BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST Form N-CSRS January 05, 2012
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 811-10339
Name of Fund: BlackRock Municipal Income Trust (BFK)
Fund Address: 100 Bellevue Parkway, Wilmington, DE 19809
Name and address of agent for service: John M. Perlowski, Chief Executive Officer, BlackRock Municipal Income Trust, 55 East 52 nd Street, New York, NY 10055
Registrant's telephone number, including area code: (800) 882-0052, Option 4
Date of fiscal year end: 04/30/2012
Date of reporting period: 10/31/2011

Item 1 – Report to Stockholders

October 31, 2011

Semi-Annual Report (Unaudited)

BlackRock Investment Quality Municipal Trust Inc. (BKN)

BlackRock Long-Term Municipal Advantage Trust (BTA)

BlackRock Municipal 2020 Term Trust (BKK)

BlackRock Municipal Income Trust (BFK)

BlackRock Pennsylvania Strategic Municipal Trust (BPS)

BlackRock Strategic Municipal Trust (BSD)

Not FDIC Insured No Bank Guarantee May Lose Value

Table of Contents

Page

<u>Dear Shareholder</u>	3
Semi-Annual Report:	
Municipal Market Overview	4
Trust Summaries	5
The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging	11
Derivative Financial Instruments	11
Financial Statements	
Schedules of Investments	12
Statements of Assets and Liabilities	37
Statements of Operations	38
Statements of Changes in Net Assets	39
Statement of Cash Flows	41
Financial Highlights	42
Notes to Financial Statements	48
Disclosure of Investment Advisory Agreements and Sub-Advisory Agreements	55
Officers and Trustees	59
Additional Information	60

2SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OCTOBER 31, 2011

Dear Shareholder

One year ago, the global economy appeared to solidly be in recovery mode and investors were optimistic as the US Federal Reserve launched its second round of quantitative easing. Stock markets rallied despite ongoing sovereign debt problems in Europe and inflationary pressures looming over emerging markets. Fixed income markets, however, saw yields move sharply upward (pushing prices down), especially on the long end of the historically steep yield curve. While high yield bonds benefited from the risk rally, most fixed income sectors declined in the fourth quarter of 2010. The tax-exempt municipal market faced additional headwinds as it became evident that the Build America Bond program would not be extended and municipal finance troubles burgeoned.

Early 2011 saw spikes of volatility as political turmoil swept across the Middle East/North Africa region and prices of oil and other commodities soared. Natural disasters in Japan disrupted industrial supply chains and concerns mounted regarding US debt and deficit issues. Nevertheless, equities generally performed well early in the year as investors chose to focus on the continuing stream of strong corporate earnings and positive economic data. Credit markets were surprisingly resilient in this environment and yields regained relative stability in 2011. The tax-exempt market saw relief from its headwinds and steadily recovered from its fourth-quarter lows. Equities, commodities and high yield bonds outpaced higher-quality assets as investors increased their risk tolerance.

However, the environment changed dramatically in the middle of the second quarter. Markets dropped sharply in May when fears mounted over the possibility of Greece defaulting on its debt, rekindling fears about the broader sovereign debt crisis. Concurrently, economic data signaled that the recovery had slowed in the United States and other developed nations. Confidence was further shaken by the prolonged debt ceiling debate in Washington, DC. On August 5th, Standard & Poor s downgraded the US government s credit rating and turmoil erupted in financial markets around the world. Extraordinary levels of volatility persisted in the months that followed as Greece teetered on the brink of default. Financial problems intensified in Italy and Spain and both countries faced credit rating downgrades. Debt worries spread to the core European nations of France and Germany, and the entire euro-zone banking system came under intense pressure. Late in the summer, economic data out of the United States and Europe grew increasingly bleak while China and other emerging economies began to show signs of slowing growth. By the end of the third quarter, equity markets had fallen nearly 20% from their April peak while safe-haven assets such as US Treasuries, gold and the Swiss franc skyrocketed.

October brought enough positive economic data to assuage fears of a double-dip recession in the United States and corporate earnings continued to be strong. Additionally, European policymakers demonstrated an increased willingness to unite in their struggle to resolve the region s debt and banking crisis. These encouraging developments brought many investors back from the sidelines and risk assets rallied through the month, albeit with large daily swings as investor reactions to news from Europe vacillated between faith and skepticism.

Overall, lower-risk investments including US Treasuries, municipal securities and investment grade credits posted gains for the 6- and 12-month periods ended October 31, 2011. Risk assets, including equities and high yield debt, broadly declined over the six months; however, US stocks and high yield bonds remained in positive territory on a 12-month basis. Continued low short-term interest rates kept yields on money market securities near their all-time lows. While markets remain volatile and uncertainties abound, BlackRock remains dedicated to finding opportunities and managing risk in this environment.

Sincerely,

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

While markets remain volatile and uncertainties abound, BlackRock remains dedicated to finding opportunities and managing risk in this environment.

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

Total Returns as of October 31, 2011

US large cap equities (S&P 500® Index)	(7.11)%	8.09	%
US small cap equities	(13.76)	6.71	
(Russell 2000® Index) International equities (MSCI Europe, Australasia,	(14.90)	(4.08)
Far East Index)				
Emerging market equities (MSCI Emerging	(15.91)	(7.72)
Markets Index)				
3-month Treasury	0.04		0.13	
bill (BofA Merrill Lynch				
3-Month Treasury				
Bill Index)				
US Treasury securities	12.11		7.79	
(BofA Merrill Lynch 10-				
Year US Treasury Index)				
US investment grade	4.98		5.00	
bonds (Barclays				
Capital US Aggregate				
Bond Index)				
Tax-exempt municipal	5.56		3.78	
bonds (Barclays Capital				
Municipal Bond Index)				
US high yield bonds	(0.95))	5.16	
(Barclays Capital US				
Corporate High Yield 2%				
Issuer Capped Index)				
**				

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

Municipal Market Overview

For the 12-Month Period Ended October 31, 2011

At the outset of the 12-month period, the municipal bond market was faced with a perfect storm of events that ultimately resulted in losses for the fourth quarter of 2010 at a level not seen since the Fed tightening cycle of 1994. US Treasury yields lost support due to concerns over the federal deficit and municipal valuations suffered a quick and severe setback, as it became evident the Build America Bond (BAB) program would expire at the end of 2010. The program had opened the taxable market to municipal issuers, successfully alleviating supply pressure in the traditional tax-exempt marketplace and bringing down yields in that space.

