	2 122 220
5.00%, 06/01/32 3,375 3,878,921 San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		2,000	2,133,220
San Leandro California Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 08/01/41 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 08/01/19 ^(a) 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/38 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		3 375	3 878 021
08/01/41 3,060 3,455,689 San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 3,000 3,586,410 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 08/01/19 ^(a) 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/38 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		3,373	3,070,721
San Marcos Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, (AGM), 5.25%, 08/15/40 Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 08/01/19 ^(a) Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/38 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		3 060	3 455 689
Torrance Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008, Measure Z, 6.00%, 08/01/19 ^(a) Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/38 Usest Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		•	
08/01/19 ^(a) 4,000 4,271,080 Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21 ^(a) 3,445 3,874,764 Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/38 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A: 1 1 1		-,	2,223,123
Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 08/01/38 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:		4,000	4,271,080
08/01/38 1,625 1,921,026 West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:	Tustin California School District, GO, Election of 2008, Series B, 5.25%, 08/01/21(a)	•	
West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO, Series A:	Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%,		
	08/01/38	1,625	1,921,026
Election of 2010 (AGM), 5.25%, 08/01/32 4,960 5,524,994			
	Election of 2010 (AGM), 5.25%, 08/01/32	4,960	5,524,994

Election of 2012, 5.50%, 08/01/39	2,500	2,923,550
		105,927,886
Education 6.6% California Educational Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, San Francisco University:		
6.13%, 10/01/21 ^(a)	3,075	3,558,636
6.13%, 10/01/36	3,205	3,690,557
California Municipal Finance Authority, RB, Emerson College, 5.75%, 01/01/22 ^(a)	2,500	2,882,800
California Municipal Finance Authority, Refunding RB, Emerson College, Series B:		
5.00%, 01/01/34	695	803,740
5.00%, 01/01/36	750	863,205
5.00%, 01/01/37	630	723,360
	Par	
Security	(000)	Value
Education (continued) California State University Refunding RR Systemswide Society A 5 00% 11/01/22	¢ 5.640	¢ 6 624 162
California State University, Refunding RB, Systemwide, Series A, 5.00%, 11/01/33 University of California, RB, Series AV, 5.25%, 05/15/47	\$ 5,640 500	\$ 6,634,163 589,680
University of California, Refunding RB, Series AR,	300	369,060
5.00%, 05/15/41	10,000	11,528,600
3.00 %, 03/13/11	10,000	11,520,000
		31,274,741
Health 9.4%		
ABAG Finance Authority for Nonprofit Corps., Refunding RB, Sharp Healthcare, Series B,		
6.25%, 08/01/19 ^(a)	4,975	5,330,514
California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB:		
Adventist Health System West, Series A,		
5.75%, 09/01/19 ^(a)	6,710	
Children's Hospital, Series A, 5.25%, 11/01/41	8,500	
Sutter Health, Series B, 6.00%, 08/15/42 California Health Facilities Financing Authority Refunding RR. Series A(8)	6,015	6,608,620
California Health Facilities Financing Authority, Refunding RB, Series A ^(a) : Catholic Healthcare West, 6.00%, 07/01/19	5,550	5,902,036
Dignity Health, 6.00%, 07/01/19	4,520	
California Statewide Communities Development Authority, RB, Kaiser Permanente, Series	1,520	1,000,701
A, 5.00%, 04/01/42	1,000	1,103,250
California Statewide Communities Development Authority, Refunding RB, Trinity Health	,	, ,
Credit Group Composite Issue, 5.00%, 12/01/41	4,000	4,427,800
		44,736,259
State 8.6%		
Orange County Community Facilities District, Special Tax Bonds, Village of Esencia,	2.500	2.024.675
Series A, 5.25%, 08/15/45	2,500	2,824,675
State of California, GO, Various Purposes, 6.00%, 04/01/38	12,000	12,580,440
State of California Public Works Board, LRB:	12,000	12,360,440
Department of Education, Riverside Campus Project, Series B, 6.50%, 04/01/19 ^(a)	9,000	9,536,490
Various Capital Projects, Series I, 5.50%, 11/01/33	4,940	
Various Capital Projects, Sub-Series I-1,	,	, ,
6.38%, 11/01/19 ^(a)	5,025	5,455,793
State of California Public Works Board, RB, Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation,		
Series F,		
5.25%, 09/01/33	4,335	4,979,051

