EATON VANCE OHIO MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST Form N-CSR January 26, 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: 811-09149** 

**Eaton Vance Ohio Municipal Income Trust** 

(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in Charter)

Two International Place, Boston, Massachusetts 02110

(Address of Principal Executive Offices)

Maureen A. Gemma

### Two International Place, Boston, Massachusetts 02110

(Name and Address of Agent for Services)

(617) 482-8260

(Registrant s Telephone Number)

November 30

**Date of Fiscal Year End** 

**November 30, 2017** 

**Date of Reporting Period** 

## **Item 1. Reports to Stockholders**

# **Municipal Income Trusts**

# Annual Report

November 30, 2017

California (CEV) Massachusetts (MMV) Michigan (EMI) New Jersey (EVJ)

New York (EVY) Ohio (EVO) Pennsylvania (EVP)

Commodity Futures Trading Commission Registration. Effective December 31, 2012, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) adopted certain regulatory changes that subject registered investment companies and advisers to regulation by the CFTC if a fund invests more than a prescribed level of its assets in certain CFTC-regulated instruments (including futures, certain options and swap agreements) or markets itself as providing investment exposure to such instruments. Each Fund has claimed an exclusion from the definition of the term—commodity pool operator—under the Commodity Exchange Act. Accordingly, neither the Funds nor the adviser with respect to the operation of the Funds is subject to CFTC regulation. Because of its management of other strategies, each Fund—s adviser is registered with the CFTC as a commodity pool operator and a commodity trading advisor.

Fund shares are not insured by the FDIC and are not deposits or other obligations of, or guaranteed by, any depository institution. Shares are subject to investment risks, including possible loss of principal invested.

### Annual Report November 30, 2017

## Eaton Vance

# **Municipal Income Trusts**

### **Table of Contents**

Management s Discussion of Fund Performance	
Performance and Fund Profile	
California Municipal Income Trust	4
Massachusetts Municipal Income Trust	5
Michigan Municipal Income Trust	6
New Jersey Municipal Income Trust	7 8
New York Municipal Income Trust Ohio Municipal Income Trust	9
Pennsylvania Municipal Income Trust	10
Endnotes and Additional Disclosures	11
Financial Statements	12
Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm	70
Federal Tax Information	71
Dividend Reinvestment Plan	72
Management and Organization	74
Important Notices	77

## **Municipal Income Trusts**

November 30, 2017

Management s Discussion of Fund Performance

#### **Economic and Market Conditions**

The fiscal year that began on December 1, 2016 was characterized by a significant flattening of the municipal bond yield curve and a rally in longer-term bonds that lasted for most of the period.

As the period opened, the municipal market was just recovering from one of its largest declines in at least two decades. In the wake of Donald Trump s surprise win in the November 2016 presidential election, rates had risen, the yield curve had steepened and bond prices had fallen as markets anticipated that decreasing regulation and lower tax rates under a Trump administration could lead to higher economic growth and inflation.

In December 2016, however, longer-term interest rates began to reverse direction—despite a Federal Reserve Board (the Fed) rate hike that month and two subsequent hikes in 2017 that put upward pressure on short-term rates. Mixed U.S. economic data, including anemic inflation, along with loss of confidence that the Trump administration could accomplish health care or tax reform, put downward pressure on long-term rates that would increase as the period wore on. As a result, municipal bonds rallied modestly in December 2016 and continued to stabilize during January and February 2017. From March through July 2017, long-term rates drifted downward and the yield curve flattened. In August and early September 2017, increasing geopolitical tension between the U.S. and North Korea led to a flight to quality that drove investors toward the perceived safety of U.S. Treasurys. Consequently, long-term rates declined further as Treasury prices rallied, and through October 2017, the municipal market rallied along with Treasurys. With the Fed pushing up on the short end of the yield curve and the market pushing down on the long end, the Treasury and municipal bond yield curves flattened dramatically.

In the final month of the period ended November 30, 2017, however, the municipal market experienced considerable volatility after the GOP-controlled House and Senate released their tax plan proposals. As it became apparent that various elements of the plans could reduce the amount of new municipal debt, issuers rushed to bring new bonds to market before a tax bill was enacted. Municipal prices fluctuated throughout November 2017 on uncertainty over which features of the tax plans would actually become law.

