BLACKROCK MUNIYIELD INVESTMENT QUALITY FUND Form N-CSRS April 05, 2017

### 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 811-07156

Name of Fund: BlackRock MuniYield Investment Quality Fund (MFT)

Fund Address: 100 Bellevue Parkway, Wilmington, DE 19809

Name and address of agent for service: John M. Perlowski, Chief Executive Officer, BlackRock MuniYield

Investment Quality Fund, 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: 07/31/2017

Date of reporting period: 01/31/2017

Item 1 Report to Stockholders

#### JANUARY 31, 2017

## SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT (UNAUDITED)

BlackRock MuniHoldings California Quality Fund, Inc. (MUC) BlackRock MuniHoldings New Jersey Quality Fund, Inc. (MUJ) BlackRock MuniYield Investment Quality Fund (MFT) BlackRock MuniYield Michigan Quality Fund, Inc. (MIY) BlackRock MuniYield Pennsylvania Quality Fund (MPA)

Not FDIC Insured May Lose Value No Bank Guarantee

# The Markets in Review

Dear Shareholder,

The 12 months ended January 31, 2017 was an exceptionally strong period for risk assets (such as stocks and high yield bonds), while higher-quality assets generated muted returns after struggling in the latter part of 2016. As the period began, worries about slowing growth in China and the instability of oil prices had global equity prices sliding. However, the broad market momentum shifted in the second half of 2016 as reflationary expectations in the United States helped drive a pick-up in global growth.

Markets were remarkably resilient during the period. Big surprises such as the United Kingdom s vote to leave the European Union and the outcome of the U.S. presidential election brought spikes in equity market volatility, but they were ultimately short-lived. Instead, investors used the sell-offs to seize upon buying opportunities, allowing markets to quickly rebound. We believe this reinforces the case for taking the long view rather than reacting to short-term market noise.

The global reflationary theme rising nominal growth, wages and inflation was the dominant driver of asset returns during the period, outweighing significant political upheavals and uncertainty. This trend accelerated after the U.S. election and continued into the beginning of 2017, stoked by expectations for an extra boost to U.S. growth via fiscal policy.

Although economic momentum is gaining traction, the capacity for rapid global growth is restrained by structural factors including an aging population, low productivity growth and excess savings. A tempered economic growth trend and high valuations across most assets have set the stage for muted investment returns going forward.

Equity markets still have room to move, although the disparity between winners and losers is widening, making stock selection increasingly important. Fixed income investors are also facing challenges as bond markets recalibrate to accommodate rising rates and higher inflation expectations. And in a world where political risk and policy uncertainty abound, there is no lack of potential catalysts for higher volatility.

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

Sincerely,

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

### Total Returns as of January 31, 2017

	6-month	12-month
U.S. large cap equities	5.96%	20.04%
(S&P 500 <sup>®</sup> Index)		
U.S. small cap equities	12.43	33.53
(Russell 2000 <sup>®</sup> Index)		
International equities	3.49	12.03
(MSCI Europe, Australasia,		
Far East Index)		
Emerging market equities	4.92	25.41
(MSCI Emerging Markets Index)		
3-month Treasury bills	0.20	0.37
(BofA Merrill Lynch 3-Month		
U.S. Treasury Bill Index)		

U.S. Treasury securities (BofA Merrill Lynch 10-Year U.S. Treasury Index)	(7.87)	(3.26)
U.S. investment grade bonds	(2.95)	1.45
(Bloomberg Barclays U.S.		
Aggregate Bond Index) Tax-exempt municipal	(2.94)	0.24
bonds (S&P Municipal	(2.94)	0.24
Bond Index)		
U.S. high yield bonds	6.09	20.77
(Bloomberg Barclays U.S. Corporate High Yield 2% Issuer		
Capped Index)		

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

2

THIS PAGE NOT PART OF YOUR FUND REPORT

# Table of Contents

	Page
The Markets in Review	2
Semi-Annual Report:	
Municipal Market Overview	4
The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging	5
Derivative Financial Instruments	5
Fund Summaries	6
Financial Statements:	
Schedules of Investments	16
Statements of Assets and Liabilities	43
Statements of Operations	44
Statements of Changes in Net Assets	45
Statements of Cash Flows	47
Financial Highlights	48
Notes to Financial Statements	53
Officers and Directors	65
Additional Information	66

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 31, 2017

# Municipal Market Overview

#### For the Reporting Period Ended January 31, 2017 Municipal Market Conditions

Municipal bonds generated modestly positive performance for the period, in spite of vastly rising interest rates as a result of generally stronger economic data, signs of inflation pressures, Fed monetary policy normalization, and market expectations for pro-growth fiscal policy. However, ongoing reassurance from the Fed that rates would be increased gradually and would likely remain low overall resulted in strong demand for fixed income investments. Investors favored the income, relative yield, and stability of municipal bonds amid bouts of interest rate volatility (bond prices rise as rates fall) resulting from the United Kingdom s decision to leave the European Union, the contentious U.S. election, and widening central bank divergence i.e., policy easing outside the United States while the Fed slowly commences policy tightening. During the 12 months ended January 31, 2017, municipal bond funds garnered net inflows of approximately \$24 billion (based on data from the Investment Company Institute).

For the same 12-month period, total new issuance remained robust from a historical perspective at \$451 billion (significantly above the \$394 billion issued in the prior 12-month period). A noteworthy portion of new supply during this period was attributable to refinancing activity (roughly 60%) as issuers continued to take advantage of low interest rates and a flatter yield curve to reduce their borrowing costs.

S&P Municipal Bond Index Total Returns as of January 31, 2017 6 months: (2.94)% 12 months: 0.24%

A Closer Look at Yields

From January 31, 2016 to January 31, 2017, yields on AAA-rated 30-year municipal bonds increased by 33 basis points (bps) from 2.75% to 3.08%, while 10-year rates rose by 61 bps from 1.71% to 2.32% and 5-year rates increased 63 bps from 1.00% to 1.63% (as measured by Thomson Municipal Market Data). The municipal yield curve modestly flattened over the 12-month period with the spread between 2- and 30-year maturities flattening by

9 bps and the spread between 10- and 30-year maturities flattening by 28 bps.