Tohaga 7.2%		41,136,687
Tobacco 7.2% Country of Collifornia Tahanaa Sanniitiinatian Ananay Pafundian PR. Anat Parland		
County of California Tobacco Securitization Agency, Refunding RB, Asset-Backed,		
Merced County, Series A,	1 125	1 126 520
5.25%, 06/01/45	1,135	1,136,532
Golden State Tobacco Securitization Corp., Refunding RB, Asset-Backed, Senior Series		
A-1, 5.75%, 06/01/47	27,800	28,064,656
Tobacco Securitization Authority of Northern California, Refunding RB, Asset-Backed		
Bonds, Series A-1,		
5.38%, 06/01/38	2,000	2,003,860
Tobacco Securitization Authority of Southern California, Refunding RB, Tobacco		
Settlement, Asset-Backed, Senior Series A-1:		
5.00%, 06/01/37	2,500	2,507,250
5.13%, 06/01/46	885	886,531
		,
		34,598,829
Transportation 21.2%		- 1,- 2 0,0 - 2
City & County of San Francisco California Airports Commission, ARB, Series E, 6.00%,		
05/01/39	6,750	7,120,305
City & County of San Francisco California Airports Commission, Refunding ARB, Series	-,	- , - ,
A, AMT:		
San Francisco International Airport, 5.00%, 05/01/41	5,170	5,827,676
5.00%, 05/01/42	6,805	7,725,989
3.0076, 03/01/12	0,003	1,123,707

18

2018 BLACKROCK SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT TO SHAREHOLDERS

Schedule of Investments (unaudited) (continued)

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

January 31, 2018

(Percentages shown are based on Net Assets)

	Par	
Security	(000)	Value
Transportation (continued)		
City & County of San Francisco California Airports Commission, Refunding RB, San		
Francisco International Airport, Series B, AMT, 5.00%, 05/01/46	\$ 3,375	\$ 3,788,741
City of Long Beach California Harbor Revenue, ARB, Green Bonds, Series B, AMT,		
5.00%, 05/15/43	1,695	1,935,419
City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, ARB, AMT:		
Los Angeles International Airport, Sub-Series A,		
5.00%, 05/15/42	8,980	10,134,020
Los Angeles International Airport, Sub-Series B,		
5.00%, 05/15/34	3,425	3,913,302
Subordinate, Los Angeles International Airport, Series B, 5.00%, 05/15/41	4,000	4,520,240
Sub-Series A, 5.00%, 05/15/42	3,325	3,796,618
City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles		
International Airport, Senior, Series A:		
5.00%, 05/15/34	6,650	6,941,735
5.00%, 05/15/40	4,760	5,102,863
City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Norman Y Mineta San Jose International		
Airport SJC, AMT:		
Series A, 5.00%, 03/01/36	2,800	3,201,492
Series A, 5.00%, 03/01/37	1,500	1,711,275
Series A, 5.00%, 03/01/41	3,850	4,372,791
Series A-1, 5.75%, 03/01/34	3,875	4,286,138
Series A-1, 6.25%, 03/01/34	2,650	2,995,825
County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 07/01/41	12,500	14,296,500
County of Sacramento California, ARB:		
PFC/Grant, Sub-Series D, 6.00%, 07/01/35	3,000	3,056,070
Senior Series B, 5.75%, 07/01/39	1,850	1,883,300
Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT,		
5.00%, 08/01/44	4,135	4,607,010
		101,217,309
Utilities 17.7%		
Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series		
A, 5.38%, 04/01/21 ^(a)	7,690	8,594,575
City of Chula Vista California, Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series D,		
5.88%, 01/01/34	6,555	6,935,714
City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB:		
Power System, Sub-Series A-1, 5.25%, 07/01/38	9,000	9,142,380
Water System, Series A, 5.38%, 07/01/38	2,000	2,070,800
City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Water		
System, Series A, 5.25%, 07/01/39	4,000	4,418,800
City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%,	2 000	2.006.100
06/01/19 ^(a)	2,000	2,096,180