For the 12-month period ended November 30, 2017, the Bloomberg Barclays Municipal Bond Index (the Index).<sup>2</sup> a broad measure of the asset class, returned 5.58%. For the period as a whole, rates rose for municipal bonds with maturities of four years or less and declined for longer-term issues. The largest rate declines (and greatest price appreciation) occurred at the long end of the curve, causing the curve to flatten. As investors appeared to have a strong appetite for risk during the period, lower-rated bonds generally outperformed higher-rated issues. Across the curve, municipal bonds outperformed comparable U.S. Treasurys.

#### Fund Performance

For the fiscal year ended November 30, 2017, the Massachusetts and New York Trusts (the Funds) shares at net asset value (NAV) outperformed the 5.58% return of the Index, while the California, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio and Pennsylvania Funds at NAV underperformed the Index.

Each Fund s overall strategy is to invest primarily in investment grade bonds of the Fund s particular state. Management may hedge to various degrees against the greater potential risk of volatility caused by the use of leverage and by investing in bonds at the long end of the yield curve by using U.S. Treasury futures. As a risk management tactic within each Fund s overall strategy, interest rate hedging is intended to moderate performance on both the upside and the downside of the market. During this period of positive performance by municipal bonds, the Funds Treasury futures hedge mitigated some of the upside, and thus detracted from performance relative to the unhedged Index, for all Funds except

the Michigan and Ohio Funds, which did not use a hedging strategy during the period. As of period end, the California, Massachusetts and New York Funds did not have a hedging strategy in place.

In managing the Funds, management employs leverage through Residual Interest Bond (RIB) Financing and/or Auction Preferred Shares (APS) and Institutional MuniFund Term Preferred (iMTP) Shares<sup>6</sup> to seek to enhance the Funds—tax-exempt income. The use of leverage has the effect of achieving additional exposure to the municipal market, and thus magnifying a Fund—s exposure to its underlying investments in both up and down market environments. During this period of positive performance by municipal bonds, the use of leverage contributed to Fund performance versus the Index—which does not employ leverage—for all seven Funds.

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

## **Municipal Income Trusts**

November 30, 2017

Management s Discussion of Fund Performance continued

#### State-specific Results

Eaton Vance California Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 5.33%, underperforming the 5.58% return of the Index. Detractors from Fund performance versus the Index included the Fund s hedging strategy, as noted earlier, an overweight, relative to the Index, in prerefunded, or escrowed, bonds, and security selection in the electric utilities sector. In contrast, performance relative to the Index was helped by leverage, an overweight in zero-coupon bonds, which were the best-performing coupon structure in the Index during the period, and security selection in general obligation bonds.

Eaton Vance Massachusetts Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 6.28%, outperforming the 5.58% return of the Index. Leverage, an overweight and security selection in the education sector, and an overweight in BBB-rated bonds contributed to performance relative to the Index. The Fund s hedging strategy, an overweight in prerefunded bonds, and security selection in zero-coupon bonds all detracted from performance versus the Index.

Eaton Vance Michigan Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 5.51%, underperforming the 5.58% return of the Index. Detractors from performance relative to the Index included an overweight and security selection in insured Puerto Rico bonds, as well as an overweight in prerefunded bonds and an underweight in BBB-rated issues. In contrast, performance versus the Index was aided by leverage, security selection in general obligation bonds, and an overweight in the health care sector, which was the best-performing sector in the Index during the period.

Eaton Vance New Jersey Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 5.52%, underperforming the 5.58% return of the Index. Security selection in insured and uninsured Puerto Rico bonds, the Fund s hedging strategy, and an overweight in prerefunded bonds all detracted from Fund performance versus the Index. Contributors to the Fund s performance relative to the Index included leverage, an overweight in zero-coupon bonds, and an overweight in bonds with 17 or more years remaining to maturity.

Eaton Vance New York Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 5.84%, outperforming the 5.58% return of the Index. Leverage aided performance relative to the Index, as did an overweight in zero-coupon bonds and an overweight and

security selection in the health care sector. Detractors from performance versus the Index included the Fund s hedging strategy, an overweight in prerefunded bonds, and security selection in bonds with 17 or more years remaining to maturity.

Eaton Vance Ohio Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 4.37%, underperforming the 5.58% return of the Index. Performance versus the Index was hurt by an overweight in prerefunded bonds, security selection in insured Puerto Rico bonds, and security selection in AA-rated bonds. Contributors to results versus the Index included leverage, an overweight in zero-coupon bonds, an overweight in the health care sector, and security selection in local general obligation bonds.

