

BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST II  
Form N-CSRS  
May 01, 2014

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 811-21126

Name of Fund: BlackRock Municipal Income Trust II (BLE)

Fund Address: 100 Bellevue Parkway, Wilmington, DE 19809

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

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

Date of fiscal year end: 08/31/2014

Date of reporting period: 02/28/2014

Item 1 Report to Stockholders

**SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT (UNAUDITED)**

**BlackRock Municipal Bond Investment Trust (BIE)**

**BlackRock Municipal Bond Trust (BBK)**

**BlackRock Municipal Income Investment Quality Trust (BAF)**

**BlackRock Municipal Income Quality Trust (BYM)**

**BlackRock Municipal Income Trust II (BLE)**

**BlackRock MuniHoldings Investment Quality Fund (MFL)**

**BlackRock MuniVest Fund, Inc. (MVF)**

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

## Table of Contents

	Page
<u>Dear Shareholder</u>	3
<b><u>Semi-Annual Report:</u></b>	
<u>Municipal Market Overview</u>	4
<u>The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging</u>	5
<u>Derivative Financial Instruments</u>	5
<u>Trust Summaries</u>	6
<u>Financial Statements:</u>	
<u>Schedules of Investments</u>	20
<u>Statements of Assets and Liabilities</u>	57
<u>Statements of Operations</u>	58
<u>Statements of Changes in Net Assets</u>	59
<u>Statements of Cash Flows</u>	63
<u>Financial Highlights</u>	64
<u>Notes to Financial Statements</u>	71
<u>Officers and Trustees</u>	80
<u>Additional Information</u>	81

## Dear Shareholder

One year ago, US financial markets were improving despite a sluggish global economy, as easy monetary policy gave investors enough conviction to take on more risk in their portfolios. Slow but positive growth in the US was sufficient to support corporate earnings, while uncomfortably high unemployment reinforced expectations that the Federal Reserve would continue its aggressive monetary stimulus programs. International markets were more volatile given uneven growth rates and more direct exposure to macro risks such as the banking crisis in Cyprus and a generally poor outlook for European economies. Emerging markets significantly lagged the rest of the world amid fears over slowing growth and debt problems.

Global financial markets were rattled in May when then-Fed Chairman Bernanke mentioned the possibility of reducing (or tapering) the central bank's asset purchase programs' comments that were widely misinterpreted as signaling an end to the Fed's zero-interest-rate policy. US Treasury yields rose sharply, triggering a steep sell-off across fixed income markets. (Bond prices move in the opposite direction of yields.) Equity prices also suffered as investors feared the implications of a potential end of a program that had greatly supported the markets. Markets rebounded in late June, however, when the Fed's tone turned more dovish, and improving economic indicators and better corporate earnings helped extend gains through most of the summer.

Although autumn brought mixed events, it was a surprisingly positive period for most asset classes. Early on, the Fed defied market expectations with its decision to delay tapering, but higher volatility returned in late September when the US Treasury Department warned that the national debt would soon breach its statutory maximum. The ensuing political brinkmanship led to a partial government shutdown, roiling global financial markets through the first half of October. Equities and other so-called risk assets managed to resume their rally when politicians engineered a compromise to reopen the government and extend the debt ceiling, at least temporarily.

The remainder of 2013 was generally positive for stock markets in the developed world, although investors continued to grapple with uncertainty about when and how much the Fed would scale back on stimulus. When the long-awaited taper announcement ultimately came in mid-December, the Fed reduced the amount of its monthly asset purchases but at the same time reaffirmed its commitment to maintaining low short-term interest rates. Markets reacted positively, as the taper signaled the Fed's perception of real improvement in the economy, and investors were finally relieved from the anxiety that had gripped them for quite some time.

The start of the new year brought another turn in sentiment, as heightened volatility in emerging markets and mixed US economic data caused global equities to weaken in January while bond markets found renewed strength. Although these headwinds persisted, equities were back on the rise in February thanks to positive developments in Washington, DC. For one, Congress extended the nation's debt ceiling through mid-March 2015, thereby reducing some degree of fiscal uncertainty for the next year. Additionally, investors were encouraged by market-friendly comments in new Fed Chair Janet Yellen's Congressional testimony, giving further assurance that short-term rates would remain low for a prolonged period.