City of Petaluma California Wastewater, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 05/01/21 ^(a) City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB,	5,625	6,403,050
Sub-Series A, 5.00%, 11/01/37	5,000	5,554,100
Cucamonga Valley Water District, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 09/01/31	4,320	4,839,307
Dublin-San Ramon Services District Water Revenue, Refunding RB, 6.00%, 02/01/21 ^(a) East Bay Municipal Utility District Water System Revenue, RB, Green Bond, Series A,	2,425	2,736,807
5.00%, 06/01/45 El Dorado Irrigation District/El Dorado County Water Agency, Refunding RB, Series A	6,000	7,007,280
(AGM), 5.25%, 03/01/39	10,000	11,475,300
Los Angeles Department of Water, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 07/01/44 Los Angeles Department of Water & Power System Revenue, RB, Series B, 5.00%,	3,000	3,552,780
07/01/38	6,000 <i>Par</i>	6,917,220
Security	(000)	Value
Utilities (continued)		
Yorba Linda Water District, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 10/01/38	\$ 2,570	
		84,744,974
Total Municipal Bonds in California		443,636,685
Multi-State 0.4% Housing 0.4% Controlling Family Lawrent Trans(b):		
Centerline Equity Issuer Trust ^(b) :	1 000	1.050.210
Series A-4-2, 6.00%, 05/15/19 Series B-3-2, 6.30%, 05/15/10	1,000 1,000	1,050,210
Series B-3-2, 6.30%, 05/15/19	1,000	1,053,800
		2,104,010
Puerto Rico 1.1%		
Tobacco 1.1%		
Children s Trust Fund, Refunding RB, Tobacco Settlement Asset-Backed Bonds:		
5.50%, 05/15/39	2,910	2,677,171
5.63%, 05/15/43	2,765	2,527,127
		5,204,298
Total Municipal Bonds 94.4% (Cost \$428,676,021)		450,944,993
Municipal Bonds Transferred to Tender Option Bond Trusts ^(c)		
California 75.5%		
County/City/Special District/School District 25.1%		
California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%,		
11/15/41	11,620	13,265,857
Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2008, Series C,		
5.25%, 08/01/20 ^{(a)(d)}	12,902	14,061,729
Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Refunding, Election of 2008,		
Series A, 6.00%, 08/01/19 ^(a)	20,131	21,496,449
Los Angeles Unified School District California, GO, Series I, 5.00%, 01/01/34	5,000	5,229,700

Palomar California Community College District, GO, Election of 2006, Series C, 5.00%,		
08/01/44	15,140	17,211,909
San Diego Community College District California, GO, Election of 2002, 5.25%,	10.404	11.052.405
08/01/19 ^(a)	10,484	11,073,497
San Joaquin California Delta Community College District, GO, Election of 2004, Series C, 5.00%, 08/01/39	14,505	16,442,660
San Jose Unified School District, GO:	14,505	10,442,000
Election of 2002, Series D, 5.00%, 08/01/18 ^(a)	14,625	14,893,018
Series C, 4.00%, 08/01/39	6,100	6,369,376
		120,044,195
Education 17.3%		
Grossmont Union High School District, GO, Election of 2004, 5.00%, 08/01/18 ^(a)	13,095	13,334,988
University of California, RB:		
Series AM, 5.25%, 05/15/44	5,000	5,803,450
Series O, 5.75%, 05/15/19 ^(a)	12,303	12,982,309
University of California, Refunding RB:		
Series A, 5.00%, 11/01/43	11,791	13,545,584
Series AI, 5.00%, 05/15/38	14,225	16,098,876
Series AR, 5.00%, 05/15/38	4,250	4,916,570
Series I, 5.00%, 05/15/40	14,065	15,998,779
		82,680,556
Health 9.1%		
California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB, Sutter Health, Series A, 5.00%,		
08/15/52	9,695	10,795,853
California Statewide Communities Development Authority, RB, Kaiser Permanente,		
Series A, 5.00%, 04/01/42	18,960	20,906,244