Eaton Vance Pennsylvania Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 3.17%, underperforming the 5.58% return of the Index. An overweight and security selection in insured Puerto Rico bonds, an overweight in prerefunded bonds, and an overweight in bonds with less than two years remaining to maturity all detracted from Fund performance versus the Index. Contributors to performance relative to the Index included leverage, an overweight in the education sector, security selection in local general obligation bonds, and an overweight in the health care sector.

Each Fund s insured Puerto Rico holdings were insured by various municipal bond insurers. It should be noted that most uninsured bonds issued by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and its various conduit issuers were no longer included in the Index. As Puerto Rico continued to deal

with an ongoing fiscal crisis, bonds issued by its various legal entities were impacted by a number of factors throughout the period, including monetary default. As the period ended, Puerto Rico continued to negotiate with creditors and address its current debt structure under the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (PROMESA) passed by the U.S. Congress.

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

# California Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2017

Performance<sup>2,3</sup>

Portfolio Manager Craig R. Brandon, CFA

% Average Annual Total Returns	<b>Inception Date</b>	One Year	Five Years	Ten Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	5.33%	4.09%	5.16%
Fund at Market Price		2.34	1.34	5.23
Bloomberg Barclays Municipal Bond Index		5.58%	2.55%	4.37%
Bloomberg Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		8.23	3.63	5.17
% Premium/Discount to NAV <sup>4</sup>				
// Tremum/Discount to NAV				12.42%
				1211270
Distributions <sup>5</sup>				
Total Distributions per share for the period				\$0.495
Distribution Rate at NAV				3.23%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV				6.58%
Distribution Rate at Market Price				3.69%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price				7.52%
% Total Leverage <sup>6</sup>				
Auction Preferred Shares (APS)				1.91%
Institutional MuniFund Term Preferred (iMTP) Shares				29.87
Residual Interest Bond (RIB) Financing				4.66
Fund Profile				

Credit Quality (% of total investments)<sup>7,8</sup>

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

Past performance is no guarantee of future results. Returns are historical and are calculated by determining the percentage change in net asset value (NAV) or market price (as applicable) with all distributions reinvested and include management fees and other expenses. Fund performance at market price will differ from its results at NAV due to factors such as changing perceptions about the Fund, market conditions, fluctuations in supply and demand for Fund shares, or changes in Fund distributions. Investment return and principal value will fluctuate so that shares, when sold, may be worth more or less than their original cost. Performance less than or equal to one year is cumulative. Performance is for the stated time period only; due to market volatility, current Fund performance may be lower or higher than the quoted return. For performance as of the most recent month-end, please refer to eatonvance.com.

4

# Massachusetts Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2017

Performance<sup>2,3</sup>

Portfolio Manager Craig R. Brandon, CFA

% Average Annual Total Returns	Inception Date	One Year	Five Years	Ten Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	6.28%	3.13%	5.60%
Fund at Market Price		2.29	0.36	5.64
Bloomberg Barclays Municipal Bond Index		5.58%	2.55%	4.37%
Bloomberg Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		8.23	3.63	5.17

#### % Premium/Discount to NAV4

11.88%

Distri	bution	<sub>S</sub> 5

Distributions	
Total Distributions per share for the period	\$0.521
Distribution Rate at NAV	3.13%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV	5.83%
Distribution Rate at Market Price	3.55%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price	6.61%

### % Total Leverage<sup>6</sup>

APS	5.27%
iMTP Shares	27.22
RIB Financing	1.47

Fund Profile

Credit Quality (% of total investments)<sup>7,8</sup>

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

# Michigan Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2017

Performance<sup>2,3</sup>

Portfolio Manager Cynthia J. Clemson

% Average Annual Total Returns	<b>Inception Date</b>	One Year	Five Years	Ten Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	5.51%	4.46%	6.11%
Fund at Market Price		3.72	2.56	6.34
Bloomberg Barclays Municipal Bond Index		5.58%	2.55%	4.37%
Bloomberg Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		8.23	3.63	5.17
% Premium/Discount to NAV <sup>4</sup>				
				12.47%
Distributions <sup>5</sup>				
Total Distributions per share for the period				\$0.486
Distribution Rate at NAV				3.18%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV				5.87%
Distribution Rate at Market Price				3.63%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price				6.70%
% Total Leverage <sup>6</sup>				
APS				1.38%
iMTP Shares Fund Profile				35.69

