

BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST
Form N-CSR
July 01, 2016

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 52nd Street, New York, NY 10055

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

Date of fiscal year end: 04/30/2016

Date of reporting period: 04/30/2016

Item 1 Report to Stockholders

ANNUAL REPORT

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 Strategic Municipal Trust (BSD)

Not FDIC Insured May Lose Value No Bank Guarantee

Table of Contents

	Page
<u>The Markets in Review</u>	3
<u>Annual Report:</u>	
<u>Municipal Market Overview</u>	4
<u>The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging</u>	5
<u>Derivative Financial Instruments</u>	5
<u>Trust Summaries</u>	6
<u>Financial Statements:</u>	
<u>Schedules of Investments</u>	16
<u>Statements of Assets and Liabilities</u>	50
<u>Statements of Operations</u>	51
<u>Statements of Changes in Net Assets</u>	52
<u>Statements of Cash Flows</u>	54
<u>Financial Highlights</u>	55
<u>Notes to Financial Statements</u>	60
<u>Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm</u>	73
<u>Automatic Dividend Reinvestment Plan</u>	74
<u>Officers and Trustees</u>	75
<u>Additional Information</u>	78

The Markets in Review

Dear Shareholder,

Diverging monetary policies and shifting economic outlooks across regions have been the overarching themes driving financial markets over the past couple of years. Investors spent most of 2015 anticipating the end of the Federal Reserve's (the Fed's) near-zero interest rate policy as U.S. growth outpaced other developed markets. The Fed ultimately hiked rates in December, whereas the European Central Bank and the Bank of Japan took additional steps to stimulate growth, even introducing negative interest rates. The U.S. dollar had strengthened considerably ahead of these developments, causing profit challenges for U.S. companies that generate revenues overseas, and pressuring emerging market currencies and commodities prices.

Global market volatility increased in the latter part of 2015 and spilled over into early 2016. Oil prices were a key factor behind the instability after collapsing in mid-2015 due to excess global supply. China, one of the world's largest consumers of oil, was another notable source of stress for financial markets. Signs of slowing economic growth, a depreciating yuan and declining confidence in the country's policymakers stoked investors' worries about the potential impact of China's weakness on the global economy. Risk assets (such as equities and high yield bonds) suffered in this environment.

After a painful start to the new year, fears of a global recession began to fade as the first quarter wore on, allowing markets to calm and risk assets to rebound. Central bank stimulus in Europe and Japan, combined with a more tempered outlook for rate hikes in the United States, helped bolster financial markets. A softening in U.S. dollar strength offered some relief to U.S. exporters and emerging market economies. Oil prices found firmer footing as global supply showed signs of leveling off.

The selloff in risk assets at the turn of the year brought valuations to more reasonable levels, creating some appealing entry points for investors in 2016. Nonetheless, slow but relatively stable growth in the United States is countered by a less optimistic global economic outlook and uncertainties around the efficacy of China's policy response, the potential consequences of negative interest rates in Europe and Japan, and a host of geopolitical risks.

For the 12 months ended April 30, 2016, higher-quality assets such as municipal bonds, U.S. Treasuries and investment grade corporate bonds generated positive returns, while riskier assets such as non-U.S. and small cap equities broadly declined.

At BlackRock, we believe investors need to think globally, extend their scope across a broad array of asset classes and be prepared to adjust accordingly as market conditions change over time. 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 April 30, 2016

6-month	12-month
0.43%	1.21%

Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

U.S. large cap equities (S&P 500® Index)		
U.S. small cap equities (Russell 2000® Index)	(1.90)	(5.94)
International equities (MSCI Europe, Australasia, Far East Index)	(3.07)	(9.32)
Emerging market equities (MSCI Emerging Markets Index)	(0.13)	(17.87)
3-month Treasury bills (BofA Merrill Lynch 3-Month U.S. Treasury Bill Index)	0.14	0.15
U.S. Treasury securities (BofA Merrill Lynch 10-Year U.S. Treasury Index)	3.76	3.74
U.S. investment grade bonds (Barclays U.S. Aggregate Bond Index)	2.82	2.72
Tax-exempt municipal bonds (S&P Municipal Bond Index)	3.52	5.16
U.S. high yield bonds (Barclays U.S. Corporate High Yield 2% Issuer Capped Index)	2.38	(1.08)