SCHEDULES OF INVESTMENTS 19

Schedule of Investments (unaudited) (continued)	BlackRock California Municipal Inco	me Trust (BFZ)
January 31, 2018	(Percentages shown are based	l on Net Assets)
Security Health (continued)	Par (000)	Value
Regents of the University of California Medical Center Pooled Series L, 5.00%, 05/15/47	Revenue, Refunding RB, \$ 10,290	\$ 11,620,291
State 2.5%		43,322,388
State of California, GO, Refunding, Various Purposes, 5.00%, 09/01/35	10,115	11,751,454
Transportation 9.0% City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, ARB, Los Angeles International Airport, Sub-Series A,	AMT:	
5.00%, 05/15/42 Series D, 5.00%, 05/15/41	13,730 18,632	15,494,390 20,827,968
County of San Diego Regional Transportation Commission, R 5.00%, 04/01/48	efunding RB, Series A, 5,740	6,619,454
Utilities 12.5%		42,941,812
County of Orange California Water District, COP, Refunding, County of San Diego California Water Authority Financing Co		11,051,632
Series A (AGM) ^(a) : 5.00%, 01/01/00 5.00%, 05/01/18	1,670 8,370	1,685,498 8,447,674
Eastern Municipal Water District, COP, Series H, 5.00%, 07/01/18 ^(a) Los Angeles Department of Water, Refunding RB, Series A, 5	.00%, 07/01/46 18,002 6,412	18,270,154 7,350,135
San Diego Public Facilities Financing Authority Sewer, Refun 5.25%, 05/15/19 ^(a)		13,071,412
		59,876,505
Total Municipal Bonds Transferred to Tender Option Bond Trusts 75.5%		260 616 010
(Cost \$352,707,307)		360,616,910
Total Long-Term Investments 169,9% (Cost \$781,383,328)		811,561,903
Security Short-Term Securities 0.1%	Shares	Value
	417,528 \$	417,569

BlackRock Liquidity Funds, MuniCash, Institutional Class, $0.95\%^{(e)(f)}$

Total Short-Term Securities 0.1% (Cost \$417,546)

417,569

Total Investments 170.0%		
(Cost \$781,800,874)		811,979,472
Other Assets Less Liabilities 1.8%		8,480,261
Liability for TOB Trust Certificates, Including Interest Expense and Fees Payable	(35.9)%	(171,593,282)
VMTP Shares, at Liquidation Value (35.9)%		(171,300,000)

Net Assets Applicable to Common Shares 100.0%

\$ 477,566,451

- (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) 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.
- (d) 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 agreements, which expires on August 1, 2018, is \$6,798,086. See Note 4 of the Notes to Financial Statements for details.
- (e) Annualized 7-day yield as of period end.
- (f) During the period ended January 31, 2018, 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:

								Chan	ge in
	Shares		Shares				Net U	Inrea	lized
	Held at	Net	Held at	Value at	Realize M ppreciation			ation	
Affiliate	07/31/17	Activity	01/31/18	01/31/18	Inconficain (Loss)Depreciation)		tion)		
BlackRock Liquidity Funds,									
MuniCash, Institutional Class	252,116	165,412	417,528	\$417,569	\$ 6,967	\$	356	\$	(2)

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.

⁽a) Includes net capital gain distributions, if applicable.

Schedule of Investments (unaudited) (continued)

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

January 31, 2018

Derivative Financial Instruments Outstanding as of Period End

Futures Contracts

Description Short Contractor	Number of Contracts	Expiration Date	Notional unt (000)	Ap_{i}	Value/ Inrealized preciation preciation)
Short Contracts: 10-Year U.S. Treasury Note	92	03/20/18	\$ 11,185	\$	235,617
Long U.S. Treasury Bond	132	03/20/18	19,511		597,749
5-Year U.S. Treasury Note	34	03/29/18	3,900		47,304
				\$	880,670

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 as follows:

	Commodity Contracts C	Credit Contracts C	C Equity E	0	Interest Rate Contracts C	Other ontracts	Total
Assets Derivative Financial							
Instruments							
Futures contracts							
Net unrealized appreciation ^(a)	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 880,670	\$	\$880,670

⁽a) 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, 2018, the effect of derivative financial instruments in the Statements of Operations was as follows:

Commodity Credit Equity Foreign Interest Other Total
Contracts Contracts Currency Rate Contracts
Exchange Contracts