Credit Quality (% of total investments)<sup>7</sup>

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

# New Jersey Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2017

Performance<sup>2,3</sup>

Portfolio Manager Adam A. Weigold, CFA

% Average Annual Total Returns	<b>Inception Date</b>	One Year	Five Years	Ten Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	5.52%	3.75%	5.13%
Fund at Market Price		2.91	1.19	5.26
Bloomberg Barclays Municipal Bond Index		5.58%	2.55%	4.37%
Bloomberg Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		8.23	3.63	5.17
% Premium/Discount to NAV <sup>4</sup>				
				13.22%
Distributions <sup>5</sup>				
Total Distributions per share for the period				\$0.555
Distribution Rate at NAV				4.05%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV				7.86%
Distribution Rate at Market Price				4.67%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price				9.06%
% Total Leverage <sup>6</sup>				
APS				4.38%
iMTP Shares				28.71
RIB Financing				5.28
Fund Profile				

Credit Quality (% of total investments)<sup>7,8</sup>

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

# New York Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2017

Performance<sup>2,3</sup>

Portfolio Manager Craig R. Brandon, CFA

% Average Annual Total Returns	Inception Date	One Year	Five Years	Ten Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	5.84%	3.94%	5.62%
Fund at Market Price		2.56	0.91	5.28
Bloomberg Barclays Municipal Bond Index		5.58%	2.55%	4.37%
Bloomberg Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		8.23	3.63	5.17

#### % Premium/Discount to NAV4

10.39%

Distributions	
Total Distributions per share for the period	\$0.605
Distribution Rate at NAV	4.21%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV	8.16%
Distribution Rate at Market Price	4.70%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price	9.11%

#### % Total Leverage<sup>6</sup>

APS	3.22%
iMTP Shares	23.13
RIB Financing	12.67

Fund Profile

Credit Quality (% of total investments)<sup>7,8</sup>

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

# Ohio Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2017

Performance<sup>2,3</sup>

#### Portfolio Manager Cynthia J. Clemson

% Average Annual Total Returns	<b>Inception Date</b>	One Year	Five Years	Ten Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	4.37%	3.80%	5.80%
Fund at Market Price		2.23	0.37	6.15
Bloomberg Barclays Municipal Bond Index		5.58%	2.55%	4.37%
Bloomberg Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		8.23	3.63	5.17

#### % Premium/Discount to NAV4

10.43%

			_
Dia	mih	utio	ma5
17151	,	ulk	115-

Distributions	
Total Distributions per share for the period	\$0.582
Distribution Rate at NAV	3.64%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV	6.77%
Distribution Rate at Market Price	4.07%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price	7.57%

### % Total Leverage<sup>6</sup>

APS	6.49%
iMTP Shares	27.61
RIB Financing	2.18

Fund Profile

Credit Quality (% of total investments)<sup>7,8</sup>

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

# Pennsylvania Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2017

Performance<sup>2,3</sup>

Portfolio Manager Adam A. Weigold, CFA

% Average Annual Total Returns	<b>Inception Date</b>	One Year	Five Years	Ten Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	3.17%	3.84%	5.13%
Fund at Market Price		2.62	1.06	5.49
Bloomberg Barclays Municipal Bond Index		5.58%	2.55%	4.37%
Bloomberg Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		8.23	3.63	5.17

### % Premium/Discount to NAV<sup>4</sup>

10.78%

Distributions <sup>5</sup>	
Total Distributions per share for the period	\$0.517
Distribution Rate at NAV	3.73%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV	6.80%
Distribution Rate at Market Price	4.18%
Tayabla Equivalent Distribution Pate at Market Price	7.62%