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

THIS PAGE NOT PART OF YOUR FUND REPORT

3

Municipal Market Overview

For the Reporting Period Ended April 30, 2016

Municipal Market Conditions

Municipal bonds generated positive performance for the period, due to falling interest rates and a favorable supply-and-demand environment. Interest rates were volatile in 2015 (bond prices rise as rates fall) leading up to a long-awaited rate hike from the U.S. Federal Reserve (the Fed) that ultimately came in December. However, ongoing reassurance from the Fed that rates would be increased gradually and would likely remain low overall resulted in strong demand for fixed income investments, with municipal bonds being one of the strongest-performing sectors for the 12-month period. Investors favored the relative stability of municipal bonds amid bouts of volatility resulting from uneven U.S. economic data, falling oil prices, global growth concerns, geopolitical risks, and widening central bank divergence i.e., policy easing outside the United States while the Fed was posturing to commence policy tightening. During the 12 months ended April 30, 2016, municipal bond funds garnered net inflows of approximately \$27 billion (based on data from the Investment Company Institute).

For the same 12-month period, total new issuance remained relatively strong from a historical perspective at \$380 billion (though lower than the \$397 billion issued in the prior 12-month period). A noteworthy portion of new supply during this period was attributable to refinancing activity (roughly 58%) as issuers took advantage of low interest rates and a flatter yield curve to reduce their borrowing costs.

S&P Municipal Bond Index	
Total Returns as of April 30, 2016	
6 months:	3.52%
12 months:	5.16%

A Closer Look at Yields

From April 30, 2015 to April 30, 2016, yields on AAA-rated 30-year municipal bonds decreased by 47 basis points (bps) from 3.05% to 2.58%, while 10-year rates fell by 51 bps from 2.12% to 1.61% and 5-year rates decreased 32 bps from 1.30% to 0.98% (as measured by Thomson Municipal Market Data). The municipal yield curve experienced significant flattening over the 12-month period with the spread between 2- and 30-year maturities flattening by 58 bps and the spread between 2- and 10-year maturities flattening by 62 bps.

During the same time period, on a relative basis, tax-exempt municipal bonds broadly outperformed U.S. Treasuries with the greatest outperformance experienced in longer-term issues. In absolute terms, the positive performance of municipal bonds was driven largely by falling interest rates as well as a supply/demand imbalance within the municipal market as investors sought income and incremental yield in an environment where opportunities became increasingly scarce. More broadly, municipal bonds benefited from the greater appeal of tax-exempt investing in light of the higher tax rates implemented in 2014. The asset class is known for its lower relative volatility and preservation of principal with an emphasis on income as tax rates rise.

Financial Conditions of Municipal Issuers

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

The opinions expressed are those of BlackRock as of April 30, 2016, 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.

Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

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

The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging

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

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

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

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

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

Leverage also generally causes greater changes in the Trusts' NAVs, market prices and dividend rates than comparable portfolios without leverage. In a declining market, leverage is likely to cause a greater decline in the net asset value and market price of a Trust's Common Shares than if the Trusts were not leveraged. In addition, the Trusts 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. The Trusts 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. 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 advisor will be higher than if the Trusts did not use leverage.

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

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

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

Derivative Financial Instruments

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

transaction or illiquidity of the instrument. The Trusts' successful use of a derivative financial instrument depends on the investment advisor'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.

Trust Summary as of April 30, 2016

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.

Trust Information

Symbol on New York Stock Exchange (NYSE)	BKN
Initial Offering Date	February 19, 1993
Yield on Closing Market Price as of April 30, 2016 (\$16.94) ¹	5.24%
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	9.26%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.074
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.888
Economic Leverage as of April 30, 2016 ⁴	35%

¹ 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 marginal federal tax rate of 43.4%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.

³ The monthly distribution per Common Share, declared on June 1, 2016, was decreased to \$0.072 per share. The yield on closing market price, current monthly distribution per Common Share and current annualized distribution per Common Share do not reflect the new distribution rate. The new distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change in the future.

⁴ 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 12 months ended April 30, 2016 were as follows:

	Returns Based On	
	Market Price	NAV
BKN ^{1,2}	15.15%	10.92%
Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) ³	13.64%	8.61%

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

Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

² The Trust moved from a discount to NAV to a premium during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.

³ Average return.