During the same time period, on a relative basis, tax-exempt municipal bonds broadly underperformed U.S. Treasuries with the greatest underperformance experienced in the intermediate part of the yield curve. In absolute terms, the positive performance of municipal bonds was driven largely by a supply/demand imbalance within the municipal market as investors sought income and incremental yield in an environment where opportunities became increasingly scarce. More broadly, municipal bonds came under pressure post the November U.S. election, erasing a bulk of year-to-date performance and influencing a strong pattern of mutual fund inflows to turn negative in the closing months of the period. The asset class is known for its lower relative volatility and preservation of principal with an emphasis on income as tax rates rise.

### **Financial Conditions of Municipal Issuers**

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

The opinions expressed are those of BlackRock as of January 31, 2017, and are subject to change at any time due to changes in market or economic conditions. The comments should not be construed as a recommendation of any individual holdings or market sectors. Investing involves risk including loss of principal. Bond values fluctuate in price so the value of your investment can go down depending on market conditions. Fixed income risks include interest-rate and credit risk. Typically, when interest rates rise, there is a corresponding decline in bond values. Credit risk refers to the possibility that the bond issuer will not be able to make

principal and interest payments. There may be less information on the financial condition of municipal issuers than for public corporations. The market for municipal bonds may be less liquid than for taxable bonds. Some investors may be subject to Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT). Capital gains distributions, if any, are taxable.

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

4

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

# The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging

The Funds may utilize leverage to seek to enhance the distribution rate on, 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 Fund on its longer-term portfolio investments purchased with the proceeds from leverage. To the extent that the total assets of the Funds (including the assets obtained from leverage) are invested in higher-yielding portfolio investments, the Funds 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 Fund s Common Shares capitalization is \$100 million and it utilizes leverage for an additional \$30 million, creating a total value of \$130 million available for investment in longer-term income securities. If prevailing short-term interest rates are 3% and longer-term interest rates are 6%, the yield curve has a strongly positive slope. In this case, a Fund s financing costs on the \$30 million of proceeds obtained from leverage are based on the lower short-term interest rates. At the same time, the securities purchased by a Fund with the proceeds from leverage earn income based on longer-term interest rates. In this case, a Fund s financing cost of leverage is significantly lower than the income earned on a Fund 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 Funds return on assets purchased with leverage proceeds, income to shareholders is lower than if the Funds had not used leverage. Furthermore, the value of the Funds 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 Funds obligations under their respective leverage arrangements generally does not fluctuate in relation to interest rates. As a result, changes in interest rates can influence the Funds 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 Fund s intended leveraging strategy will be successful.

The use of leverage also generally causes greater changes in each Fund s NAV, market price and dividend rates than comparable portfolios without leverage. In a declining market, leverage is likely to cause a greater decline in the NAV and market price of a Fund s Common Shares than if the Fund were not leveraged. In addition, each Fund 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 Funds to incur losses. The use of leverage may limit a Fund s ability to invest in certain types of securities or use certain types of hedging strategies. Each Fund incurs expenses in connection with the use of leverage, all of which are borne by Common Shareholders and may reduce income to the Common Shares. Moreover, to the extent the calculation of the Funds investment advisory fees includes assets purchased with the proceeds of leverage, the investment advisory fees payable to the Funds investment adviser will be higher than if the Funds did not use leverage.

To obtain leverage, each Fund 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 (TOB Trusts) as described in the Notes to Financial Statements.

Under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the 1940 Act ), each Fund is permitted to issue debt up to  $\frac{3}{3}$ % of its total managed assets or equity securities (e.g., Preferred Shares) up to 50% of its total managed assets. A Fund may voluntarily elect to limit its leverage to less than the maximum amount permitted under the 1940 Act. In addition, a Fund 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 Fund segregates or designates on its books and records cash or liquid assets having a value not less than the value of a Fund s obligations under the TOB Trust (including accrued interest), a TOB Trust is not considered a senior security and is not subject to the foregoing limitations and requirements under the 1940 Act.

# Derivative Financial Instruments

The Funds may invest in various derivative financial instruments. These instruments are used to obtain exposure to a security, commodity, index, market, and/or other asset without owning or taking physical custody of securities, commodities and/or other referenced assets or to manage market, equity, credit, interest rate, foreign currency exchange rate, commodity and/or other risks. Derivative financial instruments may give rise to a form of economic leverage and involve risks, including the imperfect correlation between the value of a derivative financial instrument and the underlying asset, possible default of the counterparty to the

transaction or illiquidity of the instrument. The Funds successful use of a derivative financial instrument depends on the investment adviser s ability to predict pertinent market movements accurately, which cannot be assured. The use of these instruments may result in losses greater than if they had not been used, may limit the amount of appreciation a Fund can realize on an investment and/or may result in lower distributions paid to shareholders. The Funds investments in these instruments, if any, are discussed in detail in the Notes to Financial Statements.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 31, 2017

## Fund Summary as of January 31, 2017

### BlackRock MuniHoldings California Quality Fund, Inc.

#### **Fund Overview**

BlackRock MuniHoldings California Quality Fund, Inc. s (MUC) (the Fund ) investment objective is to provide shareholders with current income exempt from federal and California income taxes. The Fund 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. Under normal market conditions, the Fund invests at least 80% of its assets in investment grade municipal obligations with remaining maturities of one year or more at the time of investment. The municipal obligations in which the Fund primarily invests are either rated investment grade quality, or are considered by the Fund s adviser to be of comparable quality, at the time of investment. The Fund may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives.

