

BLACKROCK MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST II

Form N-CSRS

May 01, 2013

Table of Contents

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 52nd Street, New York, NY 10055

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

Date of fiscal year end: 08/31/2013

Date of reporting period: 02/28/2013

Table of Contents

Item 1 Report to Stockholders

2

Table of Contents

FEBRUARY 28, 2013

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

Table of Contents

	Page
<u>Dear Shareholder</u>	3
<u>Semi-Annual Report:</u>	
<u>Municipal Market Overview</u>	4
<u>The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging</u>	5
<u>Derivative Financial Instruments</u>	5
<u>Trust Summaries</u>	6
<u>Financial Statements:</u>	
<u>Schedules of Investments</u>	20
<u>Statements of Assets and Liabilities</u>	56
<u>Statements of Operations</u>	57
<u>Statements of Changes in Net Assets</u>	58
<u>Statements of Cash Flows</u>	60
<u>Financial Highlights</u>	61
<u>Notes to Financial Statements</u>	68
<u>Officers and Trustees</u>	78
<u>Additional Information</u>	79

Table of Contents

Dear Shareholder

Despite a number of headwinds, risk assets generated strong returns during the 6- and 12-month periods as investors sought meaningful yields in the ongoing low-interest-rate environment. About this time one year ago, the European debt crisis returned to the headlines as unresolved policy decisions left it unclear as to how troubled peripheral countries would finance their sovereign debt, causing yields to soar. In the second quarter of 2012, political instability in Greece and severe deficit and liquidity problems in Spain raised the specter of a full-blown euro collapse. Alongside the drama in Europe, investors were discouraged by gloomy economic reports from various parts of the world. A slowdown in China, a key powerhouse for global growth, emerged as a particular concern. As the outlook for the global economy worsened, however, investors grew increasingly optimistic that the world's largest central banks would soon intervene to stimulate growth. This theme, along with the announcement of the European Central Bank's (ECB's) firm commitment to preserve the euro currency bloc, drove most asset classes higher through the summer. Policy relief came in early September, when the ECB announced its decision to support the eurozone's debt-laden countries with unlimited purchases of short term sovereign debt. Days later, the US Federal Reserve announced its own much-anticipated stimulus package.

Although financial markets world-wide were buoyed by accommodative monetary policies, risk assets weakened in the fall. Global trade began to slow as many European countries fell into recession and growth continued to decelerate in China, where a once-a-decade leadership change compounded uncertainty. In the United States, stocks slid on lackluster corporate earnings reports and market volatility rose in advance of the US Presidential election. In the post-election environment, investors grew increasingly concerned over the fiscal cliff, the automatic tax increases and spending cuts that had been scheduled to take effect at the beginning of 2013. There was widespread fear that the fiscal cliff would push the United States into recession unless politicians could agree upon alternate measures to reduce the deficit before the end of 2012. Worries that bipartisan gridlock would preclude a timely budget deal triggered higher levels of volatility in financial markets around the world in the months leading up to the last day of the year. Ultimately, the worst of the fiscal cliff was averted with a last-minute tax deal; however, decisions relating to spending cuts and the debt ceiling continued to weigh on investors' minds.

Investors shook off the nerve-racking finale to 2012 and began the New Year with a powerful equity rally. Money that had been pulled to the sidelines amid year-end tax-rate uncertainty poured back into the markets in January. Key indicators signaled modest but broad-based improvements in the world's major economies, particularly in China. Global equities soared through January while rising US Treasury yields pressured high-quality fixed income assets. However, bond markets strengthened in February when economic momentum slowed and investors toned down their risk appetite. US stocks continued to rise, but at a more moderate pace. Uncertainty about how long the Federal Reserve would maintain its easing bias drove high levels of volatility later in the month, but these fears abated as the budget sequester (automatic spending cuts scheduled to take effect March 1) began to appear imminent and was deemed likely to deter any near-term curtailment of monetary easing policies. Outside the United States, equities largely declined as political uncertainty escalated after the Italian presidential election ended in a stalemate.

On the whole, riskier asset classes outperformed lower-risk investments for the 6- and 12-month periods ended February 28, 2013. International, US small cap and emerging market equities were the leading asset classes for the 6-month period, while US stocks and high yield bonds generated the strongest returns for the 12-month period. US Treasury yields remained relatively low overall, but have inched higher in recent months, pressuring Treasuries and investment-grade bonds. Tax-exempt municipal bonds, however, continued to benefit from favorable supply-and-demand dynamics. Near-zero short term interest rates continued to keep yields on money market securities near their all-time lows.