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

A positive interest-rate backdrop helped fuel a robust gain for the U.S. municipal bond market during the annual period. U.S. Treasury yields fell (as prices rose) amid an environment of slow global growth, declining yields overseas, and an emerging consensus that the Fed would maintain a gradual approach to raising short-term interest rates. Municipals generally outperformed Treasuries, reflecting favorable supply-and-demand conditions in the market and the overall health of state and local finances outside of select areas such as Puerto Rico, Illinois and New Jersey. Longer-term municipal bonds outpaced their short-term counterparts, while lower-quality securities typically outperformed higher-quality issues.

With this as the backdrop, the Trust's holdings in longer-duration and longer-dated bonds generally provided the best returns. (Duration is a measure of interest-rate sensitivity.) The Trust's allocations to the tax-backed (states, local and school districts), health care and transportation sectors were positive contributors to performance. Positions in zero-coupon bonds, which delivered outstanding returns compared to current-coupon issues, also contributed. Consistent with the broader market environment, the strongest returns came from the Trust's holdings in higher-yielding, lower-rated investment-grade credits. With that said, positions in high-quality, pre-refunded bonds also contributed positively to performance.

Income in the form of coupon payments made up a meaningful portion of the Trust's total return for the period. In addition, the Trust's minimal cash position and use of leverage provided both incremental return and income.

The Trust's use of U.S. Treasury futures contracts to manage interest rate risk had a slightly negative impact on performance due to the overall strength in the market.

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.

BlackRock Investment Quality Municipal Trust, Inc.

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	4/30/16	4/30/15	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 16.94	\$ 15.60	8.59%	\$ 17.36	\$ 14.44
Net Asset Value	\$ 16.83	\$ 16.09	4.60%	\$ 16.85	\$ 15.68

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

Overview of the Trust's Total Investments*

Sector Allocation	4/30/16	4/30/15
Health	23%	23%
County/City/Special District/School District	16	15
Education	15	17
Transportation	14	12
Utilities	12	12
State	10	12
Corporate	7	6
Tobacco	3	3

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

Call/Maturity Schedule³

Calendar Year Ended December 31,

2016	4%
2017	1
2018	7
2019	9
2020	9

³ 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 ¹	4/30/16	4/30/15
AAA/Aaa	6%	5%
AA/Aa	46	46
A	28	31
BBB/Baa	11	9
BB/Ba	2	2
B	1	1

Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

N/R²

6

6

- ¹ For financial reporting purposes, credit quality ratings shown above reflect the highest rating assigned by either Standard & Poor's (S&P) or Moody's Investors Service (Moody's) if ratings differ. These rating agencies are independent, nationally recognized statistical rating organizations and are widely used. Investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BBB/Baa or higher. Below investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BB/Ba or lower. Investments designated N/R are not rated by either rating agency. Unrated investments do not necessarily indicate low credit quality. Credit quality ratings are subject to change.
- ² The investment advisor evaluates the credit quality of unrated investments based upon certain factors including, but not limited to, credit ratings for similar investments and financial analysis of sectors and individual investments. Using this approach, the investment advisor has deemed certain of these unrated securities as investment grade quality. As of April 30, 2016 and April 30, 2015, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment advisor to be investment grade represents less than 1% and 3%, respectively, of the Trust's total investments.

ANNUAL REPORT

APRIL 30, 2016

7

Trust Summary as of April 30, 2016

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 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.

Trust Information

Symbol on NYSE	BTA
Initial Offering Date	February 28, 2006
Yield on Closing Market Price as of April 30, 2016 (\$12.28) ¹	5.67%
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	10.02%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.058
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.696
Economic Leverage as of April 30, 2016 ⁴	37%

¹ 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 marginal federal tax rate of 43.4%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.

³ The monthly distribution per Common Share, declared on June 1, 2016, was decreased to \$0.0545 per share. The yield on closing market price, current monthly distribution per Common Share and current annualized distribution per Common Share do not reflect the new distribution rate. The new distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change in the future.

⁴ 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 12 months ended April 30, 2016 were as follows:

	Returns Based On	
	Market Price	NAV
BTA ^{1,2}	14.39%	9.51%
Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) ³	13.64%	8.61%

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

Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

² The Trust's discount to NAV, which narrowed during the period, accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.

³ Average return.