Towards the end of 2010, news about municipal finance troubles mounted and damaged confidence among retail investors. From mid-November through year end, weekly outflows from municipal mutual funds averaged over \$2.5 billion. Political uncertainty surrounding the midterm elections and tax policies exacerbated the situation. These conditions combined with seasonal illiquidity sapped willful market participation from the trading community. December brought declining demand with no comparable reduction in supply as issuers rushed their deals to market before the BAB program was retired. This supply-demand imbalance led to wider quality spreads and higher yields.

Demand is usually strong at the beginning of a new year, but retail investors continued to move away from municipal mutual funds in 2011. From the middle of November 2010, outflows persisted for 29 consecutive weeks, totaling \$35.1 billion before the trend finally broke in June. Weak demand has been counterbalanced by lower supply in 2011. According to Thomson Reuters, year-to-date through October, new issuance was down 34% compared to the same period last year. Higher interest rates during the first quarter, fiscal policy changes and a reduced need for municipal borrowing were among the factors that deterred issuers from bringing new deals to the market. In this positive technical environment, the S&P/Investortools Main Municipal Bond Index returned 8.05% for the first ten months of 2011, as municipal bonds outperformed most other fixed income asset classes year-to-date.

On August 5th, Standard & Poor s (S&P s) downgraded the US government credit rating from AAA to AA+, leading to the downgrade of approximately 11,000 municipal issues directly linked to the US debt rating. Nevertheless, the municipal market posted solid gains for the month of August, aided primarily by an exuberant Treasury market, severe volatility in US equities and continued supply constraint in the primary municipal market. Increased demand from both traditional and non-traditional buyers pushed long-term municipal bond yields lower, resulting in a curve-flattening trend that continued through period end.

Overall, the municipal yield curve flattened during the period from October 31, 2010 to October 31, 2011. As measured by Thomson Municipal Market Data, yields declined by 11 basis points (bps) to 3.75% on AAA quality-rated 30-year municipal bonds and by 12 bps to 2.39%, on 10-year bonds, while yields on 5-year issues rose 6 bps to 1.26%. With the exception of the 2- to 5-year range, the yield spreads between maturities decreased over the past year. The most significant decrease was seen in the 5- to 10-year range, where the spread tightened by 18 bps, while the overall slope between 2- and 30-year maturities decreased by 9 bps to 3.31%.

The fundamental picture for municipalities is improving. Austerity is the general theme across the country, while a small number of states continue to rely on the kick the can approach to close their shortfalls, using aggressive revenue projections and accounting gimmicks. It has been nearly a year since the first highly publicized interview about the fiscal problems plaguing state and local governments. Thus far, the prophecy of widespread defaults across the municipal market has not materialized. According to S&P s, municipal defaults in 2011 are down 69% compared to the

same period in 2010. Year-to-date monetary defaults in the S&P/Investortools Main Municipal Bond Index total roughly \$750 million, representing less than 0.5% of the index. BlackRock maintains the view that municipal bond defaults will remain in the periphery and the overall market is fundamentally sound. We continue to recognize that careful credit research and security selection remain imperative amid uncertainty in this economic environment.

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

4SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OCTOBER 31, 2011

Trust Summary as of October 31, 2011 BlackRock Investment Quality Municipal Trust Inc.

Trust Overview

BlackRock Investment Quality Municipal Trust Inc. s (BKN) (the Trust) investment objective is to provide high current income exempt from regular federal income tax consistent with the preservation of capital. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing at least 80% of its assets in municipal obligations exempt from federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax). Under normal market conditions, the Trust invests at least 80% of its assets in securities rated investment grade 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.

Performance

For the six months ended October 31, 2011, the Trust returned 15.87% based on market price and 13.82% based on net asset value (NAV). For the same period, the closed-end Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category posted an average return of 11.60% based on market price and 11.08% based on NAV. During the period, Lipper combined the General Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) and Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category. All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends. The Trust's premium to NAV, which widened during the period, accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV. The following discussion relates to performance based on NAV. As the municipal yield curve moved lower (interest rates declined) and flattened (rates on the longer end of the curve fell the most), the Trust benefited from its slightly long duration bias (preference for securities with a higher sensitivity to interest rate movements) and its positioning toward the longer end of the municipal yield curve (preference for bonds with longer-dated maturities). The Trust also benefited from its holdings in tax-backed, development district and health care bonds. Detracting from performance were the Trust s exposures to the housing and corporate-related sectors, which underperformed the broader municipal bond market for the six-month period.

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.

Symbol on New York Stock Exchange (NYSE)	BKN
	February
Initial Offering Date	19, 1993
Yield on Closing Market Price as of October 31, 2011 (\$14.61) ¹	6.90 %
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	10.62 %
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.084
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ³	\$1.008
Leverage as of October 31, 2011 ⁴	36 %

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.

² Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum federal tax rate of 35%.

³ The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.

Represents Auction Market Preferred Shares (AMPS) and tender option bond trusts (TOBs) as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including any assets attributable to AMPS and TOBs, 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 11.