	Contracts						
Net Realized Gain (Loss) from: Futures contracts	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 249,388	\$	\$ 249,388
Net Change in Unrealized Appreciation (Depreciation) on:							
Futures contracts	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 937,532	\$	\$ 937,532

Average Quarterly Balances of Outstanding Derivative Financial Instruments

Futures contracts:

Average notional value of contracts short

\$30,831,539

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

SCHEDULES OF INVESTMENTS 21

Schedule of Investments (unaudited) (continued)

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

January 31, 2018

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 ^(a)	\$	\$811,561,903	\$	\$811,561,903
Short-Term Securities	417,569			417,569
	\$417,569	\$811,561,903	\$	\$811,979,472
Derivative Financial Instruments ^(b)				
Assets:				
Interest rate contracts	\$880,670	\$	\$	\$ 880,670

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 VMTP Shares at Liquidation Value	\$	\$ (170,958,028) (171,300,000)	\$	\$ (170,958,028) (171,300,000)
	\$	\$ (342,258,028)	\$	\$ (342,258,028)

During the period ended January 31, 2018, there were no transfers between levels.

See notes to financial statements.

⁽a) See above Schedule of Investments for values in each sector.

⁽b) Derivative financial instruments are futures contracts which are valued at the unrealized appreciation (depreciation) on the instrument.

2018 BLACKROCK SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT TO SHAREHOLDERS

Schedule of Investments (unaudited) BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust (BFO) January 31, 2018 (Percentages shown are based on Net Assets) Par (000)Security Value **Municipal Bonds Florida 98.4%** Corporate 7.9% Citizens Property Insurance Corp., RB, Senior Secured, Series A-1, 5.00%, 06/01/20 \$3,140 \$ 3,364,510 County of Hillsborough Florida IDA, Refunding RB, Tampa Electric Co. Project, Series A, 5.65%, 05/15/18 1.000 1,011,480 County of Palm Beach Florida Solid Waste Authority, Refunding RB, 5.00%, 10/01/20 2,000 2,171,140 6,547,130 County/City/Special District/School District 27.0% City of Jacksonville Florida, RB, Series B, 5.00%, 10/01/20 760 825,862 City of Jacksonville Florida, Refunding RB: Better Jacksonville Sales Tax, 5.00%, 10/01/20 4,000 4,340,080 Brooks Rehabilitation Project, 5.00%, 11/01/20 400 432,448 County of Broward Florida School Board, COP, Refunding, Series A, 5.00%, 07/01/20 2,000 2,154,920 County of Broward Florida School Board, COP, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 07/01/18^(a) 2,500 2,540,800 County of Miami-Dade Florida School Board, COP, Refunding, Series B (AGC), 5.25%, 05/01/18^(a) 4,000 4,039,160 485 512,354 Florida State Board of Education, GO, Refunding, Capital Outlay, Series B, 5.00%, 06/01/20 Indian River County School Board, COP, Refunding, Series A, 5.00%, 07/01/20 1,000 1,075,490 Miami-Dade County School Board Foundation, Inc., COP, Refunding, Series A, 5.00%, 05/01/20 1,250 1,337,387 Palm Beach County School District, COP, Refunding Series B, 5.00%, 08/01/20 3,000 3,242,580 Stevens Plantation Florida Imports Project Dependent Special District, RB, 6.38%, 05/01/49(b)(c) 2,425 1,697,500 22,198,581 **Education 4.8%** City of Tampa Florida, Refunding RB, Florida Revenue The University of Tampa Project, 795 5.00%, 04/01/20 844,894 Florida Atlantic University Traffic and Parking Services Revenue, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 07/01/20 1,150 1,237,101 Florida State Board of Governors, Refunding RB, University of Central Florida, Series A, 400 405,984 5.00%, 07/01/18 Florida State Higher Educational Facilities Financial Authority, Refunding RB, University of Tampa Project, Series A, 5.00%, 04/01/20 1,000 1,063,850

Volusia County School Board, COP, Refunding Series A,

County of Brevard Florida Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, 5.00%, 04/01/20