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

Fund Information	
Symbol on New York Stock Exchange ( NYSE )	MUC
Initial Offering Date	February 27, 1998
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2017 (\$14.40) <sup>1</sup>	5.13%
Tax Equivalent Yield <sup>2</sup>	10.45%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.0615
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.7380
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2017 <sup>4</sup>	41%

<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 and state tax rate of 50.93%, 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.
- <sup>3</sup> The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- <sup>4</sup> Represents VMTP Shares and TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Fund, including any assets attributable to VMTP Shares and TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Fund, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

#### Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2017 were as follows:

	Returns Ba	<b>Returns Based On</b>		
	Market Price	NAV		
MUC <sup>1,2</sup>	(9.34)%	(5.20)%		
Lipper California Municipal Debt Funds <sup>3</sup>	(8.72)%	(5.28)%		

<sup>1</sup> All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions.

- <sup>2</sup> The Fund s discount to NAV widened during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.
- <sup>3</sup> Average return.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The following discussion relates to the Fund s absolute performance based on NAV:

Municipal bonds lost ground in the six-month reporting period. After producing slightly positive returns in August, municipal bonds began to move lower in September and October due to a pick-up in new tax-exempt issuance and rising yields in the U.S. Treasury market. (Prices and yields move in opposite directions.) The weakness accelerated in November once Donald Trump s election victory caused investors to adjust their expectations in favor of stronger growth and tighter Fed policy. The municipal market subsequently stabilized and retraced some of its losses in December and January as the relative attractiveness of the asset class brought in new investors, but the modest rally was insufficient to make up for the earlier downturn.

California underperformed the national tax-exempt market, reflecting an unwinding of previously tight credit spreads for state and local issues, together with a larger calendar of new issuance. Despite the after-tax value provided by California muni bonds for retail investors subject to the state s high tax brackets, California funds were not immune to the redemptions experienced by both the general market and high-yield products in the latter part of the six month reporting period.

At the sector level, local school district and health care sectors represented the largest detractors from performance due to their higher weightings. To the extent that the Fund held zero coupon bonds, these positions detracted since the bonds longer duration accentuated the negative price performance in a down market. (Duration is a measure of interest rate sensitivity.)

Reinvestment was a further drag on results, as the proceeds of higher-yielding bonds that matured or were called needed to be reinvested at materially lower prevailing rates. The Fund continued to employ leverage in order to increase income. Since leverage also amplifies the effect of market movements, it was a net detractor from performance at a time of falling prices.

The Fund sought to manage interest rate risk using U.S. Treasury futures. Given that Treasury yields rose as prices fell, this aspect of the Fund s positioning had a positive effect on returns. The Fund s exposure to pre-refunded issues also benefited performance, as their low duration enabled them to hold up better than longer-duration bonds at a time of rising yields.

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.

6

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

#### BlackRock MuniHoldings California Quality Fund, Inc.

#### Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	1/31/17	7/31/16	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 14.40	\$ 16.28	(11.55)%	\$ 16.35	\$ 13.53
Net Asset Value	\$ 15.27	\$ 16.51	(7.51)%	\$ 16.54	\$ 14.92

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

Overview of the Fund s Total Investments\*

Sector Allocation	1/31/17	7/31/16
County/City/Special District/School District	40%	40%
Utilities	19	19
Transportation	16	15
Health	14	14
Education	5	5
State	5	5
Corporate	1	2

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

Call/Maturity Schedule <sup>2</sup>	
Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2017	11%
2018	12
2019	15
2020	5
2021	13

 $^2$  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 <sup>1</sup>	1/31/17	7/31/16
AAA/Aaa	15%	16%
AA/Aa	73	73
Α	10	8
BBB/Baa	1	1
N/R	1	2
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. 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.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 31, 2017

## Fund Summary as of January 31, 2017

### BlackRock MuniHoldings New Jersey Quality Fund, Inc.

#### **Fund Overview**

BlackRock MuniHoldings New Jersey Quality Fund, Inc. s (MUJ) (the Fund ) investment objective is to provide shareholders with current income exempt from federal income tax and New Jersey personal income taxes. The Fund seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing primarily in long-term, investment grade municipal obligations exempt from federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax) and New Jersey personal income taxes. The municipal obligations in which the Fund primarily invests are either rated investment grade quality, or are considered by the Fund s adviser to be of comparable quality, at the time of investment. Under normal market conditions, the Fund invests at least 80% of its assets in municipal obligations with remaining maturities of one year or more at the time of investment. The Fund may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives.

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

Fund Information	
Symbol on NYSE	MUJ
Initial Offering Date	March 11, 1998
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2017 (\$14.20) <sup>1</sup>	5.70%
Tax Equivalent Yield <sup>2</sup>	11.06%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.0675
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.8100
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2017 <sup>4</sup>	39%

<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 and state tax rate of 48.48%, 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.
- <sup>3</sup> The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- <sup>4</sup> Represents VRDP Shares and TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Fund, including any assets attributable to VRDP Shares and TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Fund, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

#### Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2017 were as follows:

	Returns Ba	<b>Returns Based On</b>		
	Market Price	NAV		
MUJ <sup>1,2</sup>	(9.46)%	(6.03)%		
Lipper New Jersey Municipal Debt Funds <sup>3</sup>	(9.68)%	(6.06)%		

<sup>1</sup> All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions.

- <sup>2</sup> The Fund s discount to NAV widened during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.
- <sup>3</sup> Average return.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The following discussion relates to the Fund s absolute performance based on NAV:

Municipal bonds lost ground in the six-month reporting period. After producing slightly positive returns in August, municipal bonds began to move lower in September and October due to a pick-up in new tax-exempt issuance and rising yields in the U.S. Treasury market. (Prices and yields move in opposite directions.) The weakness accelerated in November once Donald Trump s election victory caused investors to adjust their expectations in favor of stronger growth and tighter Fed policy. The municipal market subsequently stabilized and retraced some of its losses in December and January as the relative attractiveness of the asset class brought in new investors, but the modest rally was insufficient to make up for the earlier downturn.

New Jersey underperformed the broader U.S. municipal bond market. The state s credit rating remained under pressure due to continuing budgetary issues, lagging job growth versus the national averages, continued population out-migration and concerns about its pension-funding difficulties.