The table below summarizes the changes in the Trust s market price and NAV per share:

10/31/114/30/11 Change High Low

Market Price \$ 14.61 \$ 13.08 11.70 % \$14.74 \$12.80 Net Asset Value \$ 13.99 \$12.75 9.73 % \$14.32 \$12.75

The following charts show the sector and credit quality allocations of the Trust s long-term investments:

Sector Allocations

	10/3	1/11	4/30	0/11
Health	27	%	27	%
County/City/Special District/School District	17		15	
State	14		14	
Education	12		12	
Transportation	11		11	
Utilities	6		7	
Corporate	6		6	
Tobacco	4		4	
Housing	3		4	

Credit Quality Allocations⁵

10/31/114/30/11

AAA/Aaa	3	%	3	%
AA/Aa	33		36	
A	32		29	
BBB/Baa	21		19	
BB/Ba	1		2	
В	1		1	
CCC/Caa	1		1	
Not Rated ⁶	8		9	

⁵ Using the higher of Standard & Poor s (S&P s) or Moody s Investors Service (Moody s) ratings. The investment advisor has deemed certain of these securities to be of investment grade quality. As of October 31,

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OCTOBER 31, 2011 5

^{6 2011} and April 30, 2011, the market value of these securities was \$11,387,834, representing 3%, and \$8,694,533, representing 2%, respectively, of the Trust s long-term investments.

Trust Summary as of October 31, 2011 BlackRock Long-Term Municipal Advantage Trust

Trust Overview

BlackRock Long-Term Municipal Advantage Trust s (BTA) (the Trust) investment objective is to provide current income exempt from regular federal income tax. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing, under normal market conditions, at least 80% of its assets in municipal obligations and derivative instruments with exposure to such municipal obligations, in each case that are exempt from federal income tax (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax). The Trust has economic exposure to additional municipal bonds through its ownership of residential interest in tender option bonds, which are rated investment quality. The Trust invests, under normal market conditions, primarily in long-term municipal bonds with a maturity of more than ten years at the time of investment and, under normal market conditions, the Trust's municipal bond portfolio will have a dollar-weighted average maturity of greater than 10 years. 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.

Performance

For the six months ended October 31, 2011, the Trust returned 11.66% based on market price and 11.82% based on NAV. For the same period, the closed-end Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category posted an average return of 11.60% based on market price and 11.08% based on NAV. During the period, Lipper combined the General Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) and Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) categories into one General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category. All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends. The Trust's discount to NAV, which widened during the period, accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV. The following discussion relates to performance based on NAV. The Trust performed well due to its yield-curve-flattening bias and duration positioning. The Trust has consistently emphasized longer-dated securities in order to benefit from long-term rates declining faster than short-term rates, a scenario that occurred during the period. In addition, the Trust s holdings generated a high distribution yield, which in the aggregate had a meaningful impact on returns. Sector concentrations in health and tobacco had a positive impact on performance, as did the avoidance of pre-refunded and escrowed issues, which underperformed the broader market. Detracting from performance was the Trust s long-standing focus on corporate-related debt, which modestly underperformed for the six-month period.

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.

Symbol on NYSE	BTA	
	Febru	ıary
Initial Offering Date	28, 20	006
Yield on Closing Market Price as of October 31, 2011 (\$11.00) ¹	7.04	%
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	10.83	%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.0625	5

Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share³ \$0.7740 Leverage as of October 31, 2011⁴ 37 %

The table below summarizes the changes in the Trust s market price and NAV per share:

10/31/114/30/11 Change High Low

Market Price \$ 11.00 \$ 10.20 7.84 % \$ 11.42 \$ 9.86 Net Asset Value \$ 11.35 \$ 10.51 7.99 % \$ 11.54\$ 10.51

The following charts show the sector and credit quality allocations of the Trust s long-term investments:

Sector Allocations

	10/3	1/11	4/30)/11
Health	18	%	18	%
Education	15		15	
County/City/Special District/School District	13		14	
Transportation	13		13	
Utilities	12		12	
State	12		9	
Housing	7		9	
Corporate	5		5	
Tobacco	5		5	

Credit Quality Allocations⁵

10/31/114/30/11

AAA/Aaa ⁶	22	%	22	%
AA/Aa ⁶	41		40	
A^6	11		9	
BBB/Baa ⁶	10		12	
BB/Ba	1		1	
В	3		2	
Not Rated ⁷	12		14	

⁵ Using the higher of S&P s or Moody s ratings.

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.

² Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum federal tax rate of 35%.

A change in the distribution rate was declared on November 1, 2011. The monthly Distribution per Common Share increased to \$0.0645. The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.

Represents TOBs as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including any assets 4 attributable to TOBs, 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 11.

⁶ Through its investment in TOBs, the Trust has economic exposure to investment grade bonds.

The investment advisor has deemed certain of these securities to be of investment grade quality. As of October 31,

^{7 2011} and April 30, 2011, the market value of these securities was \$3,292,790 and \$3,226,983, each representing 1%, respectively, of the Trust s long-term investments.

⁶SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OCTOBER 31, 2011

Trust Summary as of October 31, 2011 BlackRock Municipal 2020 Term Trust

Trust Overview

BlackRock Municipal 2020 Term Trust s (BKK) (the Trust) investment objectives are to provide current income exempt from regular federal income tax and to return \$15 per Common Share (the initial offering price per Common Share) to holders of Common Shares on or about December 31, 2020. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objectives by investing, under normal market conditions, at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds exempt from federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax). The Trust invests, under normal market conditions, at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds that are investment grade 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 objectives will be achieved.