While accommodative monetary policy was the main driver behind positive market performance over the period, it was also a key cause of investor uncertainty. Developed market stocks were the strongest performers for the six- and 12-month periods ended February 28. In contrast, emerging markets were weighed down by uneven growth, high levels of debt and severe currency weakness, in addition to the broader concern about reduced global liquidity. The anticipation of Fed tapering during 2013 pressured US Treasury bonds and other high-quality fixed income sectors, including tax-exempt municipals and investment grade corporate bonds. High yield bonds, to the contrary, benefited from income-oriented investors' search for yield in the low-rate environment. Short-term interest rates remained near zero, keeping yields on money market securities close to historic lows.

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 [www.blackrock.com](http://www.blackrock.com) for further insight about investing in today's world.

Sincerely,

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

## Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST II - Form N-CSRS

*While accommodative monetary policy was the main driver behind positive market performance over the period, it was also a key cause of investor uncertainty.*

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

### Total Returns as of February 28, 2014

	6-month	12-month
US large cap equities (S&P 500® Index)	15.07%	25.37%
US small cap equities (Russell 2000® Index)	17.75	31.56
International equities (MSCI Europe, Australasia, Far East Index)	15.01	19.28
Emerging market equities (MSCI Emerging Markets Index)	4.77	(6.01)
3-month Treasury bill (BofA Merrill Lynch 3-Month US Treasury Bill Index)	0.03	0.08
US Treasury securities (BofA Merrill Lynch 10-Year US Treasury Index)	2.61	(3.65)
US investment grade bonds (Barclays US Aggregate Bond Index)	2.84	0.15
Tax-exempt municipal bonds (S&P Municipal Bond Index)	6.08	(0.27)
US high yield bonds (Barclays US Corporate High Yield 2% Issuer Capped Index)	7.46	8.36

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 February 28, 2014

### Municipal Market Conditions

In the earlier months of 2013, municipal bond supply was met with robust demand as investors were starved for yield in the low-rate, low-return environment and seeking tax-exempt investments in light of higher US tax rates that became effective at the turn of the year. Investors moved into municipal bond mutual funds, favoring long-duration and high-yield funds as they tend to provide higher levels of income.

However, market conditions turned less favorable in May when the US Federal Reserve initially mentioned the eventual reduction of its bond-buying stimulus program (which ultimately took effect in January 2014). Further signals from the Fed alluding to a retrenchment of asset purchases led to rising interest rates and waning municipal bond performance in June. (Bond prices fall as rates rise.) Municipal bond mutual funds saw strong outflows in the last six months of 2013, before investors again sought the relative safety of the asset class in the new year. For the 12-month period ended February 28, 2014, net outflows were approximately \$64 billion (based on data from the Investment Company Institute).

High levels of interest rate volatility resulted in a sharp curtailment of tax-exempt issuance in May through the end of the period. However, from a historical perspective, total new issuance for the 12 months ended February 28, 2014 remained relatively strong at \$315 billion (but meaningfully lower than the \$387 billion issued in the prior 12-month period). A significant portion of new supply during this period was attributable to refinancing activity (roughly 40%) as issuers took advantage of lower interest rates to reduce their borrowing costs.

#### S&P Municipal Bond Index

Total Returns as of February 28, 2014

6 months : 6.08%

12 months : (0.27)%

### A Closer Look at Yields

From February 28, 2013 to February 28, 2014, muni yields increased by 81 basis points ( bps ) from 2.91% to 3.72% on AAA-rated 30-year municipal bonds, while increasing 59 bps from 1.81% to 2.40% on 10-year bonds and rising another 23 bps from 0.77% to 1.00% on 5-year issues (as measured by Thomson Municipal Market Data). Overall, the municipal yield curve remained relatively steep over the 12-month period as the spread between 2- and 30-year maturities widened by 86 bps and the spread between 2- and 10-year maturities widened by 64 bps.