Investors continue to face many of the same risks as in years past. But we see a world of possibilities. BlackRock was built to provide the global market insight, breadth of capabilities, unbiased investment advice and deep risk management expertise these times require. Investors everywhere are asking, *So what do I do with my money?* Visit www.blackrock.com for answers.

Sincerely,

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

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

Despite a number of headwinds, risk assets generated strong returns during the 6- and 12-month periods as investors sought meaningful yields in the ongoing low-interest-rate environment.

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

Total Returns as of February 28, 2013

	6-month	12-month
US large cap equities (S&P 500® Index)	8.95%	13.46%
US small cap equities (Russell 2000® Index)	13.02	14.02
International equities (MSCI Europe, Australasia, Far East Index)	14.41	9.84
Emerging market equities (MSCI Emerging Markets Index)	12.06	0.28
3-month Treasury bill (BofA Merrill Lynch 3-Month US Treasury Bill Index)	0.05	0.11
US Treasury securities (BofA Merrill Lynch 10-Year US Treasury Index)	(1.51)	3.66
US investment grade bonds (Barclays US Aggregate Bond Index)	0.15	3.12
Tax-exempt municipal bonds (S&P Municipal Bond Index)	2.40	5.71
US high yield bonds (Barclays US Corporate High Yield 2% Issuer Capped Index)	6.67	11.79

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

Table of Contents**Municipal Market Overview****For the Reporting Period Ended February 28, 2013****Municipal Bonds Performed Well**

Market conditions remained favorable even though supply picked up considerably in the past year. Total new issuance for the 12 months ended February 28, 2013 was \$383 billion as compared to \$303 billion in the prior 12-month period. However, it is important to note that a significant portion (roughly 60%) of the new supply during the most recent 12-month period was attributable to refinancing activity as issuers took advantage of lower interest rates to reduce their borrowing costs.

Increased supply was met with strong demand during the period as investors were starved for yield in the low- rate environment. Investors poured into municipal bond mutual funds, particularly long-duration and high-yield funds as they tend to provide higher levels of income. For the 12 months ended February 28, 2013, municipal bond fund inflows exceeded \$46 billion (according to the Investment Company Institute).

S&P Municipal Bond Index

Total Returns as of February 28, 2013

6 months: 2.40%

12 months: 5.71%

A Closer Look at Yields

From February 29, 2012 to February 28, 2013, muni yields declined by 32 basis points (bps) from 3.23% to 2.91% on AAA-rated 30-year municipal bonds, while falling a modest 4 bps from 1.85% to 1.81% on 10-year bonds and rising 9 bps from 0.68% to 0.77% on 5-year bonds (as measured by Thomson Municipal Market Data). (Bond prices rise as yields fall.) Overall, the municipal yield curve remained relatively steep, but flattened over the 12-month period as the spread between 2- and 30-year maturities tightened by 37 bps and the spread between 2- and 10-year maturities tightened by 9 bps.

During the same time period, US Treasury rates fell by 10 bps in both the 5- and 10-year space while rising 1 bp on 30-year bonds. Accordingly, tax-exempt municipal bonds moderately underperformed Treasuries in the 5- and 10-year space, but significantly outperformed Treasury bonds on the long end of the curve. This outperformance was driven largely by a supply/demand imbalance within the municipal market while evidence of a recovering domestic economy pushed interest rates higher. Additionally, as higher US tax rates began to appear imminent late in 2012, municipal bonds benefited from the increased appeal of tax-exempt investing. Municipals have become an appropriate avenue for investors seeking yield in the low-rate environment as the asset class is known for its lower volatility and preservation of earnings as tax rates rise.

Financial Conditions of Municipal Issuers Continue to Improve

Austerity and de-leveraging have been the general themes across the country as states seek to balance their budgets, although a small number of states continue to rely on a "kick-the-can" approach to close their budget gaps. Broadly speaking, state governments have demonstrated better fiscal health as their revenues have steadily improved in recent years. Many local municipalities, however, continue to face higher 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 and security selection remain imperative amid uncertainty in this economic environment.

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

Table of Contents

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.