Performance

For the six months ended October 31, 2011, the Trust returned 5.17% based on market price and 8.06% based on NAV. For the same period, the closed-end Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category posted an average return of 11.60% based on market price and 11.08% based on NAV. During the period, Lipper combined the General Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) and Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) categories into one General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category. All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends. The Trust's premium to NAV, which narrowed during the period, accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV. The following discussion relates to performance based on NAV. The Trust benefited from interest rates moving lower across the municipal yield curve during the period, bond prices rise as their yields fall. The Trust s exposure to zero-coupon bonds had a positive impact on performance as these issues outpaced other coupon structures in the broad market rally. Also boosting returns was exposure to lower-quality issues, which outperformed higher-quality municipal bonds during the period. The Trust is managed to a 2020 termination date and therefore generally maintains a shorter maturity profile than its Lipper category competitors. This shorter maturity profile was a disadvantage as the municipal yield curve moved lower and flattened during the period. The Trust had limited exposure to the long end of the curve, where interest rates fell the most, and therefore did not experience price appreciation of the same magnitude as did its Lipper category competitors with longer maturity profiles.

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.

Symbol on NYSE	BKK	
	Septe	mber
Initial Offering Date	30, 2	2003
	Dece	mber
Termination Date (on or about)	31, 2	2020
Yield on Closing Market Price as of October 31, 2011 (\$15.46) ¹	4.83	%
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	7.43	%

Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share³ \$0.06225 Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share³ \$0.74700 Leverage as of October 31, 2011⁴ 36 %

- 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.
- ² Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum federal tax rate of 35%.
- ³ The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- Represents AMPS and TOBs as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including
- 4 any assets attributable to AMPS and TOBs, 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 11.

The table below summarizes the changes in the Trust s market price and NAV per share:

10/31/114/30/11 Change High Low

Market Price \$ 15.46 \$15.06 2.66 % \$15.70 \$14.85 Net Asset Value \$ 15.43 \$14.63 5.47 % \$15.73 \$14.63

The following charts show the sector and credit quality allocations of the Trust s long-term investments:

Sector Allocations

	10/3	1/11	4/30)/11
Corporate	18	%	19	%
Health	15		15	
Transportation	14		13	
Utilities	13		10	
State	10		10	
County/City/Special District/School District	9		10	
Education	9		9	
Tobacco	7		9	
Housing	5		5	

Credit Quality Allocations⁵

	10/3	31/11	4/3	0/11
AAA/Aaa	6	%	12	%
AA/Aa	20		16	
A	29		28	
BBB/Baa	31		27	
BB/Ba	3		4	
В	3		4	
CCC/Caa	1		1	
Not Rated ⁶	7		8	

⁵ Using the higher of S&P s or Moody s ratings.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OCTOBER 31, 2011 7

The investment advisor has deemed certain of these securities to be of investment grade quality. As of October 31,

^{6 2011} and April 30, 2011, the market value of these securities was \$15,463,770, representing 3%, and \$11,262,007, representing 2%, respectively, of the Trust s long-term investments.

Trust Summary as of October 31, 2011 BlackRock Municipal Income Trust

Trust Overview

BlackRock Municipal Income Trust s (BFK) (the Trust) investment objective is to provide current income exempt from regular federal income tax. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing primarily in municipal bonds exempt from federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax). The Trust invests, under normal market conditions, at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds that are investment grade 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.

Performance

For the six months ended October 31, 2011, the Trust returned 16.00% based on market price and 13.89% based on NAV. For the same period, the closed-end Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category posted an average return of 11.60% based on market price and 11.08% based on NAV. During the period, Lipper combined the General Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) and Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) categories into one General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category. All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends. The Trust's premium to NAV, which widened during the period, accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV. The following discussion relates to performance based on NAV. The Trust performed well due to its yield-curve-flattening bias and duration positioning. The Trust has consistently emphasized longer-dated securities in order to benefit from long-term rates declining faster than short-term rates, a scenario that occurred during the period. In addition, the Trust sholdings generated a high distribution yield, which in the aggregate had a meaningful impact on returns. Sector concentrations in health and tobacco had a positive impact on performance, as did holding only minimal exposure to pre-refunded and escrowed issues, which underperformed the broader market. Detracting from performance was the Trust slong-standing focus on corporate-related debt, which modestly underperformed for the six-month period.

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.

Symbol on NYSE	BFK
Initial Offering Date	July 27, 2001
Yield on Closing Market Price as of October 31, 2011 (\$13.81) ¹	6.96 %
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	10.71 %
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.0801
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.9612
Leverage as of October 31, 2011 ⁴	38 %

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.

- ² Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum federal tax rate of 35%.
- ³ The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- Represents AMPS and TOBs as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including
- ⁴ any assets attributable to AMPS and TOBs, 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 11.

The table below summarizes the changes in the Trust s market price and NAV per share:

10/31/114/30/11 Change High Low

Market Price \$ 13.81 \$ 12.35 11.82 % \$ 13.89 \$ 12.30 Net Asset Value \$ 13.35 \$ 12.16 9.79 % \$ 13.59 \$ 12.16

The following charts show the sector and credit quality allocations of the Trust s long-term investments:

Sector Allocations

	10/3	1/11	4/30)/11
Health	19	%	20	%
Transportation	18		16	
State	15		13	
Utilities	13		11	
Corporate	11		12	
County/City/Special District/School District	10		10	
Education	8		9	
Tobacco	4		4	
Housing	2		5	

Credit Quality Allocations⁵

10/31/114/30/11

AAA/Aaa	6	%	11	%
AA/Aa	35		33	
A	25		24	
BBB/Baa	18		15	
BB/Ba	1		4	
В	5		6	
CCC/Caa	1		1	
C	1			
Not Rated ⁶	8		6	

⁵ Using the higher of S&P s or Moody s ratings.

The investment advisor has deemed certain of these securities to be of investment grade quality. As of October 31,

^{6 2011} and April 30, 2011, the market value of these securities was \$29,755,503 and \$28,787,350, each representing 3%, respectively, of the Trust s long-term investments.