At the sector level, exposure to state tax-backed, transportation and education sectors detracted from performance. Holdings in longer-duration bonds, which were more sensitive to rising yields, also detracted. (Duration is a measure of interest-rate sensitivity.) Credit spreads widened during the six month reporting period, whereby the Fund s holdings in lower-rated investment-grade bonds were a further detractor.

Portfolio income, which was enhanced by the Fund s use of leverage, made a positive contribution during a period of falling prices. However, leverage also served to accentuate the price declines associated with rising yields.

At a time when lower-quality, longer-dated bonds experienced the largest underperformance, the Funds spositions in high-quality, short-dated issues performed relatively well and helped mitigate the impact of the market decline. The Fund sought to manage interest rate risk using U.S. Treasury futures. Given that Treasury yields rose as prices fell, this aspect of the Funds positioning had a positive effect on returns. 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.

8

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

#### BlackRock MuniHoldings New Jersey Quality Fund, Inc.

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	1/31/17	7/31/16	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$ 14.20	\$ 16.12	(11.91)%	\$ 16.25	\$ 13.60
Net Asset Value	\$ 15.13	\$ 16.55	(8.58)%	\$ 16.57	\$ 14.88

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

Overview of the Fund s Total Investments\*

Sector Allocation	1/31/17	7/31/16
Transportation	24%	24%
Education	20	21
State	19	20
County/City/Special District/School District	15	15
Health	13	11
Housing	4	4
Utilities	3	3
Corporate	2	2

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

Call/Maturity Schedule <sup>2</sup>	
Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2017	8%
2018	10
2019	4
2020	9
2021	17

<sup>2</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	1/31/17	7/31/16
AA/Aa	58%	57%
A	34	35
BBB/Baa	8	8

<sup>1</sup> For financial reporting purposes, credit quality ratings shown above reflect the highest rating assigned by either S&P or Moody s if ratings differ. These rating agencies are independent, nationally recognized statistical rating organizations and are widely used. Investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BBB/Baa or higher. Below investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BB/Ba or lower. Investments designated N/R are not rated by either rating agency. Unrated investments do not necessarily indicate low credit quality. Credit quality ratings are subject to change.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 31, 2017

## Fund Summary as of January 31, 2017

#### BlackRock MuniYield Investment Quality Fund

#### Fund Overview

BlackRock MuniYield Investment Quality Fund s (MFT) (the Fund ) investment objective is to provide shareholders with as high a level of current income exempt from federal income taxes as is consistent with its investment policies and prudent investment management. The Fund seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing at least 80% of its assets in municipal obligations exempt from federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax). Under normal market conditions, the Fund invests primarily in long-term municipal obligations that are investment grade quality, or are considered by the Fund s adviser to be of comparable quality, at the time of investment. The Fund may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives.

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

Fund Information	
Symbol on NYSE	MFT
Initial Offering Date	October 30, 1992
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2017 (\$14.41) <sup>1</sup>	5.91%
Tax Equivalent Yield <sup>2</sup>	10.44%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.071
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.852
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2017 <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.
- <sup>3</sup> The monthly distribution per Common Share, declared on March 1, 2017, was decreased to \$0.067 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 TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Fund, including any assets attributable to VMTP Shares and TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Fund, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

#### Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2017 were as follows:

	<b>Returns Based On</b>		
	Market Price	NAV	
MFT <sup>1,2</sup>	(7.78)%	(4.97)%	
Lipper General & Insured Municipal Debt Funds (Leveraged) <sup>3</sup>	(7.34)%	(5.63)%	

<sup>1</sup> All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions.

- <sup>2</sup> The Fund s premium to NAV narrowed during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.
- <sup>3</sup> Average return.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The following discussion relates to the Fund s absolute performance based on NAV:

Municipal bonds lost ground in the six-month reporting period. After producing slightly positive returns in August, municipal bonds began to move lower in September and October due to a pick-up in new tax-exempt issuance and rising yields in the U.S. Treasury market. (Prices and yields move in opposite directions.) The weakness accelerated in November once Donald Trump s election victory caused investors to adjust their expectations in favor of stronger growth and tighter Fed policy. The municipal market subsequently stabilized and retraced some of its losses in December and January as the relative attractiveness of the asset class brought in new investors, but the modest rally was insufficient to make up for the earlier downturn.

Positions in bonds with longer maturities declined the most in value since they typically have longer durations (above-average interest rate sensitivity). The Fund s exposure to issues with 4% coupons also detracted from results, as lower coupons generally underperform in rising rate environments.

From a sector allocation perspective, the Fund s exposure to transportation and utilities sectors were the largest detractors.

Portfolio income, which was enhanced by the Fund s use of leverage, made a positive contribution during a period of falling prices. However, leverage also served to accentuate the price declines associated with rising yields.

The Fund sought to manage interest rate risk using U.S. Treasury futures. Given that Treasury yields rose as prices fell, this aspect of the Fund s positioning had a positive effect on returns. Positions in high-quality, short-duration bonds such as pre-refunded securities held up relatively well in the down market due to their lower interest rate sensitivity.

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.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

10

#### BlackRock MuniYield Investment Quality Fund

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	1/31/17	7/31/16	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$14.41	\$16.09	(10.44)%	\$ 16.43	\$ 13.23
Net Asset Value	\$14.35	\$15.55	(7.72)%	\$ 15.55	\$ 14.10

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

Overview of the Fund s Total Investments\*

Sector Allocation	1/31/17	7/31/16
Transportation	38%	40%
County/City/Special District/School District	18	15
Utilities	16	19
Health	11	10
State	9	9
Education	4	3
Housing	2	2
Tobacco	1	1
Corporate	1	1

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

Call/Maturity Schedule <sup>2</sup>	
Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2018	10%
2019	25
2020	4
2021	20

 $^2$  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 <sup>1</sup>	1/31/17	7/31/16
AAA/Aaa	7%	6%
AA/Aa	58	62
A	26	25
BBB/Baa	8	7
N/R	1	