To obtain leverage, the Trusts issue Variable Rate Demand Preferred Shares (VRDP Shares) or Variable Rate Muni Term Preferred Shares (VMTP Shares) (VRDP Shares and VMTP Shares are collectively referred to as Preferred Shares). Preferred Shares pay dividends at prevailing short-term interest rates, and the Trusts invest the proceeds in long-term municipal bonds. In general, the concept of leveraging is based on the premise that the financing cost of assets to be obtained from leverage, which will be based on short-term interest rates, will normally be lower than the income earned by each Trust on its longer-term portfolio investments. To the extent that the total assets of each Trust (including the assets obtained from leverage) are invested in higher-yielding portfolio investments, each 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. However, in order to benefit shareholders, the yield curve must be positively sloped; that is, short-term interest rates must be lower than long-term interest rates. If the yield curve becomes negatively sloped, meaning short-term interest rates exceed long-term interest rates, income to shareholders will be lower than if the Trusts had not used leverage.

To illustrate these concepts, assume a Trust's Common Shares capitalization is \$100 million and it issues Preferred Shares for an additional \$50 million, creating a total value of \$150 million available for investment in long-term municipal bonds. If prevailing short-term interest rates are 3% and long-term interest rates are 6%, the yield curve has a strongly positive slope. In this case, the Trust pays dividends on the \$50 million of Preferred Shares based on the lower short-term interest rates. At the same time, the securities purchased by the Trust with assets received from Preferred Shares issuance earn income based on long-term interest rates. In this case, the dividends paid to holders of Preferred Shares (Preferred Shareholders) are significantly lower than the income earned on the Trust's long-term investments, and therefore the holders of Common Shares (Common Shareholders) are the beneficiaries of the incremental net income.

If short-term interest rates rise, narrowing the differential between short-term and long-term interest rates, the incremental net income pickup will be reduced or eliminated completely. Furthermore, if prevailing short-term interest rates rise above long-term interest rates, the yield curve has a negative slope. In this case, the Trust pays higher short-term interest rates whereas the Trust's total portfolio earns income based on lower long-term interest rates.

Furthermore, the value of the Trusts' portfolio investments generally varies inversely with the direction of long-term interest rates, although other factors can influence the value of portfolio investments. In contrast, the redemption value of the Trusts' Preferred Shares and/or debt securities does not fluctuate in relation to interest rates. As a result, changes in interest rates can influence the Trusts' NAVs positively or negatively in addition to the impact on Trust performance from leverage from Preferred Shares and borrowings discussed above.

The Trusts may also leverage their assets through the use of tender option bond trusts (TOBs), as described in Note 1 of the Notes to Financial Statements. TOB investments generally will provide the Trusts with economic benefits in periods of declining short-term interest rates, but expose the Trusts to risks during periods of rising short-term interest rates similar to those associated with Preferred Shares issued by the Trusts, as described above. Additionally, fluctuations in the market value of municipal bonds deposited into the TOB trust may adversely affect each Trust's NAV per share.

The use of leverage may enhance opportunities for increased income to the Trusts and Common Shareholders, but as described above, it also creates risks as short- or long-term interest rates fluctuate. Leverage also will generally cause greater changes in the Trusts' NAVs, market prices and dividend rates than comparable portfolios without leverage. If the income derived from securities purchased with assets received from leverage exceeds the cost of leverage, the Trusts' net income will be greater than if leverage had not been used. Conversely, if the income from the securities purchased is not sufficient to cover the cost of leverage, each Trust's net income will be less than if leverage had not been used, and therefore the amount available for distribution to Common Shareholders will be reduced. Each Trust may be required to sell portfolio securities at inopportune times or at distressed values in order to comply with regulatory requirements applicable to the use of leverage or as required by the terms of leverage instruments, which may cause a Trust to incur losses. The use of leverage may limit each Trust's ability to invest in certain types of securities or use certain types of hedging strategies, such as in the case of certain restrictions imposed by rating agencies that rate the Preferred Shares issued by the Trusts. Each 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.

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

Under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the "1940 Act"), the Trusts are permitted to issue senior securities in the form of equity securities (e.g., Preferred Shares) up to 50% of their total managed assets (each Trust's total assets less the sum of its accrued liabilities). In addition, each Trust with VRDP or VMTP Shares limits its economic leverage to 45% of its total managed assets. As of February 28, 2013, the Trusts had economic leverage from Preferred Shares and/or TOBs as a percentage of their total managed assets as follows:

	Percent of Economic Leverage
BIE	39%
BBK	36%
BAF	36%
BYM	37%
BLE	39%
MFL	40%
MVF	39%

Derivative Financial Instruments

The Trusts may invest in various derivative financial instruments, including financial futures contracts and options, as specified in Note 2 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 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 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.