⁸ SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OCTOBER 31, 2011

Trust Summary as of October 31, 2011 BlackRock Pennsylvania Strategic Municipal Trust

Trust Overview

BlackRock Pennsylvania Strategic Municipal Trust s (BPS) (the Trust) investment objectives are to provide current income that is exempt from regular federal and Pennsylvania income taxes and to invest in municipal bonds that over time will perform better than the broader Pennsylvania municipal bond market. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objectives by investing, under normal market conditions, primarily in municipal bonds exempt from federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax) and Pennsylvania income taxes. The Trust invests, under normal market conditions, at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds that are investment grade 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 objectives will be achieved.

Performance

For the six months ended October 31, 2011, the Trust returned 8.01% based on market price and 11.20% based on NAV. For the same period, the closed-end Lipper Pennsylvania Municipal Debt Funds category posted an average return of 9.40% based on market price and 9.06% based on NAV. All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends. The Trust's discount to NAV, which widened during the period, accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV. The following discussion relates to performance based on NAV. As the municipal yield curve moved lower (interest rates declined) and flattened (rates on the longer end of the curve fell the most), the Trust benefited from its slightly long duration bias (preference for securities with a higher sensitivity to interest rate movements) and its positioning toward the longer end of the municipal yield curve (preference for bonds with longer-dated maturities). The Trust generated a high level of income accrual during the period by improving the coupon structure of its portfolio and maintaining a low level of cash reserves. In addition, the Trust sought investments with valuations that remain attractive relative to their level of credit risk. Given the broad rally in the municipal market during the period, most sectors performed well. However, the Trust was exposed to short-term securities, which rallied less as the yield curve flattened, and pre-refunded securities, which had little room to rally from their near-zero 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.

Symbol on NYSE Amex	BPS
	August 25,
Initial Offering Date	1999
Yield on Closing Market Price as of October 31, 2011 (\$13.57) ¹	6.72 %
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	10.34 %
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.076
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.912
Leverage as of October 31, 2011 ⁴	43 %

- 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.
- ² Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum federal tax rate of 35%.
- ³ The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
 - Represents AMPS and TOBs as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including
- 4 any assets attributable to AMPS and TOBs, 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 11.

The table below summarizes the changes in the Trust s market price and NAV per share:

10/31/114/30/11 Change High Low

Market Price \$ 13.57 \$ 12.99 4.46 % \$14.45 \$12.79 Net Asset Value \$ 14.10 \$13.11 7.55 % \$14.42 \$13.11

The following charts show the sector and credit quality allocations of the Trust s long-term investments:

Sector Allocations

	10/3	1/11	4/30	0/11
Health	33	%	32	%
Transportation	16		12	
State	15		15	
Education	14		12	
Housing	9		15	
County/City/Special District/School District	6		8	
Utilities	4		3	
Corporate	3		3	

Credit Quality Allocations⁵

10/31/114/30/11

AAA/Aaa	2	%	9	%
AA/Aa	59		48	
A	23		25	
BBB/Baa	11		6	
BB/Ba	1		8	
Not Rated ⁶	4		4	

⁵ Using the higher of S&P s or Moody s ratings.

The investment advisor has deemed certain of these securities to be of investment grade quality. As of October 31,

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OCTOBER 31, 2011 9

^{6 2011} and April 30, 2011, the market value of these securities was \$1,734,359, representing 4%, and \$486,340, representing 1%, respectively, of the Trust s long-term investments.

Trust Summary as of October 31, 2011 BlackRock Strategic Municipal Trust

Trust Overview

BlackRock Strategic Municipal Trust s (BSD) (the Trust) investment objectives are to provide current income that is exempt from regular federal income tax and to invest in municipal bonds that over time will perform better than the broader municipal bond market. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing, primarily in municipal bonds exempt from 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 investment grade quality securities at the time of investment and, under normal market conditions, primarily invests in municipal bonds with long-term maturities in order to maintain a weighted average maturity of 15 years or more. 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 objectives will be achieved.

Performance

For the six months ended October 31, 2011, the Trust returned 17.19% based on market price and 11.78% based on NAV. For the same period, the closed-end Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category posted an average return of 11.60% based on market price and 11.08% based on NAV. During the period, Lipper combined the General Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) and Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) categories into one General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category. All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends. The Trust moved from a discount to NAV to a premium by period-end, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV. The following discussion relates to performance based on NAV. The Trust performed well due to its yield-curve-flattening bias and duration positioning. The Trust has consistently emphasized longer-dated securities in order to benefit from long-term rates declining faster than short-term rates, a scenario that occurred during the period. In addition, the Trust sholdings generated a high distribution yield, which in the aggregate had a meaningful impact on returns. Sector concentrations in health care and tobacco had a positive impact on performance, as did holding only minimal exposure to pre-refunded and escrowed issues, which underperformed the broader market. Detracting from performance was the Trust slong-standing focus on corporate-related debt, which modestly underperformed for the six-month period.

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.

Symbol on NYSE	BSD
	August
Initial Offering Date	25, 1999
Yield on Closing Market Price as of October 31, 2011 (\$13.45) ¹	6.60 %
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	10.15 %
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.074
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.888
Leverage as of October 31, 2011 ⁴	38 %

- 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.
- ² Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum federal tax rate of 35%.
- ³ The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
 - Represents AMPS and TOBs as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including
- 4 any assets attributable to AMPS and TOBs, 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 11.