5.00%, 08/01/20

Health 18.5%

377,766

3,929,595

531,925

350

500

County of Highlands Florida Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, Hospital, Adventist Health, Series I, 5.00%, 11/15/20 County of Orange Florida Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, Mayflower Retirement	2,155	2,277,576
Center: 3.25%, 06/01/18 3.50%, 06/01/19	195 200	,
County of Palm Beach Florida Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB: Acts Retirement-Life Communities, Inc., 5.00%, 11/15/22 Bethesda Healthcare System Project, Series A (AGM),	4,735	5,278,389
5.00%, 07/01/20 ^(d) County of Palm Beach Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, Acts Retirement-Life	1,285	1,387,080
Communities, Inc., 4.00%, 11/15/20 Halifax Hospital Medical Center, Refunding RB,	2,000	2,102,820
5.00%, 06/01/20	590 <i>Par</i>	,
Security Health (continued)	(000)	Value
Miami Beach Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB,	Φ 150	Φ 161.220
5.00%, 11/15/20 South Miami Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, Baptist Health South Florida	\$ 150	\$ 161,328
Obligated Group, 5.00%, 08/15/20	2,250	2,420,730
H		15,190,702
Housing 0.2% County of Lee Florida HFA, RB, S/F Housing, Multi-County Program, Series A-2, AMT (Ginnie Mae, Fannie Mae & Freddie Mac), 6.00%, 09/01/40 County of Manatee Florida HFA, RB, S/F Housing, Series A, AMT (Ginnie Mae, Fannie	80	81,321
Mae & Freddie Mac), 5.90%, 09/01/40	90	90,803
		172,124
State 10.8%		
Florida Municipal Loan Council, RB, Series D (AGM): 5.00%, 10/01/19	1,050	1,106,942
4.00%, 10/01/20	1,105	1,164,383
4.00%, 10/01/21 Florida Municipal Loan Council, Refunding RB:	500	534,415
CAB, Series A (NPFGC), 0.00%, 04/01/20 ^(e)	2,315	2,139,847
Series B-2 (AGM), 4.00%, 10/01/20	655	687,239
State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Refunding RB, Series A, 5.00%, 07/01/20	3,000	3,235,350
		8,868,176
Transportation 14.8% City of Jacksonville Florida Port Authority, Refunding RB, AMT, 4.00%, 11/01/20 County of Broward Florida Fuel System, RB, Lauderdale Fuel Facilities, Series A (AGM),	865	897,585
AMT, 5.00%, 04/01/20	160	170,147
County of Broward Florida Port Facilities, Refunding RB, Series B, AMT, 5.00%, 09/01/20	2,500	2,692,250
County of Hillsborough Aviation Authority, Refunding ARB, Tampa International Airport, Series A, 5.00%, 10/01/18	3,400	3,483,062

County of Miami-Dade Florida, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 10/01/20 County of Miami-Dade Florida Expressway Authority, Refunding RB, Toll System, Series	1,375	1,484,807
A, 5.00%, 07/01/20	1,500	1,615,080
County of Miami-Dade Florida Transit System Sales Surtax, Refunding RB, 5.00%,		
07/01/20	550	592,059
Greater Orlando Aviation Authority, Refunding RB, Series C, 5.00%, 10/01/20	1,130	1,224,841
T. W		12,159,831
Utilities 14.4%		
City of Fort Lauderdale Florida Water & Sewer Revenue, Refunding RB, 5.00%, 09/01/20	2,970	3,221,886
City of Miami Beach Florida, RB, 5.00%, 09/01/20	250	269,752
City of North Miami Florida Beach Water Revenue, RB,		
5.00%, 08/01/20	1,200	1,290,000
County of Miami-Dade Florida Water & Sewer System, Refunding RB, Series B (AGM),		
5.25%, 10/01/19	4,000	4,236,640
Florida Governmental Utility Authority, RB, Golden Gate Utility System (AGM), 5.00%,		
07/01/19	510	534,215
Florida Governmental Utility Authority, Refunding RB (AGM):		
4.00%, 10/01/20	500	526,870
Lehigh Utility, 5.00%, 10/01/20	635	685,711
Florida Municipal Power Agency, RB, 5.00%, 10/01/20	500	541,285
Town of Davie Florida, Refunding RB, Nova Southeastern University Project, Series B,		
5.00%, 04/01/20	530	561,641
		11,868,000
Total Municipal Bonds in Florida		80,934,139