Table of Contents**Trust Summary** as of February 28, 2013**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.

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

Performance

For the six months ended February 28, 2013, the Trust returned 4.15% based on market price and 3.94% based on NAV. For the same period, the closed-end Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category posted an average return of 2.51% based on market price and 4.16% 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 Trust's holdings in the State of California contributed positively to performance. While federal tax rate increases were supportive of municipal bonds overall, the addition of a state tax rate increase in California made these issues even more compelling on an after-tax basis. Also enhancing results were holdings in the health, education and transportation sectors. Particularly strong returns came from the Trust's lower-quality holdings in those sectors, which benefited from strong demand as investors sought higher-yielding investments in the low interest rate environment.

Conversely, exposure to Puerto Rico sales tax bonds had a negative impact on performance as the continued decline of the local economy and concerns about credit rating downgrades resulted in falling prices across Puerto Rico-issued securities broadly. 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, 2013 (\$16.83) ¹	5.56%
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	9.82%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.0780
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.9360
Economic Leverage as of February 28, 2013 ⁴	39%

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.

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

- ² Tax equivalent yield assumes the maximum marginal federal tax rate of 43.4%, which includes the 3.8% Medicare tax. Actual tax rates will vary based on income, exemptions and deductions. Lower taxes will result in lower tax equivalent yields.
- ³ The Monthly Distribution per Common Share, declared on March 1, 2013, was decreased to \$0.076 per share. The Yield on Closing Market Price, Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share and Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share do not reflect the new distribution rate. The new distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change in the future.
- ⁴ Represents VRDP Shares and 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.

Table of Contents**BlackRock Municipal Bond Investment Trust****Market Price and Net Asset Value**

The table below summarizes the changes in the Trust's market price and NAV per share:

	2/28/13	8/31/12	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 16.83	\$ 16.61	1.32%	\$ 17.99	\$ 16.20
Net Asset Value	\$ 17.07	\$ 16.88	1.13%	\$ 17.70	\$ 16.61

The following charts show the sector allocation, credit quality allocation and call/maturity schedule of the Trust's long-term investments:

Sector Allocation

	2/28/13	8/31/12
County/City/Special District/School District	21%	19%
Transportation	21	18
Health	16	17
Utilities	16	16
Education	11	12
State	9	12
Housing	4	4
Corporate	1	1
Tobacco	1	1

Credit Quality Allocation¹

	2/28/13	8/31/12
AAA/Aaa	13%	15%
AA/Aa	57	60
A	26	20
BBB/Baa	4	5

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

Call/Maturity Schedule²

Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2013	
2014	4%
2015	
2016	2
2017	1

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

Table of Contents**Trust Summary** as of February 28, 2013**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 months ended February 28, 2013, the Trust returned 4.98% based on market price and 5.01% based on NAV. For the same period, the closed-end Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) category posted an average return of 2.51% based on market price and 4.16% based on NAV. All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends. The Trust's premium 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.

The Trust's lower-quality investment grade holdings contributed positively to performance as the tightening of credit spreads drove their outperformance over higher-quality bonds during the period. Additional positive performance came from the Trust's allocations to the higher-yielding health, corporate and school district sectors. Heavy exposure to California credits, the best performing state for the period, boosted returns. The Trust also benefited from the roll-down effect, whereby effective maturities become shorter with the passing of the year and therefore bonds are evaluated at lower yield levels, which, in a steep yield curve environment, results in higher prices.

Detracting from performance was the Trust's neutral-to-long average duration (greater sensitivity to interest rates) as most of the municipal yield curve experienced slightly higher yields and lower bond prices. The Trust's yield curve positioning favoring longer-dated maturities also had a negative effect. Exposure to Puerto Rico credits detracted from results as the commonwealth's deteriorating credit metrics and ratings downgrades led to the underperformance of those issues.

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

Trust Information

Symbol on NYSE	BBK
Initial Offering Date	April 30, 2002
Yield on Closing Market Price as of February 28, 2013 (\$17.35) ¹	5.78%
Tax Equivalent Yield ²	10.21%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share ³	\$0.0835
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share ³	\$1.0020
Economic Leverage as of February 28, 2013 ⁴	36%

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.