The table below summarizes the changes in the Trust s market price and NAV per share:

10/31/114/30/11 Change High Low

Market Price \$ 13.45 \$11.88 13.22 % \$13.58 \$11.85 Net Asset Value \$ 13.25 \$12.27 7.99 % \$13.51 \$12.27

The following charts show the sector and credit quality allocations of the Trust s long-term investments:

Sector Allocations

	10/3	1/11	4/30)/11
Health	25	%	24	%
Transportation	18		18	
State	14		10	
Education	11		12	
Corporate	11		9	
Utilities	10		8	
County/City/Special District/School District	9		12	
Tobacco	2		1	
Housing			6	

Credit Quality Allocations⁵

10/31/114/30/11

AAA/Aaa	12	%	16	%
AA/Aa	33		35	
A	21		17	
BBB/Baa	20		17	
BB/Ba	2		5	
В	5		3	
CCC/Caa	1		1	
Not Rated ⁶	6		6	

⁵ Using the higher of S&P s or Moody s ratings.

The investment advisor has deemed certain of these securities to be of investment grade quality. As of October 31,

10SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OCTOBER 31, 2011

^{6 2011} and April 30, 2011, the market value of these securities was \$3,810,508, representing 3%, and \$3,150,431, representing 2%, respectively, of the Trust s long-term investments.

The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging

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

To leverage, the Trusts, except for BTA, issue AMPS, which pay dividends at prevailing short-term interest rates, and invest the proceeds in long-term municipal bonds. In general, the concept of leveraging is based on the premise that the financing cost of assets to be obtained from leverage, which will be based on short-term interest rates, will normally be lower than the income earned by each Trust on its longer-term portfolio investments. To the extent that the total assets of each Trust (including the assets obtained from leverage) are invested in higher-yielding portfolio investments, each Trust shareholders will benefit from the incremental net income.

To illustrate these concepts, assume a Trust s Common Shares capitalization is \$100 million and it issues AMPS for an additional \$50 million, creating a total value of \$150 million available for investment in long-term municipal bonds. If prevailing short-term interest rates are 3% and long-term interest rates are 6%, the yield curve has a strongly positive slope. In this case, the Trust pays dividends on the \$50 million of AMPS based on the lower short-term interest rates. At the same time, the securities purchased by the Trust with assets received from AMPS issuance earn the income based on long-term interest rates. In this case, the dividends paid to holders of AMPS (AMPS Shareholders) are significantly lower than the income earned on the Trust s long-term investments, and therefore the Common Shareholders are the beneficiaries of the incremental net income.

If short-term interest rates rise, narrowing the differential between short-term and long-term interest rates, the incremental net income pickup will be reduced or eliminated completely. Furthermore, if prevailing short-term interest rates rise above long-term interest rates, the yield curve has a negative slope. In this case, the Trust pays higher short-term interest rates whereas the Trust s total portfolio earns income based on lower long-term interest rates.

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 redemption value of the Trusts AMPS does not fluctuate in relation to interest rates. As a result, changes in interest rates can influence the Trusts NAVs positively or negatively in addition to the impact on Trust performance from leverage from AMPS discussed above.

The Trusts may also leverage their assets through the use of TOBs, as described in Note 1 of the Notes to Financial Statements. TOB investments generally will provide the Trusts with economic benefits in periods of declining short-term interest rates, but expose the Trusts to risks during periods of rising short-term interest rates similar to those associated with AMPS issued by the Trusts, as described above. Additionally, fluctuations in the market value of municipal bonds deposited into the TOB trust may adversely affect each Trust s NAV per share.

The use of leverage may enhance opportunities for increased income to the Trusts and Common Shareholders, but as described above, it also creates risks as short- or long-term interest rates fluctuate. Leverage also will generally cause greater changes in the Trusts NAVs, market prices and dividend rates than comparable portfolios without leverage. If the income derived from securities purchased with assets received from leverage exceeds the cost of leverage, the Trusts net income will be greater than if leverage had not been used. Conversely, if the income from the securities purchased is not sufficient to cover the cost of leverage, each Trust s net income will be less than if leverage had not been used, and therefore the amount available for distribution to Common Shareholders will be reduced. 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 a Trust to incur losses. The use of leverage may limit each Trust s ability to invest in certain types of securities or use certain types of hedging strategies, such as in the case of certain restrictions imposed by rating agencies that rate the AMPS issued by the Trusts. Each Trust will incur expenses in connection with the use of leverage, all of which are borne by Common Shareholders and may reduce income to the Common Shares.

Under the Investment Company Act of 1940, the Trusts are permitted to issue AMPS in an amount of up to 50% of their total managed assets at the time of issuance. Under normal circumstances, each Trust anticipates that the total economic leverage from AMPS and/or TOBs will not exceed 50% of its total managed assets at the time such leverage is incurred. As of October 31, 2011, the Trusts had economic leverage from AMPS and/or TOBs as a percentage of their total managed assets as follows:

Percent of Leverage BKN 36 % BTA 37 % BKK 36 %

BFK 38 % BPS 43 %

BSD 38 %

Derivative Financial Instruments

The Trusts may invest in various derivative financial instruments, including financial futures contracts, as specified in Note 2 of the Notes to Financial Statements, which may constitute forms of economic leverage. Such derivative financial instruments are used to obtain exposure to a market without owning or taking physical custody of securities or to hedge market and/or interest rate risks. Derivative financial instruments 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 derivative financial instrument. The Trusts—ability to use a derivative financial instrument successfully depends on the investment advisor—s ability to predict pertinent market movements accurately, which cannot be assured. The use of derivative financial instruments may result in losses greater than if they had not been used, may require a Trust to sell or purchase portfolio investments at inopportune times or for distressed values, may limit the amount of appreciation a Trust can realize on an investment, may result in lower dividends paid to shareholders or may cause a Trust to hold an investment that it might otherwise sell. The Trusts—investments in these instruments are discussed in detail in the Notes to Financial Statements.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OCTOBER 31, 2011 11