<sup>1</sup> For financial reporting purposes, credit quality ratings shown above reflect the highest rating assigned by either S&P or Moody s if ratings differ. These rating agencies are independent, nationally recognized statistical rating organizations and are widely used. Investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BBB/Baa or higher. Below investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BB/Ba or lower. Investments designated N/R are not rated by either rating agency. Unrated investments do not necessarily indicate low credit quality. Credit quality ratings are subject to change.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 31, 2017

## Fund Summary as of January 31, 2017

### BlackRock MuniYield Michigan Quality Fund, Inc.

#### **Fund Overview**

BlackRock MuniYield Michigan Quality Fund, Inc. s (MIY) (the Fund ) investment objective is to provide shareholders with as high a level of current income exempt from federal and Michigan income taxes as is consistent with its investment policies and prudent investment management. The Fund seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing at least 80% of its assets in municipal obligations exempt from federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax) and Michigan income taxes. Under normal market conditions, the Fund invests primarily in long-term municipal obligations that are investment grade quality, or are considered by the Fund s adviser to be of comparable quality, at the time of investment. The Fund may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives.

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

Fund Information	
Symbol on NYSE	MIY
Initial Offering Date	October 30, 1992
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2017 (\$13.70) <sup>1</sup>	5.61%
Tax Equivalent Yield <sup>2</sup>	10.35%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.064
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.768
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2017 <sup>4</sup>	39%

<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 and state tax rate of 45.81%, 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.
- <sup>3</sup> The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- <sup>4</sup> Represents VRDP Shares and TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Fund, including any assets attributable to VRDP Shares and TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Fund, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

#### Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2017 were as follows:

	Returns Ba	<b>Returns Based On</b>		
	Market Price	NAV		
MIY <sup>1,2</sup>	(8.48)%	(4.98)%		
Lipper Other States Municipal Debt Funds <sup>3</sup>	(8.44)%	(5.37)%		

<sup>1</sup> All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions.

2 The Fund s discount to NAV widened during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV. 3

### Average return.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The following discussion relates to the Fund s absolute performance based on NAV:

Municipal bonds lost ground in the six-month reporting period. After producing slightly positive returns in August, municipal bonds began to move lower in September and October due to a pick-up in new tax-exempt issuance and rising yields in the U.S. Treasury market. (Prices and vields move in opposite directions.) The weakness accelerated in November once Donald Trump s election victory caused investors to adjust their expectations in favor of stronger growth and tighter Fed policy. The municipal market subsequently stabilized and retraced some of its losses in December and January as the relative attractiveness of the asset class brought in new investors, but the modest rally was insufficient to make up for the earlier downturn.

Michigan s municipal bond market performed in line with the broader national indices during the period. The slightly longer duration (interest-rate sensitivity) of the Michigan index was a headwind during a period of sharply rising yields. However, the state s economy has benefited from a cyclical upturn in manufacturing in the last few years, helping its unemployment rate to fall in line with national averages after lagging considerably previously. Michigan s fiscal picture has improved in kind, and its budget has moved into surplus.

The Fund s duration positioning detracted from performance on an absolute basis, reflecting the aggressive increase in municipal bond yields. The Fund s exposure to the long end of the yield curve also detracted, as longer-term bonds sold off more than shorter-term issues. Additionally, holdings in the healthcare-related sectors underperformed due to uncertainty surrounding the future of the Affordable Care Act.

Portfolio income, which was enhanced by the Fund s use of leverage, made a positive contribution during a period of falling prices. However, leverage also served to accentuate the price declines associated with rising yields. The Fund sought to manage interest rate risk using U.S. Treasury futures. Given that Treasury yields rose as prices fell, this aspect of the Fund s positioning had a positive effect on returns. 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.

12

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

#### BlackRock MuniYield Michigan Quality Fund, Inc.

#### Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	1/31/17	7/31/16	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$13.70	\$15.38	(10.92)%	\$ 15.40	\$ 13.25
Net Asset Value	\$15.13	\$16.36	(7.52)%	\$ 16.36	\$ 14.82

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

Overview of the Fund s Total Investments\*

Sector Allocation	1/31/17	7/31/16
Health	27%	25%
Education	23	23
County/City/Special District/School District	17	19
State	10	9
Utilities	10	10
Transportation	7	7
Housing	4	4
Corporate	2	3

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

Call/Maturity Schedule <sup>2</sup>	
Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2017	7%
2018	12
2019	5
2020	5
2021	17

<sup>2</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	1/31/17	7/31/16
AAA/Aaa	3%	3%
AA/Aa	66	69
A	26	26
BBB/Baa	3	1
N/R	2	1

<sup>1</sup> For financial reporting purposes, credit quality ratings shown above reflect the highest rating assigned by either S&P or Moody s if ratings differ. These rating agencies are independent, nationally recognized statistical rating organizations and are widely used. Investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BBB/Baa or higher. Below investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BB/Ba or lower. Investments designated N/R are not rated by either rating agency. Unrated investments do not necessarily indicate low credit quality. Credit quality ratings are subject to change.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 31, 2017

### Fund Summary as of January 31, 2017

### BlackRock MuniYield Pennsylvania Quality Fund

#### **Fund Overview**

BlackRock MuniYield Pennsylvania Quality Fund s (MPA) (the Fund ) investment objective is to provide shareholders with as high a level of current income exempt from federal and Pennsylvania income taxes as is consistent with its investment policies and prudent investment management. The Fund seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing at least 80% of its assets in municipal obligations exempt from federal income taxes (except that the interest may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax) and Pennsylvania income taxes. Under normal market conditions, the Fund invests primarily in long-term municipal obligations that are investment grade quality, or are considered by the Fund s adviser to be of comparable quality, at the time of investment. The Fund may invest directly in such securities or synthetically through the use of derivatives.