During the same time period, US Treasury rates rose by 49 bps on 30-year and 77 bps on 10-year bonds, while moving up 74 bps in 5-years. Accordingly, tax-exempt municipal bonds underperformed Treasuries on the long end of the yield curve as investors sought to reduce interest rate risk later in the period. On the short end of the curve, the outperformance of municipal bonds versus Treasuries was driven largely by a supply/demand imbalance within the municipal market and a rotation from long-duration assets (which are more sensitive to interest rate movements) into short- and intermediate-duration investments (which are less sensitive to interest rate movements). Additionally, municipal bonds benefited from the increased appeal of tax-exempt investing in the new higher tax rate environment. 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 today's environment, particularly as the recent correction has restored value in the market and placed yields at levels not obtainable since early 2011. However, opportunities have not been as broad-based as in 2011 and 2012, warranting a more tactical approach 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, 15 consecutive quarters of positive revenue growth coupled with the elimination of more than 750,000 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 be minimal and remain in the periphery, and that the overall market is fundamentally sound. We continue to recognize that careful credit research, appropriate structure and security selection remain imperative amid uncertainty in this tepid economic environment.

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. Index performance is shown for illustrative purposes only. You cannot invest directly in an index.



## 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 will be based on short-term interest rates, will normally be 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 will 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 costs of leverage are 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 will be 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 NAVs positively or negatively. Changes in the future direction of interest rates are very difficult to predict accurately, and there is no assurance that a Trust's intended leveraging strategy will be successful.

Leverage also will generally cause 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 will incur expenses in connection with the use of leverage, all of which are borne by Common Shareholders and may reduce income to the Common Shares.

To obtain leverage, each Trust has issued Variable Rate Demand Preferred Shares ( VRDP Shares ) or Variable Rate Muni Term Preferred Shares ( VMTP 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 1/3% of its total managed assets or equity securities (e.g., Preferred Shares) up to 50% of its total managed assets. A Trust may voluntarily elect to limit its leverage to less than the maximum amount permitted under the 1940 Act. In addition, a Trust may also be subject to certain asset coverage, leverage or portfolio composition requirements imposed by the Preferred Shares' governing instrument or by rating agencies rating the Preferred Shares, which may be more stringent than those imposed by the 1940 Act.

## Derivative Financial Instruments

The Trusts may invest in various derivative financial instruments, including financial futures contracts, as specified in Note 4 of the Notes to Financial Statements, which may constitute forms of economic leverage. Such 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 hedge market and/or interest rate risks. Derivative financial instruments involve risks, including the imperfect correlation between the value of a derivative financial instrument and the underlying

## Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST II - Form N-CSRS

asset,

possible default of the counterparty to the transaction or illiquidity of the derivative financial instrument. The Trusts' ability to use a derivative financial instrument successfully depends on the investment advisor's ability to predict pertinent market movements accurately, which cannot be assured. The use of derivative financial instruments may result in losses greater than if they had not been used, may require a Trust to sell or purchase portfolio investments at inopportune times or for distressed values, may limit the amount of appreciation a Trust can realize on an investment, may result in lower dividends paid to shareholders and/or may cause a Trust to hold an investment that it might otherwise sell. The Trusts' investments in these instruments are discussed in detail in the Notes to Financial Statements.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

FEBRUARY 28, 2014

5

## Trust Summary as of February 28, 2014

## BlackRock Municipal Bond Investment Trust

**Trust Overview**

BlackRock Municipal Bond Investment Trust's (BIE) (the Trust) investment objective is to provide current income exempt from regular federal income tax and Florida intangible personal property tax. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing primarily in municipal bonds exempt from federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax). Under normal market conditions, the Trust invests at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds that are investment grade quality at the time of investment. The Trust may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives. 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 February 28, 2014, the Trust returned 9.84% based on market price and 11.95% based on NAV. For the same period, the closed-end Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category posted an average return of 11.26% based on market price and 11.83% 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 benefited from its holdings in the State of California. The continued improvement in the state's economy was the catalyst for the price appreciation in these bonds. Additionally, as the municipal yield curve flattened during the period (i.e., rates on longer-dated bonds fell more than rates on shorter-dated securities), the Trust's longer-dated holdings in health, transportation and education experienced the strongest price appreciation. (Bond prices rise when rates fall.)

Conversely, the use of US Treasury futures to protect the Trust against interest rate increases detracted from returns, although the impact was minimal.