% Total Leverage <sup>6</sup>	
APS	7.45%
iMTP Shares	30.10

Fund Profile

Credit Quality (% of total investments)<sup>7</sup>

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

## **Municipal Income Trusts**

November 30, 2017

**Endnotes and Additional Disclosures** 

- The views expressed in this report are those of the portfolio manager(s) and are current only through the date stated at the top of this page. These views are subject to change at any time based upon market or other conditions, and Eaton Vance and the Fund(s) disclaim any responsibility to update such views. These views may not be relied upon as investment advice and, because investment decisions are based on many factors, may not be relied upon as an indication of trading intent on behalf of any Eaton Vance fund. This commentary may contain statements that are not historical facts, referred to as forward looking statements. The Fund s actual future results may differ significantly from those stated in any forward looking statement, depending on factors such as changes in securities or financial markets or general economic conditions, the volume of sales and purchases of Fund shares, the continuation of investment advisory, administrative and service contracts, and other risks discussed from time to time in the Fund s filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission.
- <sup>2</sup> Bloomberg Barclays Municipal Bond Index is an unmanaged index of municipal bonds traded in the U.S. Bloomberg Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index is an unmanaged index of municipal bonds traded in the U.S. with maturities of 22 years or more. Unless otherwise stated, index returns do not reflect the effect of any applicable sales charges, commissions, expenses, taxes or leverage, as applicable. It is not possible to invest directly in an index.
- <sup>3</sup> Performance results reflect the effects of leverage. Performance since inception for an index, if presented, is the performance since the Fund s or oldest share class inception, as applicable. Included in the average annual total return at NAV for the five and ten year periods is the impact of the tender and repurchase of a portion of the Fund s APS at 95.5% of the Fund s APS per share liquidation preference. Had this transaction not occurred, the total return at NAV would be lower for the Fund.
- <sup>4</sup> The shares of the Fund often trade at a discount or premium from their net asset value. The discount or premium of the Fund may vary over time and may be higher or lower than what is quoted in this report. For up-to-date premium/discount information, please refer to http://eatonvance.com/closedend.
- <sup>5</sup> The Distribution Rate is based on the Fund s last regular distribution per share in the period (annualized) divided by the Fund s NAV or market price at the end of the period. The Fund s distributions may be comprised of amounts characterized for federal income tax purposes as tax-exempt income, qualified and non-qualified ordinary dividends, capital gains and nondividend distributions, also known as return of capital. The Fund will determine the federal income tax character of distributions paid to a shareholder after the end of the calendar year. This is reported on the IRS form 1099-DIV and provided to the shareholder shortly after each year-end. For information about the tax character of distributions made in prior calendar years, please refer to Performance-Tax Character of Distributions on the Fund s webpage available at eatonvance.com. The Fund s distributions are determined by the investment adviser based on its current assessment of the Fund s long-term return potential. Fund distributions may be affected by numerous factors including changes in Fund performance, the cost of financing for
  - Funds that employ leverage, portfolio holdings, realized and projected returns, and other factors. As portfolio and market conditions change, the rate of distributions paid by the Fund could change. Taxable-equivalent performance is based on the highest combined federal and state income tax rates, where applicable. Lower tax rates would result in lower tax-equivalent performance. Actual tax rates will vary depending on your income, exemptions and deductions. Rates do not include local taxes.
- <sup>6</sup> Fund employs RIB financing and/or APS and iMTP Shares leverage. The leverage created by RIB investments, APS and iMTP Shares provides an opportunity for increased income but, at the same time, creates special risks (including the likelihood of greater price volatility). The cost of leverage rises and falls with changes in short-term interest rates. See Floating Rate Notes Issued in Conjunction with Securities Held in the notes to the financial statements for more information about RIB financing. RIB leverage represents the amount of Floating Rate Notes outstanding at period end as a percentage of Fund net assets applicable to common shares plus APS, iMTP Shares and Floating Rate Notes. APS leverage represents the liquidation value of the Fund s iMTP Shares outstanding at period end as a percentage of Fund net assets applicable to common shares plus APS, iMTP Shares and Floating Rate Notes. The Fund may be required to maintain prescribed asset coverage for its leverage and may be required to reduce its leverage at

an inopportune time.

- Ratings are based on Moody s, S&P or Fitch, as applicable. If securities are rated differently by the ratings agencies, the highest rating is applied. Ratings, which are subject to change, apply to the creditworthiness of the issuers of the underlying securities and not to the Fund or its shares. Credit ratings measure the quality of a bond based on the issuer s creditworthiness, with ratings ranging from AAA, being the highest, to D, being the lowest based on S&P s measures. Ratings of BBB or higher by S&P or Fitch (Baa or higher by Moody s) are considered to be investment-grade quality. Credit ratings are based largely on the ratings agency s analysis at the time of rating. The rating assigned to any particular security is not necessarily a reflection of the issuer s current financial condition and does not necessarily reflect its assessment of the volatility of a security s market value or of the liquidity of an investment in the security. Holdings designated as Not Rated are not rated by the national ratings agencies stated above.
- 8 The chart includes the municipal bonds held by a trust that issues residual interest bonds, consistent with the Portfolio of Investments.