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

A positive interest-rate backdrop helped fuel a robust gain for the U.S. municipal bond market during the annual period. U.S. Treasury yields fell (as prices rose) amid an environment of slow global growth, declining yields overseas, and an emerging consensus that the Fed would maintain a gradual approach to raising short-term interest rates. Municipals generally outperformed Treasuries, reflecting favorable supply-and-demand conditions in the market and the overall health of state and local finances outside of select areas such as Puerto Rico, Illinois and New Jersey. Longer-term municipal bonds outpaced their short-term counterparts, while lower-quality securities typically outperformed higher-quality issues.

Income in the form of coupon payments made up a meaningful portion of the Trust's total return for the period. In addition, the Trust's use of leverage provided both incremental return and income in a relatively stable rate environment. The Trust's duration positioning, highlighted by concentrations in longer-dated securities with maturities of 25 years and above, was helpful to performance as well. (Duration is a measure of interest-rate sensitivity.)

The Trust's concentration in securities rated A and AA helped performance, as both credit tiers outpaced issues rated AAA. Similarly, holdings in bonds rated below investment grade (i.e., below BBB) also had a positive impact on results due to the combination of their higher yields and strong relative price performance.

On a sector basis, utilities, health care and transportation were top performers for the period.

Despite offering generous yields in comparison to the broader market, the Trust's more-seasoned holdings detracted from performance due to the premium amortization that occurred as the bonds approached their first call dates. (When a bond's price trades at a premium over its face value, the difference is amortized over time. A bond premium occurs when the price of the bond has increased due to a decline in interest rates.)

The Trust's yield curve positioning also detracted somewhat given the more substantive decline in intermediate-term yields versus the longer maturities in which the portfolio is largely concentrated.

The Trust's use of U.S. Treasury futures contracts to manage interest rate risk had a slightly negative impact on its return due to the overall strength in the market.

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.

BlackRock Long-Term Municipal Advantage Trust

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	4/30/16	4/30/15	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 12.28	\$ 11.41	7.62%	\$ 12.33	\$ 10.67
Net Asset Value	\$ 12.89	\$ 12.51	3.04%	\$ 12.89	\$ 12.19

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

Overview of the Trust's Total Investments*

Sector Allocation	4/30/16	4/30/15
Health	19%	21%
Utilities	16	19
Transportation	15	16
County/City/Special District/School District	12	9
Education	11	10
Tobacco	10	5
State	8	12
Corporate	8	7
Housing	1	1

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

Call/Maturity Schedule³

Calendar Year Ended December 31,

2016	5%
2017	4
2018	2
2019	12
2020	11

³ 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 Allocation¹

	4/30/16	4/30/15
AAA/Aaa	5%	14%
AA/Aa	42	51
A	16	14
BBB/Baa	16	10
BB/Ba	7	2
B	4	2

Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

N/R²

10

7

- ¹ For financial reporting purposes, credit quality ratings shown above reflect the highest rating assigned by either S&P or Moody 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.

- ² The investment advisor evaluates the credit quality of unrated investments based upon certain factors including, but not limited to, credit ratings for similar investments and financial analysis of sectors and individual investments. Using this approach, the investment advisor has deemed certain of these unrated securities as investment grade quality. As of April 30, 2016 and April 30, 2015, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment advisor to be investment grade each represents 1% of the Trust's total investments.

ANNUAL REPORT

APRIL 30, 2016

9

Trust Summary as of April 30, 2016

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.

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

Trust Information

Symbol on NYSE	BKK
Initial Offering Date	September 30, 2003
Termination Date (on or about)	December 31, 2020
Yield on Closing Market Price as of April 30, 2016 (\$16.14) ¹	3.33%
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	5.88%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.0448
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.5376
Economic Leverage as of April 30, 2016 ⁴	10%

- ¹ 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 marginal federal tax rate of 43.4%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.
- ³ The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- ⁴ Represents AMPS and TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including any assets attributable to AMPS 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 12 months ended April 30, 2016 were as follows:

	Returns Based On	
	Market Price	NAV
BKK ^{1,2}	2.87%	3.39%
Lipper Intermediate Municipal Debt Funds ³	9.22%	6.57%

- ¹ All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions.

Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

² 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.

³ Average return.

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

A positive interest-rate backdrop helped fuel a robust gain for the U.S. municipal bond market during the annual period. U.S. Treasury yields fell (as prices rose) amid an environment of slow global growth, declining yields overseas, and an emerging consensus that the Fed would maintain a gradual approach to raising short-term interest rates. Municipals generally outperformed Treasuries, reflecting favorable supply-and-demand conditions in the market and the overall health of state and local finances outside of select areas such as Puerto Rico, Illinois and New Jersey. Longer-term municipal bonds outpaced their short-term counterparts, while lower-quality securities typically outperformed higher-quality issues.