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 )	BIE
Initial Offering Date	April 30, 2002
Yield on Closing Market Price as of February 28, 2014 (\$13.96) <sup>1</sup>	6.53%
Tax Equivalent Yield <sup>2</sup>	11.54%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.076
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.912
Economic Leverage as of February 28, 2014 <sup>4</sup>	40%

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal federal tax rate of 43.4%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.

## Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST II - Form N-CSRS

<sup>3</sup> The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.

<sup>4</sup> Represents VRDP Shares and TOBs as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, including any assets attributable to VRDP 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

FEBRUARY 28, 2014

## BlackRock Municipal Bond Investment Trust

## Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	2/28/14	8/31/13	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 13.96	\$ 13.14	6.24%	\$ 14.01	\$ 12.85
Net Asset Value	\$ 15.45	\$ 14.27	8.27%	\$ 15.45	\$ 14.14

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

## Overview of the Trust's Long-Term Investments

Sector Allocation	2/28/14	8/31/13
Transportation	24%	21%
County/City/Special District/School District	23	22
Utilities	17	17
Health	14	15
State	9	8
Education	7	10
Housing	4	5
Tobacco	1	1
Corporate	1	1
Credit Quality Allocation <sup>1</sup>	2/28/14	8/31/13
AAA/Aaa	10%	10%
AA/Aa	58	60
A	29	26
BBB/Baa	2	4
BB/Ba2	1	

<sup>1</sup> Using the higher of Standard & Poor's (S&P) or Moody's Investors Service (Moody's) ratings.

Call/Maturity Schedule<sup>2</sup>

Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2014	4%
2015	
2016	2
2017	1
2018	19

<sup>2</sup> Scheduled maturity dates and/or bonds that are subject to potential calls by issuers over the next five years.

## Trust Summary as of February 28, 2014

BlackRock Municipal Bond Trust

## Trust Overview

BlackRock Municipal Bond Trust's (BBK) (the Trust) investment objective is to provide current income exempt from regular federal income tax. The Trust seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing primarily in municipal bonds exempt from regular federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax). The Trust invests, under normal market conditions, at least 80% of its assets in municipal bonds that are investment grade quality. 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 February 28, 2014, the Trust returned 12.12% based on market price and 13.42% based on NAV. For the same period, the closed-end Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category posted an average return of 11.26% based on market price and 11.83% based on NAV. All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends. The Trust's discount to NAV, which widened during the period, accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV. The following discussion relates to performance based on NAV.

As tax-exempt rates declined over the period, the Trust's longer-duration (higher sensitivity to interest rate movements) and longer-dated bond holdings tended to provide the largest returns. (Bond prices rise when rates fall.) In this environment, the Trust's transportation, health and corporate holdings contributed positively to performance as these were among the better performing sectors. Exposure to lower-coupon and zero-coupon bonds also drove returns as they had strong price performance due to their relatively long durations for their respective maturities. The Trust's significant exposure to high-quality issues had a positive impact on results as the market's strongest performance during the period was concentrated in this quality segment. Additionally, the Trust benefited from the accrual of income generated from coupon payments on its municipal bond holdings. The use of leverage allowed the Trust to enhance its level of income.

The Trust's exposure to Puerto Rico government-related credits, although limited, was a detractor from results as credit spreads on these bonds widened materially due to investors' lack of confidence and a weak local economy. The Trust sold its exposure to these deteriorating securities early in 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	BBK
Initial Offering Date	April 30, 2002
Yield on Closing Market Price as of February 28, 2014 (\$14.54) <sup>1</sup>	6.48%
Tax Equivalent Yield <sup>2</sup>	11.45%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.0785
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.9420
Economic Leverage as of February 28, 2014 <sup>4</sup>	38%

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal federal tax rate of 43.4%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.

## Edgar Filing: BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST II - Form N-CSRS

- <sup>3</sup> The monthly distribution per common share, declared on March 3, 2014, was increased to \$0.0820 per share. The yield on closing market price, current monthly distribution per common share and current annualized distribution per common share do not reflect the new distribution rate. The new distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change in the future.
- <sup>4</sup> Represents VMTP Shares and TOBs as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Trust, 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.

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	2/28/14	8/31/13	Change	High
--	---------	---------	--------	------