Fund profile subject to change due to active management. Important Notice to Shareholders

Effective September 30, 2017, the Funds benchmark was changed to the Bloomberg Barclays Municipal Bond Index.

11

# California Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2017

Portfolio of Investments

Tax-Exempt Municipal Securities 148.1%

Security	Principal Amount (000 s omitted) Value
Education 8.8%  California Educational Facilities Authority, (Harvey Mudd College), 5.25%, 12/1/31  California Educational Facilities Authority, (Harvey Mudd College), 5.25%, 12/1/36  California Educational Facilities Authority, (Loyola Marymount University), 5.00%, 10/1/30  California Educational Facilities Authority, (Santa Clara University), 5.00%, 9/1/23  California Educational Facilities Authority, (University of San Francisco), 6.125%, 10/1/36  California Educational Facilities Authority, (University of the Pacific), 5.00%, 11/1/30  California Municipal Finance Authority, (University of San Diego), 5.00%, 10/1/31  California Municipal Finance Authority, (University of San Diego), 5.00%, 10/1/35  California Municipal Finance Authority, (University of San Diego), 5.25%, 10/1/26  California Municipal Finance Authority, (University of San Diego), 5.25%, 10/1/27  California Municipal Finance Authority, (University of San Diego), 5.25%, 10/1/28  University of California, Prerefunded to 5/15/19, 5.25%, 5/15/39  University of California, Prerefunded to 5/15/19, 5.25%, 5/15/39	\$ 195 \$ 220,800 330 370,814 745 784,835 1,600 1,820,640 235 273,061 630 694,210 415 462,074 285 316,324 810 911,226 850 954,882 895 1,004,029 205 215,873 690 727,101
	\$ 8,755,869
Electric Utilities 8.1% Chula Vista, (San Diego Gas and Electric), 5.875%, 2/15/34 Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Electric System Revenue, 5.25%, 7/1/32 Northern California Power Agency, 5.25%, 8/1/24 Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 5.00%, 8/15/27 Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 5.00%, 8/15/28 Southern California Public Power Authority, (Tieton Hydropower), 5.00%, 7/1/35 Vernon, Electric System Revenue, 5.125%, 8/1/21	\$ 270 \$ 287,237 2,170 2,221,451 1,500 1,613,670 995 1,112,529 1,335 1,492,183 680 734,325 635 670,509 \$ 8,131,904
Escrowed / Prerefunded 11.8% California Department of Water Resources, Prerefunded to 6/1/18, 5.00%, 12/1/29 California Educational Facilities Authority, (Claremont McKenna College), Prerefunded to 1/1/19, 5.00%, 1/1/39  Security	\$ 715 \$ 728,456 3,135 3,253,942 Principal Amount (000 s omitted) Value
Escrowed / Prerefunded (continued) California Educational Facilities Authority, (University of Southern California), Prerefunded to 10/1/18, 5.25%, 10/1/39 California Health Facilities Financing Authority, (Providence Health System), Prerefunded to 10/1/18, 6.50%, 10/1/38	\$ 2,490 \$ 2,571,871 1,475 1,539,207

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Prerefunded to 8/15/21, 5.00%, 8/15/27	40	380,552
Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Prerefunded to 8/15/21, 5.00%, 8/15/28	60	514,864
San Mateo Union High School District, (Election of 2006), Prerefunded to 9/1/23, 5.00%, 9/1/27	65	779,380
San Mateo Union High School District, (Election of 2006), Prerefunded to 9/1/23, 5.00%, 9/1/28	30	1,324,360
University of California, Prerefunded to 5/15/19, 5.25%, 5/15/39	55	373,829
Vernon, Electric System Revenue, Prerefunded to 8/1/19, 5.125%, 8/1/21	75	286,952