SCHEDULES OF INVESTMENTS 23

Schedule of Investments (unaudited) (continued)

BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust (BFO)

January 31, 2018

(Percentages shown are based on Net Assets)

Security Guam 0.5%	Shares/Pai (000)	
Utilities 0.5% Guam Government Waterworks Authority, RB, 5.25%, 07/01/20	\$ 100) \$ 106,862
Guam Power Authority, Refunding RB, Series A (AGM), 5.00%, 10/01/20	310	332,921
		439,783
Total Municipal Bonds 98.9% (Cost \$80,570,910)		81,373,922
Short-Term Securities 0.2 % BlackRock Liquidity Funds, MuniCash, Institutional Class, $0.95\%^{(f)(g)}$	149,341	149,356
Total Short-Term Securities 0.2% (Cost \$149,341)		149,356
Total Investments 99.1% (Cost \$80,720,251) Other Assets Less Liabilities 0.9%		81,523,278 719,761
Net Assets Applicable to Common Shares 100.0%		\$ 82,243,039

⁽g) During the period ended January 31, 2018, 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		Shares		Net Unrealized
	Held at	Net	Held at	Value at	Realize A ppreciation
Affiliate	07/31/17	Activity	01/31/18	01/31/18	Inco me in (Loss)(Depreciation)

⁽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) Issuer filed for bankruptcy and/or is in default.

⁽c) Non-income producing security.

⁽d) Security is collateralized by municipal bonds or U.S. Treasury obligations.

⁽e) Zero-coupon bond.

⁽f) Annualized 7-day yield as of period end.

BlackRock Liquidity Funds, MuniCash,

Institutional Class 2,171,482 (2,022,141) 149,341 \$149,356 \$17,914 \$ 243 \$ (535)

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.

Fair Value Hierarchy as of Period End

Various inputs are used in determining the fair value of investments. 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 categorized in the disclosure hierarchy:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total
Assets:				
Investments:				
Long-Term Investments(a)	\$	\$81,373,922	\$	\$81,373,922
Short-Term Securities	149,356			149,356
	\$ 149,356	\$81,373,922	\$	\$81,523,278

See notes to financial statements.

24

2018 BLACKROCK SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT TO SHAREHOLDERS

⁽a) Includes net capital gain distributions, if applicable.

⁽a) See above Schedule of Investments for values in each sector. During the period ended January 31, 2018, there were no transfers between levels.

Schedule of Investments (unaudited)	BlackRock Municipal 2030 Target Term Trust (BT				
January 31, 2018	(Percentages shown are based on Net Asset				
	Par				
Security Municipal Bonds	(000)	Value			
Alabama 2.0%					
Alabama Federal Aid Highway Finance Authority, RB, Se	eries A:				
5.00%, 09/01/33		\$ 4,735,575			
5.00%, 09/01/34	3,500	4,146,275			
Alabama Special Care Facilities Financing Authority-Birn		11 206 000			
Hospital of Albama, 5.00%, 06/01/30	10,000	11,306,900			
County of Jefferson Alabama Sewer Revenue, Refunding	RB, CAB, Senior Lien-Warrants,				
Series B (AGM) ^(a) : 0.00%, 10/01/31	7,375	3,804,099			
0.00%, 10/01/31	6,295				
0.00%, 10/01/32	1,275				
Homewood Educational Building Authority, Refunding R		371,037			
University:	2, 200000000000000000000000000000000000				
5.00%, 12/01/32	290	331,304			
Series A, 5.00%, 12/01/33	1,010	1,147,754			
Series A, 5.00%, 12/01/34	1,380	1,555,205			
University of South Alabama, Refunding RB, AGM:					
5.00%, 11/01/29	1,105				
5.00%, 11/01/30	2,000	2,327,380			
		24 220 000			
Alaska 0.20		34,230,900			
Alaska 0.3% Northern Tobacco Securitization Corp., Refunding RB, To	Shagaa Sattlamant Assat Backad				
Series A,	boacco Settlement, Asset-Backed,				
4.63%, 06/01/23	4,945	5,086,476			
1105 70, 00701125	1,5 1.5	2,000,170			
Arizona 2.2%					
Arizona Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, Phoen	nix Children s Hospital:				
Series A, 5.00%, 02/01/34	6,340	6,784,624			
Series B, 5.00%, 02/01/33	1,810	1,926,654			
City of Phoenix Arizona IDA, RB, Facility:					
Candeo Schools, Inc. Project, 6.00%, 07/01/23	505	553,702			
Eagle College Preparatory Project, Series A,	400	707.000			
4.50%, 07/01/22	490	507,028			
Eagle College Preparatory Project, Series A,	1 000	1.004.600			
5.00%, 07/01/33 Lagracy Traditional Schools Project Sories A	1,000	1,024,600			
Legacy Traditional Schools Project, Series A, 5.75%, 07/01/24 ^(b)	750	812,063			
County of Maricopa IDA, Refunding RB, Banner Health,		•			
Country of Dimes Asimons IDA Defending DD Treasure Ele	otile Design Co. Duningt Co. 10,200	17,003,007			

