

BLACKROCK CALIFORNIA MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST
Form N-CSRS
April 04, 2018

UNITED STATES

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM N-CSR

**CERTIFIED SHAREHOLDER REPORT OF REGISTERED MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT
COMPANIES**

Investment Company Act file number 811-10331

Name of Fund: BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

Fund Address: 100 Bellevue Parkway, Wilmington, DE 19809

Name and address of agent for service: John M. Perlowski, Chief Executive Officer, BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust, 55 East 52nd Street, New York, NY 10055

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

Date of fiscal year end: 07/31/2018

Date of reporting period: 01/31/2018

Item 1 Report to Stockholders

JANUARY 31, 2018

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT (UNAUDITED)

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust (BFO)

BlackRock Municipal 2030 Target Term Trust (BTT)

BlackRock Municipal Income Investment Trust (BBF)

BlackRock New Jersey Municipal Income Trust (BNJ)

BlackRock New York Municipal Income Trust (BNY)

**Not FDIC Insured May Lose Value No Bank
Guarantee**

The Markets in Review

Dear Shareholder,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

Total Returns as of January 31, 2018

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

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

Table of Contents

	Page
<u>The Markets in Review</u>	2
Semi-Annual Report:	
<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
Financial Statements:	
<u>Schedules of Investments</u>	18
<u>Statements of Assets and Liabilities</u>	52
<u>Statements of Operations</u>	54
<u>Statements of Changes in Net Assets</u>	56
<u>Statements of Cash Flows</u>	59
<u>Financial Highlights</u>	60
<u>Notes to Financial Statements</u>	66
<u>Trustee and Officer Information</u>	76
<u>Additional Information</u>	77
<u>Glossary of Terms Used in this Report</u>	79

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

Municipal Market Conditions

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

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

A Closer Look at Yields**S&P Municipal Bond Index**

Total Returns as of January 31, 2018

6 months: 0.01%

12 months: 3.41%

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

During the same time period, on a relative basis, tax-exempt municipal bonds strongly outperformed U.S. Treasuries with the greatest outperformance experienced in the front and intermediate portions of the yield curve. Notably, January saw interest rates move rapidly higher alongside strong global growth and a more hawkish bias from global central banks. The relative positive performance of municipal bonds was driven largely by a supply/demand imbalance within the municipal market as investors sought income and incremental yield in an environment where opportunities became increasingly scarce. The asset class is known for its lower relative volatility and preservation of principal with an emphasis on income as tax rates rise.

Financial Conditions of Municipal Issuers

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

The opinions expressed are those of BlackRock as of January 31, 2018, and are subject to change at any time due to changes in market or economic conditions. The comments should not be construed as a recommendation of any individual holdings or market sectors. Investing involves risk including loss of principal. Bond values fluctuate in price so the value of your investment can go down depending on market conditions. Fixed income risks include interest-rate and credit risk. Typically, when interest rates rise, there is a corresponding decline in bond values. Credit risk refers to the possibility that the bond issuer will not be able to make principal and interest payments. There may be less information on the financial condition of municipal issuers than for public corporations. The market for municipal bonds may be less liquid than for taxable bonds. Some investors may be subject to Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT). Capital gains distributions, if any, are taxable.

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

The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging

The Trusts may utilize leverage to seek to enhance the distribution rate on, and net asset value (NAV) of, their common shares (Common Shares). However, there is no guarantee that these objectives can be achieved in all interest rate environments.

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

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

However, in order to benefit Common Shareholders, the return on assets purchased with leverage proceeds must exceed the ongoing costs associated with the leverage. If interest and other costs of leverage exceed the Trusts' return on assets purchased with leverage proceeds, income to shareholders is lower than if the Trusts had not used leverage. Furthermore, the value of the Trusts' portfolio investments generally varies inversely with the direction of long-term interest rates, although other factors can influence the value of portfolio investments. In contrast, the value of the Trusts' obligations under their respective leverage arrangements generally does not fluctuate in relation to interest rates. As a result, changes in interest rates can influence the Trusts' NAVs positively or negatively. Changes in the future direction of interest rates are very difficult to predict accurately, and there is no assurance that the Trusts' intended leveraging strategy will be successful.

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

To obtain leverage, each Trust has issued Variable Rate Demand Preferred Shares (VRDP Shares), Variable Rate Muni Term Preferred Shares (VMTP Shares), Remarketable Variable Rate Muni Term Preferred Shares (RVMTMTP Shares) (collectively, Preferred Shares) and/or leveraged its assets through the use of tender option bond trusts (TOB

Trusts) as described in the Notes to Financial Statements.

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

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

Derivative Financial Instruments

The Trusts may invest in various derivative financial instruments. These instruments are used to obtain exposure to a security, commodity, index, market, and/or other assets without owning or taking physical custody of securities, commodities and/or other referenced assets or to manage market, equity, credit, interest rate, foreign currency exchange rate, commodity and/or other risks. Derivative financial instruments may give rise to a form of economic leverage and involve risks, including the imperfect correlation between the value of a derivative financial instrument and the underlying asset, possible default of the counterparty to the transaction or illiquidity of the instrument. The Trusts' successful use of a derivative financial instrument depends on the investment adviser's ability to predict pertinent market movements accurately, which cannot be assured. The use of these instruments may result in losses greater than if they had not been used, may limit the amount of appreciation a Trust can realize on an investment and/or may result in lower distributions paid to shareholders. The Trusts' investments in these instruments, if any, are discussed in detail in the Notes to Financial Statements.

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust**Trust Overview**

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

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

Trust Information

Symbol on New York Stock Exchange (NYSE)	BFZ
Initial Offering Date	July 27, 2001
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2018 (\$13.34) ^(a)	4.95%
Tax Equivalent Yield ^(b)	10.78%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.0550
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.6600
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2018 ^(d)	42%

^(a) Yield on closing market price is calculated by dividing the current annualized distribution per share by the closing market price. Past performance does not guarantee future results.

^(b) Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal U.S. federal and state tax rate of 54.10%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.

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

^(d) Represents VMTP Shares and TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including any assets attributable to VMTP Shares and TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Trust, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

Performance

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

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

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

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

Past performance is not indicative of future results.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Trust sought to manage interest rate risk using U.S. Treasury futures. Given that Treasury yields rose, as prices fell, this aspect of the Trust's positioning had a positive effect on returns.

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

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

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018 (continued)

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

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

Market Price and Net Asset Value History For the Past Five Years**Overview of the Trust's Total Investments*****SECTOR ALLOCATION**

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

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

CALL /MATURITY SCHEDULE ^(c)

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

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

* Excludes short-term securities.

CREDIT QUALITY ALLOCATION ^(a)

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

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

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

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018

BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust**Trust Overview**

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

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

Trust Information

Symbol on NYSE	BFO
Initial Offering Date	September 30, 2003
Termination Date (on or about)	December 31, 2020
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2018 (\$14.33) ^(a)	2.18%
Tax Equivalent Yield ^(b)	3.68%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.0260
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ^(c)	\$0.3120
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2018 ^(d)	

^(a) Yield on closing market price is calculated by dividing the current annualized distribution per share by the closing market price. Past performance does not guarantee future results.

^(b) Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal U.S. federal tax rate of 40.80%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.

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

^(d) Percentage is less than 1% which represents TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including any assets attributable to TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Trust, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

Performance

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

Returns Based On

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

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

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

Past performance is not indicative of future results.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2018 (continued)

BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

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

Market Price and Net Asset Value History For the Past Five Years**Overview of the Trust's Total Investments*****SECTOR ALLOCATION**

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

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

CALL/MATURITY SCHEDULE^(d)

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