

BLACKROCK CALIFORNIA MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST
Form N-CSRS
April 02, 2015

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: 07/31/2015

Date of reporting period: 01/31/2015

Item 1 – Report to Stockholders

JANUARY 31, 2015

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT (UNAUDITED)

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust (BFZ)

BlackRock Florida Municipal 2020 Term Trust (BFO)

BlackRock Municipal Income Investment Trust (BBF)

BlackRock Municipal Target Term Trust (BTT)

BlackRock New Jersey Municipal Income Trust (BNJ)

BlackRock New York Municipal Income Trust (BNY)

Not FDIC Insured May Lose Value No Bank Guarantee

Table of Contents

	Page
The Markets in Review	3
Semi-Annual Report:	
Municipal Market Overview	4
The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging	5
Derivative Financial Instruments	5
Trust Summaries	6
Financial Statements:	
Schedules of Investments	18
Statements of Assets and Liabilities	46
Statements of Operations	47
Statements of Changes in Net Assets	48
Statements of Cash Flows	50
Financial Highlights	51
Notes to Financial Statements	57
Officers and Trustees	68
Additional Information	69
2SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2015	

The Markets in Review

Dear Shareholder,

Market volatility, while remaining below the long-term average level, increased over the course of 2014 and into 2015, driven largely by higher valuations in risk assets (such as equities and high yield bonds), escalating geopolitical risks, uneven global economic growth and expectations around policy moves from the world's largest central banks. Surprisingly, U.S. interest rates trended lower through the period even as the U.S. Federal Reserve (the Fed) gradually reduced its bond buying program, which ultimately ended in October.

The first half of 2014 was generally a strong period for most asset classes; however, volatility ticked up in the summer as geopolitical tensions intensified in Ukraine and the Middle East and investors feared that better U.S. economic indicators may compel the Fed to increase short-term interest rates sooner than previously anticipated. Global credit markets tightened as the U.S. dollar strengthened versus other currencies, ultimately putting a strain on investor flows, and financial markets broadly weakened in the third quarter.

Several themes dominated the markets in the fourth quarter that resulted in the strong performance of U.S. markets versus other areas of the world. Economic growth strengthened considerably in the United States while the broader global economy showed signs of slowing. The European Central Bank and the Bank of Japan took aggressive measures to stimulate growth while the Fed moved toward tighter policy, causing further strengthening in the U.S. dollar. Fixed income investors piled into U.S. Treasuries where yields, although persistently low, were comparatively higher than yields on international sovereign debt, while equity investors favored the relative stability of U.S.-based companies amid rising global risks.

Oil prices, which had been gradually declining since mid-summer, suddenly plummeted in the fourth quarter due to a global supply-and-demand imbalance. Energy stocks sold off sharply and oil-exporting economies struggled, mainly within emerging markets. Conversely, the consumer sectors benefited from lower oil prices as savings at the gas pumps freed up discretionary income for other goods and services.

These trends shifted at the beginning of 2015. U.S. equity markets starkly underperformed international markets due to stretched valuations and uncertainty around the Fed's pending rate hike. In addition, the stronger U.S. dollar began to hurt earnings of large cap companies. The energy sector continued to struggle, although oil prices showed signs of stabilizing toward the end of January as suppliers became more disciplined in their exploration and production efforts.

At BlackRock, we believe investors need to think globally, extend their scope across a broad array of asset classes and be prepared to move freely 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 January 31, 2015

	6-month	12-month
U.S. large cap equities (S&P 500® Index)	4.37 %	14.22 %
U.S. small cap equities (Russell 2000® Index)	4.72 (6.97 %)	4.41 (0.43 %)

Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK CALIFORNIA MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSRS

International equities (MSCI Europe, Australasia, Far East Index)		
Emerging market equities (MSCI Emerging Markets Index)	(9.05)	5.23
3-month Treasury bill (BofA Merrill Lynch 3-Month U.S. Treasury Bill Index)	0.01	0.03
U.S. Treasury securities (BofA Merrill Lynch 10-Year U.S. Treasury Index)	9.29	12.25
U.S. investment grade bonds (Barclays U.S. Aggregate Bond Index)	4.36	6.61
Tax-exempt municipal bonds (S&P Municipal Bond Index)	4.51	8.81
U.S. high yield bonds (Barclays U.S. Corporate High Yield 2% Issuer Capped Index)	(0.89)	2.41