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

Fund Information	
Symbol on NYSE	MPA
Initial Offering Date	October 30, 1992
Yield on Closing Market Price as of January 31, 2017 (\$14.45) <sup>1</sup>	5.17%
Tax Equivalent Yield <sup>2</sup>	9.42%
Current Monthly Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.0623
Current Annualized Distribution per Common Share <sup>3</sup>	\$0.7476
Economic Leverage as of January 31, 2017 <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 and state tax rate of 45.14%, 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.
- <sup>3</sup> The distribution rate is not constant and is subject to change.
- <sup>4</sup> Represents VRDP Shares and TOB Trusts as a percentage of total managed assets, which is the total assets of the Fund, including any assets attributable to VRDP Shares and TOB Trusts, minus the sum of accrued liabilities. For a discussion of leveraging techniques utilized by the Fund, please see The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging on page 5.

#### Performance

Returns for the six months ended January 31, 2017 were as follows:

	Returns Ba	sed On
	Market Price	NAV
MPA <sup>1,2</sup>	(7.82)%	(6.41)%
Lipper Pennsylvania Municipal Debt Funds <sup>3</sup>	(9.20)%	(5.26)%

- <sup>1</sup> All returns reflect reinvestment of dividends and/or distributions.
- <sup>2</sup> The Fund s discount to NAV widened during the period, which accounts for the difference between performance based on price and performance based on NAV.
- <sup>3</sup> Average return.

Performance results may include adjustments made for financial reporting purposes in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. The following discussion relates to the Fund s absolute performance based on NAV:

Municipal bonds lost ground in the six-month reporting period. After producing slightly positive returns in August, municipal bonds began to move lower in September and October due to a pick-up in new tax-exempt issuance and rising yields in the U.S. Treasury market. (Prices and yields move in opposite directions.) The weakness accelerated in November once Donald Trump s election victory caused investors to adjust their expectations in favor of stronger growth and tighter Fed policy. The municipal market subsequently stabilized and retraced some of its losses in December and January as the relative attractiveness of the asset class brought in new investors, but the modest rally was insufficient to make up for the earlier downturn.

Yield spreads were steady for Pennsylvania s general obligation municipal bonds after Governor Tom Wolf signed a \$31.5 billion budget for fiscal year 2017 in July. The rating agency Standard & Poor s subsequently removed the commonwealth from credit watch status and affirmed its AA-minus rating. Conversely, elevated supply and widening spreads in the health care and transportation sectors, the largest sectors in the state, weighed on the performance of these bonds.

At the sector level, health care, education and transportation sectors represented the largest detractors from Fund performance. Holdings in the corporate municipal sector also detracted, as a specific issuer received a multi-notch downgrade due to its deteriorating credit fundamentals. Reinvestment was a further drag on results, as the proceeds of higher-yielding bonds that matured or were called needed to be reinvested at materially lower prevailing rates.

The Fund s more-seasoned holdings, while producing generous yields compared to current market rates, detracted from performance. The prices of many of these investments declined due to the premium amortization that occurred as the bonds approached their first call dates. (A call is when an issuer redeems a bond prior to its maturity date; premium is amount by which a bond trades above its \$100 par value.)

The Fund continued to employ leverage in order to increase income. Since leverage also amplifies the effect of market movements, it was a net detractor from performance at a time of falling prices.

The Fund sought to manage interest rate risk using U.S. Treasury futures. Given that Treasury yields rose as prices fell, this aspect of the Fund s positioning had a positive effect on returns. The Fund s exposure to pre-refunded issues also benefited performance, as their low duration enabled them to hold up better than longer-duration bonds at a time of rising yields.

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.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

14

### BlackRock MuniYield Pennsylvania Quality Fund

Market Price and Net Asset Value Per Share Summary

	1/31/17	7/31/16	Change	High	Low
Market Price	\$14.45	\$16.07	(10.08)%	\$ 16.66	\$13.84
Net Asset Value	\$15.30	\$16.76	(8.71)%	\$ 16.77	\$ 14.94

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

Overview of the Fund s Total Investments\*

Sector Allocation	1/31/17	7/31/16
Health	20%	20%
Education	20	20
County/City/Special District/School District	19	20
State	14	13
Transportation	12	12
Housing	8	7
Utilities	5	6
Corporate	2	2

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

Call/Maturity Schedule <sup>3</sup>	
Calendar Year Ended December 31,	
2017	6%
2018	11
2019	11
2020	7
2021	15

<sup>3</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	1/31/17	7/31/16
AAA/Aaa	1%	1%
AA/Aa	63	62
Α	25	23

BBB/Baa	6	6
BB/Ba		2
CCC	2	
BBB/Baa BB/Ba CCC N/R <sup>3</sup>	5	6

<sup>1</sup> For financial reporting purposes, credit quality ratings shown above reflect the highest rating assigned by either S&P or Moody s if ratings differ. These rating agencies are independent, nationally recognized statistical rating organizations and are widely used. Investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BBB/Baa or higher. Below investment grade ratings are credit ratings of BB/Ba or lower. Investments designated N/R are not rated by either rating agency. Unrated investments do not necessarily indicate low credit quality. Credit quality ratings are subject to change.

<sup>2</sup> Represents less than 1%.

<sup>3</sup> The investment adviser evaluates the credit quality of unrated investments based upon certain factors including, but not limited to, credit ratings for similar investments and financial analysis of sectors and individual investments. Using this approach, the investment adviser has deemed certain of these unrated securities as investment grade quality. As of January 31, 2017 and July 31, 2016, the market value of unrated securities deemed by the investment adviser to be investment grade represents 2% and 1%, respectively, of the Fund s total investments.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 31, 2017

# Schedule of Investments January 31, 2017 (Unaudited)

### BR MuniHoldings California Quality Fund, Inc. (MUC)

(Percentages shown are based on Net Assets)