Schedule of Investments October 31, 2011 (unaudited) BlackRock Investment Quality Municipal Trust Inc. (BKN) (Percentages shown are based on Net Assets)

Municipal Bonds Alabama 3.6%	Par (000)	Value
Birmingham Special Care Facilities Financing Authority.	,	
RB, Children's Hospital (AGC):	•	
6.00%, 6/01/34	\$1,745	\$1,928,033
6.00%, 6/01/39	500	547,915
Birmingham Water Works Board, RB, 4.75%, 1/01/36	3,150	3,196,620
Hoover City Board of Education, GO, Refunding,		
4.25%, 2/15/40	3,050	3,020,080
		8,692,648
Arizona 7.1%		
Arizona Sports & Tourism Authority, RB, Multipurpose		
Stadium Facilities, Series A (NPFGC), 5.00%, 7/01/31	2,750	2,705,862
Arizona State University, RB, Series D, 5.50%, 7/01/26	475	531,891
Mohave County Unified School District No. 20 Kingmar	1,	
GO, School Improvement Project of 2006, Series C		
(AGC), 5.00%, 7/01/26	1,800	1,946,142
Pima County IDA, Refunding IDRB, Tucson Electric		
Power,		
5.75%, 9/01/29	1,375	1,405,621
Salt Verde Financial Corp., RB, Senior:		
5.00%, 12/01/32	1,035	952,635
5.00%, 12/01/37	4,585	4,151,580
San Luis Facility Development Corp., RB, Senior Lien,		
Regional Detention Center Project:		
6.25%, 5/01/15	405	393,753
7.00%, 5/01/20	490	482,875
7.25%, 5/01/27	980	881,745
State of Arizona, COP, Department of Administration,		
Series A (AGM), 5.00%, 10/01/29	1,100	1,142,933
University Medical Center Corp. Arizona, RB:		
6.00%, 7/01/39	1,600	1,612,672
6.50%, 7/01/39	750	779,228
		16,986,937
Arkansas 0.5%		
City of Rogers Arkansas, RB, Sales & Use Tax:		
4.00%, 11/01/27	600	594,402
4.13%, 11/01/31	600	592,752
		1,187,154
California 28.0%		
California County Tobacco Securitization Agency, RB,		
CAB,	_	
Stanislaus, Sub-Series C, 6.30%, 6/01/55 (a)	7,090	71,467
California Educational Facilities Authority, RB,	_	
5.00%, 2/01/40	3,000	3,133,770

California Health Facilities Financing Authority,		
Refunding RB, Sutter Health, Series B, 5.88%, 8/15/31	2,300	2,483,954
Carlsbad Unified School District, GO, Election of 2006,		
Series B, 6.00%, 5/01/34 (b)	1,500	1,015,395
City of San Jose California, RB, Series A-1, AMT,		
5.75%, 3/01/34	3,000	3,131,820

City of San Jose California, RB, Series A-1, AM1,	2.000 2.1	21.020
5.75%, 3/01/34	3,000 3,1	31,820
Municipal Bonds California (concluded)	Par (000)	Value
County of Sacramento California, RB, Senior Series A (AGM), 5.00%, 7/01/41 Dinuba Unified School District, GO, Election	\$2,100	\$2,136,771
of 2006 (AGM): 5.63%, 8/01/31 5.75%, 8/01/33 Foothill Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency California	250 535	274,730 591,571
Refunding RB: 5.75%, 1/15/40 CAB, 5.88%, 1/15/28 Hartnell Community College District California, GO, CAB	3,495 7,000	3,147,352 6,948,760
Election of 2002, Series D, 7.39%, 8/01/34 (b) Los Altos Elementary School District, GO, CAB, Election of 1998, Series B (NPFGC), 5.93%, 8/01/24 (a)(c) Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District California, GO	2,475 10,945	1,399,216 5,800,522
Refunding, CAB, Election of 2002, Series E (AGC), 6.47%, 8/01/38 (a) Palomar Community College District, GO, CAB, Election of 2006, Series B:	12,000	2,190,600
6.09%, 8/01/30 (a)	2,270	703,042
6.33%, 8/01/39 (b)	3,000	1,331,100
San Diego Community College District California, GO, CAB, Election of 2002, 6.38%, 8/01/19 (b) State of California, GO:	4,200	2,764,902
5.00%, 10/01/41	3,625	3,613,690
Refunding (CIFG), 4.50%, 8/01/28	1,000	990,530
Various Purpose, 5.75%, 4/01/31	3,000	3,269,640
Various Purpose, 6.00%, 3/01/33	2,270	2,554,658
Various Purpose, 6.50%, 4/01/33	2,900	3,381,429
Various Purpose, 5.50%, 3/01/40	3,650	3,820,966
Various Purpose (CIFG), 5.00%, 3/01/33	5,000	5,025,550
Various Purpose (NPFGC), 5.00%, 6/01/37	5,000	5,004,600
University of California, RB, Limited Project, Series B, 4.75%, 5/15/38	2,050	2,061,644 66,847,679
Colorado 0.7% Park Creek Metropolitan District, Refunding RB, Senior Limited Property Tax (AGM), 6.00%, 12/01/38 Connecticut 2.5% Connecticut State Health & Educational Facility Authority, RB:	1,500	1,617,450

Hartford Healthcare, Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/32	2,140	2,151,256
Lawrence & Memorial Hospital, Series,		
5.00%, 7/01/36	1,900	1,911,457
Sacred Heart University, Series G, 5.38%, 7/01/31	600	613,344
Western Connecticut Health, Series M,		
5.38%, 7/01/41	1,300	1,342,952
		6,019,009

Portfolio Abbreviations

To simplify the listings of portfolio holdings in the Schedules of Investments, the names and descriptions of many of the securities have been abbreviated according to the following list:

ACA	American Capital Access Corp.	HFA	Housing Finance Agency
AGC	Assured Guaranty Corp.	HRB	Housing Revenue Bonds
AGM	Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp.	IDA	Industrial Development Authority
AMBAC	American Municipal Bond Assurance Corp.	IDB	Industrial Development Board
AMT	Alternative Minimum Tax (subject to)	IDRB	Industrial Development Revenue Bonds
ARS	Auction Rate Securities	ISD	Independent School District
CAB	Capital Appreciation Bonds	MRB	Mortgage Revenue Bonds
CIFG	CDC IXIS Financial Guaranty	NPFGC	National Public Finance Guarantee Corp.
COP	Certificates of Participation	PILOT	Payment in Lieu of Taxes
EDA	Economic Development Authority	PSF-GTD	Permanent School Fund Guaranteed
EDC	Economic Development Corp.	RB	Revenue Bonds
ERB	Economic Revenue Bonds	SAN	State Aid Notes
FGIC	Financial Guaranty Insurance Co.	S/F	Single Family
GO	General Obligation Bonds	Syncora	Syncora Guarantee
HDA	Housing Development Authority		

See Notes to Financial Statements.

12 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT OCTOBER 31, 2011

Schedule of Investments (continued) BlackRock Investment Quality Municipal Trust Inc. (BKN) (Percentages shown are based on Net Assets)

Municipal Bonds	Par (000)	Value
Delaware 0.8%	, ,	
County of Sussex Delaware, RB, NRG Energy, Inc.,		
Indian River Project, 6.00%, 10/01/40	\$1,800	\$1,810,530
District of Columbia 1.5%	7 -,000	+ -,, -
District of Columbia Tobacco Settlement Financing Corp.,		
Refunding RB, Asset-Backed, 6.50%, 5/15/33	3,500	3,636,500
Florida 12.9%	3,500	3,030,300
County of Lee Florida, Refunding, RB, Series A, Lee Airport		
(AGM), 5.00%, 10/01/28	3,000	2,946,150
County of Miami-Dade Florida, RB, CAB, Sub-Series A	2,000	2,5 10,150
(NPFGC) (a):		
5.20%, 10/01/32	4,225	1,050,884
6.68%, 10/01/32	5,000	1,288,200
5.21%, 10/01/33	4,000	931,080
6.78%, 10/01/33	15,375	3,712,601
5.21%, 10/01/34	4,580	990,883
5.22%, 10/01/35	5,000	1,006,700
County of Orange Florida, Refunding RB (Syncora),	5,000	1,000,700
4.75%, 10/01/32	5,000	5,012,850
Hillsborough County IDA, RB, National Gypsum Co.,	2,000	2,012,020
Series A, AMT, 7.13%, 4/01/30	3,700	3,297,440
Miami Beach Health Facilities Authority, RB, Mount Sinai	2,700	2,27,
Medical Center of Florida, 6.75%, 11/15/21	1,725	1,782,098
Sumter Landing Community Development District Florida,	, -	,,
RB, Sub-Series B, 5.70%, 10/01/38	3,525	2,846,825
Village Community Development District No. 6, Special	- ,	,,
Assessment Bonds, 5.63%, 5/01/22	6,035	6,068,977
,	ŕ	30,934,688
Georgia 0.7%		
Milledgeville & Baldwin County Development Authority,		
RB, Georgia College & State University Foundation,		
6.00%, 9/01/33	1,500	1,738,065
Idaho 1.2%		
Idaho Health Facilities Authority, Refunding RB, Trinity		
Health Group, Series B, 6.25%, 12/01/33	2,500	2,773,925
Illinois 12.2%		
Chicago Public Building Commission Building Illinois, RB,		
Series A (NPFGC), 7.00%, 1/01/20	5,000	6,569,100
City of Chicago Illinois Transit Authority, RB, Sales Tax		
Receipts Revenue, 5.25%, 12/01/40	1,000	1,029,950
Illinois Finance Authority, RB:		
MJH Education Assistance IV LLC, Sub-Series B,		

5		
5.38%, 6/01/35 (d)(e)	700	139,972
Navistar International, Recovery Zone,		
6.50%, 10/15/40	1,925	1,985,888
Northwestern Memorial Hospital, Series A,		
5.50%, 8/15/43	5,800	6,543,386
Roosevelt University Project, 6.50%, 4/01/44	1,500	1,562,910
Rush University Medical Center, Series C,		
6.63%, 11/01/39	1,200	1,278,264
Illinois Finance Authority, Refunding RB:		
Friendship Village Schaumburg, Series A,		
5.63%, 2/15/37	345	280,909
OSF Healthcare System, Series A, 6.00%, 5/15/39	1,535	1,584,581
Railsplitter Tobacco Settlement Authority, RB:		
6.25%, 6/01/24	6,000	6,323,580
6.00%, 6/01/28	1,700	1,767,694
	,	29,066,234
Indiana 1.9%		
Indiana Finance Authority, Refunding RB, Improvement,		
U.S. Steel Corp., 6.00%, 12/01/26	1,350	1,325,646
Indiana Finance Authority Wastewater Utility, RB,	,	, ,
5.25%, 10/01/38	3,000	3,200,550
	- ,	4,526,196
		,,
	Par	
Municipal Bonds	(000)	Value
Iowa 1.7%	, ,	
Iowa Higher Education Loan Authority, RB, Private College		
Facility, Buena Vista University Project, 5.00%, 4/01/31 \$	1,480 \$1,520,212	
Iowa Higher Education Loan Authority, Refunding RB,		
Private College Facility:		
5.75%, 9/01/30	965	981,617
6.00%, 9/01/39	1,500 1,490,415	
•	,	3,992,244
TT 0.80		, ,

Kansas 0.5%