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 January 31, 2015

Municipal Market Conditions

Municipal bonds generated strong performance in 2014, thanks to a favorable supply-and-demand environment and declining interest rates. (Bond prices rise as rates fall.) Investor demand for municipal bonds was strong from the start of the year when U.S. economic data softened amid one of the harshest winters on record. Interest rates proceeded to move lower even as the U.S. Federal Reserve (the Fed) scaled back its open-market bond purchases. This surprising development, coupled with reassurance from the Fed that short-term rates would remain low for a considerable amount of time, resulted in strong demand for fixed income investments in 2014, with municipal bonds being one of the stronger performing sectors for the year. For the 12-month period ended January 31, 2015, municipal bonds garnered net inflows of approximately \$32 billion (based on data from the Investment Company Institute).

S&P Municipal
Bond Index

From a historical perspective, total new issuance for the 12 months ended January 31, remained relatively strong at \$342 billion (slightly higher than the \$326 billion issued in the prior 12-month period). A noteworthy portion of new supply during this period was attributable to refinancing activity (roughly 45%) as issuers took advantage of lower interest rates to reduce their borrowing costs.

Total Returns as
of January 31,
2015

6 months: 4.51%
12 months: 8.81%

A Closer Look at Yields

From January 31, 2014 to January 31, 2015, yields on AAA-rated 30-year municipal bonds decreased by 135 basis points (bps) from 3.85% to 2.50%, while 10-year rates decreased 81 bps from 2.53% to 1.72% and 5-year rates decreased 16 bps from 1.10% to 0.94% (as measured by Thomson Municipal Market Data). Overall, the municipal yield curve remained relatively steep over the 12-month period even as the spread between 2- and 30-year maturities flattened by 146 bps and the spread between 2- and 10-year maturities flattened by 92 bps.

During the same time period, U.S. Treasury rates fell by 136 bps on 30-year bonds, 99 bps on 10-year bonds and 32 bps in 5-year issues. Accordingly, tax-exempt municipal bond performance was generally in line with Treasuries on both the long and short ends of the curve, while lagging in the intermediate portion of the curve as a result of increased supply. Municipals modestly outperformed Treasuries in the very short end of the curve as expectations around future Fed policy changes pressured short-term U.S. Treasury prices. Positive performance on the long end of the curve was driven largely by a supply/demand imbalance within the municipal market as investors sought income and incremental yield in an environment where opportunities had become 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. The municipal market continues to be an attractive avenue for investors seeking yield in the low-rate environment. However, opportunities have not been as broad-based as in 2011 and 2012, warranting a more flexible approach to security selection and yield curve positioning going forward.

Financial Conditions of Municipal Issuers Continue to Improve

Following an extended period of nation-wide austerity and de-leveraging as states sought to balance their budgets, solid revenue growth exceeding pre-recession levels coupled with the elimination of more than 625,000 jobs in recent years have put state and local governments in a better financial position. Many local municipalities, however, continue to face increased health care and pension costs passed down from the state level. BlackRock maintains the view that municipal bond defaults will remain minimal and in the periphery, and that the overall market is fundamentally sound. We continue to advocate careful credit research and believe that a thoughtful approach to structure and security selection remain imperative amid uncertainty in a modestly improving economic environment.

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.

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

4 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2015

The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging

The Trusts may utilize leverage to seek to enhance the yield 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 Trust (including the assets obtained from leverage) are invested in higher-yielding portfolio investments, the Trust's 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, the 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 the Trust with the proceeds from leverage earn income based on longer-term interest rates. In this case, the Trust's financing cost of leverage is significantly lower than the income earned on the 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 Trust's return on assets purchased with leverage proceeds, income to shareholders is lower than if the Trust had not used leverage. Furthermore, the value of the Trust's 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 Trust's obligations under its leverage arrangement generally does not fluctuate in relation to interest rates. As a result, changes in interest rates can influence the Trust's NAV 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 Trust were not leveraged. In addition, the 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 Trust to incur losses. The use of leverage may limit the Trust's ability to invest in certain types of securities or use certain types of hedging strategies. The 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.