\$ 11,753,413

General Obligations 38.3%		
Alta Loma School District, (Election of 2016), 5.00%, 8/1/42	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,765,020
California, 5.00%, 10/1/31	1,885	2,213,819
California, 5.50%, 11/1/35	1,600	1,775,152
California, 6.00%, 4/1/38	750	793,890
Castro Valley Unified School District, (Election of 2016), 5.00%, 8/1/41	1,000	1,174,800
Escondido, 5.00%, 9/1/36	1,000	1,149,870
Glendale Community College District, (Election of 2016), 5.00%, 8/1/37	2,000	2,368,160
Montebello Unified School District, (Election of 2016), 5.00%, 8/1/41	2,000	2,322,800
Napa Valley Unified School District, 5.00%, 8/1/41	2,885	3,389,298
Palo Alto, (Election of 2008), 5.00%, 8/1/40	3,655	3,953,211
Redondo Beach Unified School District, (Election of 2012), 4.00%, 8/1/40	1,000	1,060,830
San Bernardino Community College District, 4.00%, 8/1/30	2,890	3,118,917
San Dieguito Union High School District, (Election of 2012), 4.00%, 8/1/30	1,545	1,680,141
San Jose-Evergreen Community College District, (Election of 2010), 5.00%, 8/1/35	860	962,796
San Mateo Union High School District, (Election of 2006), 5.00%, 9/1/27	650	758,329
San Mateo Union High School District, (Election of 2006), 5.00%, 9/1/28	1,100	1,285,284
Santa Clara County, (Election of 2008), Prerefunded to 8/1/19, 5.00%, 8/1/39 <sup>(1)</sup>	3,180	3,359,416

12

Santa Clarita Community College District, 4.00%, 8/1/46

See Notes to Financial Statements.

2,500

2,634,625

# California Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2017

Portfolio of Investments continued

Security	Principal Amount s omitted)	Val	lue
General Obligations (continued) Torrance Unified School District, (Election of 2008), 5.00%, 8/1/35	\$ 2,150	\$ 2,467,3	340
		\$ 38,233,6	98
California Health Facilities Financing Authority, (Catholic Healthcare West), 5.25%, 3/1/27 California Health Facilities Financing Authority, (Catholic Healthcare West), 5.25%, 3/1/28 California Health Facilities Financing Authority, (City of Hope), 5.00%, 11/15/32 California Health Facilities Financing Authority, (City of Hope), 5.00%, 11/15/35 California Health Facilities Financing Authority, (Memorial Health Services), 5.00%, 10/1/27 California Health Facilities Financing Authority, (Memorial Health Services), 5.00%, 10/1/33 California Health Facilities Financing Authority, (St. Joseph Health System), 5.00%, 7/1/33 California Health Facilities Financing Authority, (St. Joseph Health System), 5.00%, 7/1/37 California Health Facilities Financing Authority, (St. Joseph Health), 5.00%, 11/15/38	\$ 1,000 190 635 910 1,650 1,000 1,145 535 2,000	\$ 1,104,8 209,7 725,5 1,036,1 1,868,8 1,124,9 1,303,9 605,3 2,336,1	745 589 135 340 900 949 379
		\$ 10,315,5	07
Insured Education 1.4% California Educational Facilities Authority, (Santa Clara University), (NPFG), 5.00%, 9/1/23	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,422,3	75
		\$ 1,422,3	75
Insured Escrowed / Prerefunded 10.7%  Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency, (AGC), (AGM), Escrowed to Maturity, 0.00%, 1/1/26  Glendale, Electric System Revenue, (AGC), Prerefunded to 2/1/18, 5.00%, 2/1/31  San Diego County Water Authority, Certificates of Participation, (AGM), Prerefunded to 5/1/18, 5.00%, 5/1/38 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$ 5,130 2,790 3,500	\$ 4,351,0 2,806,8 3,554,8	352
		\$ 10,712,7	'06
Insured General Obligations 5.1% Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District, (BAM), 5.00%, 8/1/39 Sweetwater Union High School District, (Election of 2000), (AGM), 0.00%, 8/1/25	\$ 1,000 4,720	\$ 1,134,4 3,908,1	13
Security	Principal Amount	\$ 5,042,5 Val	