	Par		
Municipal Bonds	(000)	Value	
California 106.3%	(000)	value	
Corporate 2.7%			
California Pollution Control Financing Authority, Refunding RB, Waste Management, Inc., AMT:			
Series A-1, 3.38%, 7/01/25 Series B-1, 3.00%, 11/01/25	\$ 5,000 9,000	\$ 5,056,650 8,938,080	
City of Chula Vista California, Refunding RB, San Diego Gas & Electric, Series A, 5.88%, 2/15/34	2,435	2,659,799	
	2,100		
		16,654,529	
County/City/Special District/School District         36.3%           Centinela Valley Union High School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series A, 5.75%, 8/01/21			
(a)	9,120	10,794,614	
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/35 County of Kern California, COP, Capital Improvements Projects, Series A (AGC),	5,000	5,208,800	
6.00%, 2/01/19 (a) County of Los Angeles California Public Works Financing Authority, Refunding RB, Series D:	3,500	3,836,210	
4.00%, 12/01/40	1,000	1,017,100	
5.00%, 12/01/45	1,430	1,609,065	
County of Orange California Sanitation District, COP, Series A, 5.00%, 2/01/19 (a)	2,500	2,692,400	
County of San Joaquin California Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, Limited Tax, Measure K, Series A, 6.00%, 3/01/36	2,665	3,083,805	
County of Ventura California Community College District, GO, Election of 2002, Series C, 5.50%, 8/01/18 (a)	4,000	4,270,720	
Culver City Redevelopment Finance Authority California, Refunding, Tax Allocation Bonds, Series A (AGM), 5.60%, 11/01/25	3,750	3,762,825	
Denair California Unified School District, GO, CAB (AGM), Election of 2007, 0.00%, 8/01/41 (b)	4,260	1,394,639	
Desert Community College District California, GO, Election of 2004, Series C (AGM), 5.00%, 8/01/17 (a)	16,530	16,881,758	
Fremont Union High School District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/40	2,500	2,601,925	
Garden Grove Unified School District, GO, Election of 2010, Series C, 5.25%, 8/01/40	5,500	6,285,180	
Gavilan Joint Community College District, GO, Election of 2004, Series D:			
5.50%, 8/01/31	2,170	2,454,096	
5.75%, 8/01/35	8,400	9,573,396	
Golden Empire Schools Financing Authority, Refunding RB, Kern High School District Projects, 1.16%, 5/01/17 (c)	5,000	5,000,000	
Grossmont California Healthcare District, GO, Election of 2006, Series B, 6.13%, 7/15/21 (a)	2,000	2,397,580	
Imperial Irrigation District, Series A, Electric System Revenue, 5.13% 11/01/18 (a)	8,000 <b>Par</b>	8,572,320	
Municipal Bonds	(000)	Value	
California (continued)			
County/City/Special District/School District (continued) Kern Community College District, GO, Safety Repair & Improvements, Series C:			
5.25%, 11/01/32	\$ 5,715	\$ 6,662,204	
5.75%, 11/01/34	12,085	14,453,418	
Los Alamitos Unified School District, GO, Refunding, School Facilities Improvement: 5.25%, 8/01/23 (a)	2,185	2,634,433	
5.25%, 8/01/39 Los Angeles Community College District California, GO, Election of 2001, Series A (NPFGC),	1,515	1,735,160	
5.00%, 8/01/17 (a)	6,645	6,786,406	
Los Rios Community College District, GO, Election of 2008, Series A, 5.00%, 8/01/35	11,000	12,092,850	
Mount San Jacinto Community College District, GO, Series A, 5.00%, 8/01/35 Oxnard Union High School District, GO, Refunding, Election of 2004, Series A (AGM),	3,565	4,059,180	
5.00%, 8/01/35	10,000	10,958,000	
Redlands Unified School District California, GO, Election of 2008 (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33	5,000	5,273,050	
Rio Elementary School District, GO, Series A, 5.25%, 8/01/40	5,865	6,664,810	

Riverside Community College District Foundation, GO, Election of 2004 (a):			
Series C (AGM), 5.00%, 8/01/17	8,750	8,936,200	
Series C (NPFGC), 5.00%, 8/01/17	8,910	9,099,605	
San Diego Regional Building Authority, RB, County Operations Center & Annex, Series A,		- , ,	
5.50%, 2/01/19 (a)	905	982,640	
San Diego Unified School District, GO, CAB, Series C (b):			
Election of 2008, 0.00%, 7/01/42	3,605	1,204,503	
Election of 2008, 0.00%, 7/01/43	1,310	418,139	
Election of 2008, 0.00%, 7/01/45	1,575	458,530	
0.00%, 7/01/47	1,000	266,430	
San Jose California Financing Authority, LRB, Convention Center Expansion & Renovation			
Project, Series A:			
5.75%, 5/01/36	2,560	2,566,886	
5.75%, 5/01/42	4,500	5,113,305	
San Jose California Financing Authority, Refunding LRB, Civic Center Project, Series A,			
5.00%, 6/01/39	5,800	6,439,624	
San Marcos Redevelopment Agency Successor Agency, Refunding, Tax Allocation Bonds,			
Series A:			
5.00%, 10/01/32	1,700	1,936,844	
5.00%, 10/01/33	1,125	1,276,256	
Snowline Joint Unified School District, COP, Refunding, Refining Project (AGC),			
5.75%, 9/01/19 (a)	5,635	6,286,237	

#### **Portfolio Abbreviations**

AGC AGM AMBAC	Assured Guarantee Corp. Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp. American Municipal Bond Assurance Corp.	COP EDA EDC	Certificates of Participation Economic Development Authority Economic Development Corp.	IDB ISD LRB	Industrial Development Board Independent School District Lease Revenue Bonds
AMT ARB	Alternative Minimum Tax (subject to) Airport Revenue Bonds	ERB GAB	Education Revenue Bonds Grant Anticipation Bonds	M/F NPFGC	Multi-Family National Public Finance Guarantee Corp.
BAM BARB BHAC CAB CHF	Build America Mutual Assurance Co. Building Aid Revenue Bonds Berkshire Hathaway Assurance Corp. Capital Appreciation Bonds Swiss Franc	GARB GO HDA HFA IDA	General Airport Revenue Bonds General Obligation Bonds Housing Development Authority Housing Finance Agency Industrial Development Authority	Q-SBLF RB S/F Syncora	Qualified School Bond Loan Fund Revenue Bonds Single-Family Syncora Guarantee

See Notes to Financial Statements.