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

Under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the 1940 Act), each Trust is permitted to issue debt up to ~~33~~ 50% 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 the Trust's obligations under the TOB (including accrued interest), a TOB 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. Derivative financial instruments are used to obtain exposure to a security, index and/or market without owning or taking physical custody of securities 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. Derivative financial instruments also involve risks, including the imperfect correlation between the value of a derivative financial instrument and the underlying asset, possible default of the counterparty to the transaction or illiquidity of the derivative

financial instrument. The Trusts' ability to use a derivative financial instrument successfully depends on the investment advisor's ability to predict pertinent market movements accurately, which cannot be assured. The use of derivative financial instruments may result in losses greater than if they had not been used, may 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 are discussed in detail in the Notes to Financial Statements.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2015 5

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2015
Trust Overview

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust

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 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. The Trust may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives.

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

Performance

For the six-month period ended January 31, 2015, the Trust returned 12.85% based on market price and 6.75% based on NAV. For the same period, the closed-end Lipper California Municipal Debt Funds category posted an average return of 12.10% based on market price and 7.85% based on NAV. All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends. 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. The following discussion relates to performance based on NAV.

Municipal bonds generally delivered strong performance during the six-month period, with yields declining as prices rose. California issues gained an additional boost from the state s improving credit profile. Longer-term municipal bonds generally outperformed shorter-term issues. In this environment, the Trust s exposure to the long end of the yield curve had a positive impact on performance. Its positions in AA-rated issues, bonds issued by school districts, and the transportation, health care and utilities sectors also helped returns. Leverage on the Trust s assets amplified the positive effect of falling rates on performance. There were no detractors from performance on an absolute basis as all areas of the Trust s investment universe appreciated during the period.

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

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, 2015 (\$15.80) ¹	5.48%
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	11.17%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.0722
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.8664
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2015 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.

Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal federal and state tax rate of 50.93%, which includes the 3.8%

² 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.

Represents VMTP Shares and TOBs as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust,

⁴ including any assets attributable to VMTP Shares and TOBs, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Trust, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

6 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2015

BlackRock California Municipal Income Trust

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	1/31/15	7/31/14	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$15.80	\$14.41	9.65%	\$15.85	\$14.37
Net Asset Value	\$16.42	\$15.83	3.73%	\$16.42	\$15.83

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

Overview of the Trust's Total Investments*

Sector Allocation	1/31/15	7/31/14
County/City/Special District/School District	35%	33%
Utilities	26	31
Health	12	11
Education	11	8
Transportation	7	7
State	6	8
Tobacco	1	
Housing	1	1
Corporate	1	1

For Trust compliance purposes, the Trust's sector classifications refer to any 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 advisor. These definitions may not apply for purposes of this report, which may combine such sector sub-classifications for reporting ease.

Call/Maturity Schedule³

Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2015	2%
2016	2
2017	10
2018	18
2019	35

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	1/31/15	7/31/14
AAA/Aaa	8%	11%
AA/Aa	73	71

A	18	18
BBB/Baa	²	²
B	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.

¹ 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 Representing less than 1% of the Trust's total investments.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2015 7

Trust Summary as of January 31, 2015

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 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 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 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.

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

Performance

For the six-month period ended January 31, 2015, the Trust returned 1.84% based on market price and 2.76% based on NAV. For the same period, the closed-end Lipper Other States Municipal Debt Funds category posted an average return of 8.27% based on market price and 7.81% based on NAV. All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends. The Trust s discount to NAV, which widened during the period, accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV. The following discussion relates to performance based on NAV.

The Trust is scheduled to mature on or about December 31, 2020, and it therefore holds securities that will mature close to that date. Given that rates declined more for bonds on the long end of the yield curve, the Trust s shorter maturity profile was a disadvantage in comparison to its Lipper category peers, which typically hold longer-dated issues.

Municipal bonds generally delivered positive performance during the six-month period, with yields declining as prices rose. In this environment, the Trust s duration exposure (sensitivity to interest rate movements) contributed positively to performance. The Trust s positions in the health care sector provided the largest total returns for the period, with utilities and transportation making the second- and third-largest contributions. In addition, the Trust s exposure to zero-coupon bonds, which outperformed current-coupon bonds, benefited returns. The income generated from coupon payments on the Trust s portfolio of Florida tax-exempt bonds also contributed to performance.

There were no detractors from performance on an absolute basis as all areas of the Trust s investment universe appreciated during the period.

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

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, 2015 (\$15.23) ¹	2.73%
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	4.82%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.0347
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.4164
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2015 ⁴	0%

¹ Yield on closing market price is calculated by dividing the current annualized distribution per share by the closi