	(000 s omitted)		)
Insured Special Tax Revenue 5.4% Puerto Rico Sales Tax Financing Corp., (NPFG), 0.00%, 8/1/45 Successor Agency to Dinuba Redevelopment Agency, (BAM), 5.00%, 9/1/28 Successor Agency to Rosemead Community Development Commission, (BAM), 5.00%, 10/1/27 Successor Agency to San Francisco City and County Redevelopment Agency, (NPFG), 5.00%, 8/1/41	\$	4,850 370 1,440 2,100	\$ 866,744 428,789 1,743,768 2,397,444
			\$ 5,436,745
Insured Transportation 6.8% Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority, (AMBAC), 0.00%, 10/1/29 Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority, (NPFG), 0.00%, 10/1/31 Puerto Rico Highway and Transportation Authority, (AGC), 5.25%, 7/1/41	\$	5,000 4,500 740	\$ 3,226,100 2,785,410 809,649
			\$ 6,821,159
Lease Revenue / Certificates of Participation 1.0% California Public Works Board, 5.00%, 11/1/38	\$	915	\$ 1,038,287
			\$ 1,038,287
Other Revenue 0.4% California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank, (Performing Arts Center of Los Angeles), 5.00%, 12/1/32	\$	385	\$ 386,028
			\$ 386,028
Senior Living / Life Care 1.6% ABAG Finance Authority for Nonprofit Corporations, (Episcopal Senior Communities), 6.00%, 7/1/31 California Statewide Communities Development Authority, (Southern California Presbyterian Homes), 7.25%, 11/15/41(2) California Statewide Communities Development Authority, (The Redwoods, a Community of Seniors), 5.125%, 11/15/35	\$	290 600 535	\$ 324,710 656,352 615,662 \$ 1,596,724
			\$ 1,590,724
Special Tax Revenue 20.3% Aliso Viejo Community Facilities District No. 2005-01, Special Tax Revenue, (Glenwood at Aliso Viejo), 5.00%, 9/1/30 Brentwood Infrastructure Financing Authority, 5.00%, 9/2/26 Brentwood Infrastructure Financing Authority, 5.00%, 9/2/34 Fontana Redevelopment Agency, (Jurupa Hills), 5.60%, 10/1/27	\$	770 285 460 1,590	\$ 861,584 288,258 464,614 1,611,640

13

See Notes to Financial Statements.

# California Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2017

Portfolio of Investments continued

Security	Principal Amount s omitted)	Value
Special Tax Revenue (continued) Los Angeles County Community Facilities District No. 3, (Valencia/Newhall Area), 5.00%, 9/1/22 Los Angeles County Community Facilities District No. 3, (Valencia/Newhall Area), 5.00%, 9/1/23 Los Angeles County Community Facilities District No. 3, (Valencia/Newhall Area), 5.00%, 9/1/24 Los Angeles County Community Facilities District No. 3, (Valencia/Newhall Area), 5.00%, 9/1/25 Los Angeles County Community Facilities District No. 3, (Valencia/Newhall Area), 5.00%, 9/1/26 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Sales Tax Revenue, 5.00%, 7/1/42 San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, Sales Tax Revenue, 5.00%, 7/1/28 Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Sales Tax Revenue, 5.00%, 4/1/34 Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Sales Tax Revenue, (Ladera Ranch), 5.00%, 8/15/27 South Orange County Public Financing Authority, Special Tax Revenue, (Ladera Ranch), 5.00%, 8/15/28 Successor Agency to La Quinta Redevelopment Agency, 5.00%, 9/1/28 Successor Agency to San Diego Redevelopment Agency, 5.00%, 9/1/31 Successor Agency to Union City Community Redevelopment Agency, 5.00%, 10/1/32 Successor Agency to Union City Community Redevelopment Agency, 5.00%, 10/1/36	\$ 240 480 240 335 240 1,685 2,400 1,250 485 725 1,600 2,000 1,360 800	\$ 267,941 535,325 267,386 372,842 266,834 1,999,101 2,602,488 1,160,550 1,444,362 542,084 803,742 1,866,128 2,376,540 1,586,562 924,096
		\$ 20,242,077
Transportation 13.8% Bay Area Toll Authority, Toll Bridge Revenue, (San Francisco Bay Area), Prerefunded to 4/1/19, 5.25%, 4/1/29 Los Angeles Department of Airports, (Los Angeles International Airport), 5.00%, 5/15/35(1) Los Angeles Department of Airports, (Los Angeles International Airport), (AMT), 5.00%, 5/15/41 Los Angeles Department of Airports, (Los Angeles International Airport), (AMT), 5.375%, 5/15/30 Sacramento County, Airport System Revenue, 5.00%, 7/1/41 San Francisco City and County Airport Commission, (San Francisco International Airport), 5.00%, 5/1/35 San Joaquin Hills Transportation Corridor Agency, 5.00%, 1/15/34	\$ 1,000 2,120 1,500 1,500 1,500 2,760 2,265	\$ 1,049,940 2,281,692 1,706,370 1,527,705 1,735,140 2,950,330 2,573,380 \$ 13,824,557
Security	(000	Principal Amount 0 s omitted)