On a sector basis, the largest contributions to Trust performance came from transportation, corporate and health care issues. Exposure to lower-quality bonds on the investment-grade spectrum further benefited results at a time of elevated investor demand for higher-risk, higher-yielding assets. Positions in zero-coupon bonds, which delivered superior returns compared to current-coupon issues, also contributed positively.

Income in the form of coupon payments made up a meaningful portion of the Trust's total return for the period. In addition, the Trust's minimal cash position and use of leverage provided both incremental return and income.

The yield curve flattened during the period, with intermediate- and long-term rates falling and one- and two-year rates moving higher in reaction to the Fed's quarter-point interest rate hike in December 2015. The Trust's holdings are largely concentrated in maturities of five years or less, meaning that it had exposure to the underperformance of bonds with one- and two-year maturities.

Despite offering generous yields in comparison to the broader market, the Trust's more-seasoned holdings detracted from performance due to the premium amortization that occurred as the bonds approached their first call dates. (When a bond's price trades at a premium over its face value, the difference is amortized over time. A bond premium occurs when the price of the bond has increased due to a decline in interest rates.)

In terms of sectors, the smallest contributions came from housing, local school district and tobacco issues.

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.

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	4/30/16	4/30/15	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 16.14	\$ 16.25	(0.68)%	\$ 16.28	\$ 15.25
Net Asset Value	\$ 16.27	\$ 16.30	(0.18)%	\$ 16.38	\$ 16.03

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

Overview of the Trust's Total Investments*

Sector Allocation	4/30/16	4/30/15
Utilities	17%	16%
Transportation	15	17
County/City/Special District/School District	14	12
State	13	12
Health	12	11
Corporate	12	14
Education	10	9
Tobacco	4	4
Housing	3	5

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

Call/Maturity Schedule³

Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2016	6%
2017	5
2018	3
2019	18
2020	46

³ 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 Allocation¹

	4/30/16	4/30/15
AAA/Aaa	6%	6%
AA/Aa	25	22
A	37	45

Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

BBB/Baa	19	17
BB/Ba	4	2
B		1
N/R ²	9	7

¹ 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.

² The investment advisor evaluates the credit quality of unrated investments based upon certain factors including, but not limited to, credit ratings for similar investments and financial analysis of sectors and individual investments. Using this approach, the investment advisor has deemed certain of these unrated securities as investment grade quality. As of April 30, 2016 and April 30, 2015, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment advisor to be investment grade represents 4% and 2%, respectively, of the Trust's total investments.

Trust Summary as of April 30, 2016

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.

Trust Information

Symbol on NYSE	BFK
Initial Offering Date	July 27, 2001
Yield on Closing Market Price as of April 30, 2016 (\$15.44) ¹	5.84%
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	10.32%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.0751
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.9012
Economic Leverage as of April 30, 2016 ⁴	37%

¹ 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 marginal federal tax rate of 43.4%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.

³ The monthly distribution per Common Share, declared on June 1, 2016, was decreased to \$0.0711 per share. The yield on closing market price, current monthly distribution per Common Share and current annualized distribution per Common Share do not reflect the new distribution rate. The new distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change in the future.

⁴ 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 12 months ended April 30, 2016 were as follows:

	Returns Based On	
	Market Price	NAV
BFK ^{1,2}	14.76%	8.57%
Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) ³	13.64%	8.61%

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

Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

² The Trust moved from a discount to NAV to a premium during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.

³ Average return.

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

A positive interest-rate backdrop helped fuel a robust gain for the U.S. municipal bond market during the annual period. U.S. Treasury yields fell (as prices rose) amid an environment of slow global growth, declining yields overseas, and an emerging consensus that the Fed would maintain a gradual approach to raising short-term interest rates. Municipals generally outperformed Treasuries, reflecting favorable supply-and-demand conditions in the market and the overall health of state and local finances outside of select areas such as Puerto Rico, Illinois and New Jersey. Longer-term municipal bonds outpaced their short-term counterparts, while lower-quality securities typically outperformed higher-quality issues.

Income in the form of coupon payments made up a meaningful portion of the Trust's total return for the period. In addition, the Trust's minimal cash position and use of leverage provided both incremental return and income.