County of Pima Arizona IDA, Refunding RB, Tucson Electric Power Co. Project, Series A,

4.00%, 09/01/29

6,321,180

6,000

		36,933,658
California 13.7%		
Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, CAB, Sub-Lien, Series A		
(AMBAC),		
0.00%, 10/01/30 ^(a)	10,530	6,408,558
Azusa Unified School District, GO, Refunding, (AGM):	4 400	4 = 0 = = 0 0
4.00%, 08/01/30	4,420	4,797,733
4.00%, 08/01/31	4,825	5,195,801
California Health Facilities Financing Authority, Refunding RB, Sutter Health, Series A,	1.700	2 012 244
5.00%, 11/15/32	1,700	2,013,344
California Municipal Finance Authority, RB:	750	000 460
Biola University, 4.00%, 10/01/27	750	800,460
Biola University, 4.00%, 10/01/33	2,500	2,572,700
Senior, S/F Housing, Caritas Affordable Housing, Inc. Project, Series A, 5.00%, 08/15/30	1,000	1,100,010
California Municipal Finance Authority, Refunding RB, Eisenhower Medical Center, Series		
A:	1 200	1 202 226
5.00%, 07/01/30	1,200	1,392,336
5.00%, 07/01/31	1,050	1,213,632
C	Par	17 - 1
Security California (continued)	(000)	Value
California (continued) California Pallytian Control Financina Authority, P.P. Passidan Passayrasa (Channel Sida)		
California Pollution Control Financing Authority, RB, Poseidon Resources (Channel Side)	¢ 12 045	¢ 15 172 420
LP Desalination Project, AMT, 5.00%, 07/01/30 ^(b)	\$ 15,845	\$ 15,173,428
California Statewide Communities Development Authority, RB:		
American Baptist Homes of the West, Series A,	1.500	1 600 210
5.00%, 10/01/23 Eductor Proporties, Inc., 5.25%, 11/15/24	1,500 2,500	1,680,210 2,719,850
Eskaton Properties, Inc., 5.25%, 11/15/34 City & County of Son Francisco Colifornio Redevelopment Agency Refunding Special	2,300	2,719,630
City & County of San Francisco California Redevelopment Agency, Refunding, Special Tax Bonds, No. 6 Mission Bay South Public Improvements, Series A:		
5.00%, 08/01/28	1,000	1,110,660
5.00%, 08/01/28	1,300	1,440,933
City of Long Beach California Harbor Revenue, RB, AMT, Series A:	1,500	1,440,933
5.00%, 05/15/31	1,200	1,405,944
5.00%, 05/15/32	1,800	2,102,526
5.00%, 05/15/33	675	785,464
5.00%, 05/15/34	1,650	1,914,214
City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Norman Y Mineta San Jose International	1,050	1,714,214
Airport SJC, Series A, AMT:		
5.00%, 03/01/30	500	582,850
5.00%, 03/01/30	1,500	1,740,765
5.00%, 03/01/32	1,000	1,156,200
5.00%, 03/01/33	975	1,123,112
5.00%, 03/01/34	1,250	-,,
	-,200	