16

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

# Schedule of Investments (continued)

### BR MuniHoldings California Quality Fund, Inc. (MUC)

	Par		
Municipal Panda	(000)	Value	
Municipal Bonds California (continued)	(000)	Value	
County/City/Special District/School District (continued)			
Sweetwater Union High School District, GO, Refunding, 4.00%, 8/01/42	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,052,800	
West Contra Costa California Unified School District, GO:	\$ 2,000	¢ 0,002,000	
Election of 2010, Series A (AGM), 5.25%, 8/01/41	5,390	6,080,243	
Election of 2010, Series B, 5.50%, 8/01/39	3,195	3,714,731	
Election of 2012, Series A, 5.50%, 8/01/39	2,500	2,906,675	
Yuba Community College District, GO, BAM, Election of 2006, Series C, 0.00%, 8/01/38 (b)	5,150	2,089,509	
		227,585,101	
Education 2.6%		227,585,101	
California Municipal Finance Authority, RB, Emerson College, 6.00%, 1/01/42	2,750	3,119,050	
University of California, Refunding RB:	2,750	5,117,000	
Series AO, 5.00%, 5/15/40	5,430	6,191,558	
Series AR, 5.00%, 5/15/41	2,360	2,705,032	
Series AR, 5.00%, 5/15/46	3,600	4,110,768	
		16,126,408	
Health 11.3%			
ABAG Finance Authority for Nonprofit Corps., Refunding RB, Sharp Healthcare, Series B,			
6.25%, 8/01/39	6,305	6,997,730	
California Health Facilities Financing Authority, RB:			
Children s Hospital, Series A, 5.25%, 11/01/41	8,000	8,839,440	
Providence Health Services, Series B, 5.50%, 10/01/39	4,130	4,497,818	
Sutter Health, Series B, 6.00%, 8/15/42	9,655	10,996,466	
California Health Facilities Financing Authority, Refunding RB:	2 700	4 111 402	
Dignity Health, Series A, 6.00%, 7/01/19 (a)	3,700 10,970	4,111,403	
Providence Health and Services, Series A, 5.00%, 10/01/38 St. Joseph Health System, Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/37	10,000	12,145,326 11,054,700	
Sutter Health, Series B, 5.00%, 11/15/46	2,275	2,526,024	
California Statewide Communities Development Authority, Refunding RB:	2,215	2,520,024	
CHF Irvine LLC, 5.00%, 5/15/40	750	799,275	
Trinity Health Credit Group Composite Issue, 5.00%, 12/01/41	6,235	6,916,298	
Washington Township Health Care District, GO, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.50%, 8/01/38	1,625	1,859,650	
		70,744,130	
State 7.7%		70,744,150	
State of California, GO, Various Purposes:			
6.00%, 3/01/33	5,000	5,659,550	
6.00%, 4/01/38	27,765	30,459,038	
State of California, GO, Refunding, Veterans Bond, 4.00%, 12/01/40	4,000	4,050,880	
State of California Public Works Board, LRB:			
Department of Education, Riverside Campus Project, Series B, 6.50%, 4/01/34	3,670	4,060,121	
Various Capital Projects, Series I, 5.50%, 11/01/33	2,015	2,376,048	
State of California Public Works Board, RB, California State Prisons, Series C,	1 205	1 208 020	
5.75%, 10/01/31	1,205	1,398,920	
		48 004 557	
	Par	48,004,557	
	r ai		
Manifest Day de	(000)	XZ-l	
Municipal Bonds California (continued)	(000)	Value	
Transportation 22.0%			
Alameda California Corridor Transportation Authority, Refunding RB, 2nd Subordinate Lien,			
Series B:			
5.00%, 10/01/35	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,638,060	
4.00%, 10/01/37	1,125	1,127,644	
City & County of San Francisco California Airports Commission, ARB, Series E,	, -		
6.00%, 5/01/39	9,650	10,613,938	

City & County of San Francisco California Airports Commission, Refunding ARB, AMT:         4,950         5,204,381           2nd Series AJ, 5,00%, 501/22         6,435         7,204,883           City & County of San Francisco California Airports Commission, Refunding RB, AMT         2,290         2,423,461           Pald Series AJ, 5,75%, 501/24         2,710         2,887,939         2,877,939           City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, ARB:         7         2,877,939         2,900         2,233,960           AMT, Series D, 5,00%, 5/15/40         3,830         4,257,543         2,000         2,233,960           AMT, Series D, 5,00%, 5/15/35         2,000         2,237,961         2,500         2,487,594           Lity of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles         1         1         1           International Airport, Series A:         5,25%, 5/15/29         2,500         2,877,594         1         1         1         1         2         2         2,575,475,976         1         <				
2nd Series A. 500%, 501/29       6,435       7,204,883         City & County of San Francisco California Airports Commission, Refunding RB, AMT       6,435       7,204,883         City & County of San Francisco California Airports Commission, Refunding RB, AMT       2,290       2,423,461         Balance 2nd, 5,75%, 501/18 (a)       2,710       2,857,939         City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, ARB:       700       2,857,939         AMT, Series D, 5,00%, 5,15545       2,000       2,233,960         AMT, Series D, 5,00%, 5,15545       1,500       1,667,445         Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles       2,590       2,877,594         City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles       5,845       6,328,498         International Airport, Series A:       5,00%, 5/15/30       3,000       3,077,110         City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT:       3,000       3,077,110         City of San Jose California, Refunding RB, Series A (AMBAC), 5,00%, 301/37       8,000       8,024,240         County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Series A, 5,00%, 7/01/41       2,500       2,787,925         County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Series A, 5,00%, 7/01/41       2,500       2,787,925         County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Series A	City & County of San Francisco California Airports Commission, Refunding ARB, AMT:			
City & County of San Francisco California Airports Commission, Refunding RB, AMT       2,290       2,423,461         Ad Series 32, 575%, 5/01/18 (a)       2,2710       2,857,939         City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, ARB:		,		
(AGM):       2.290       2.433.461         Dal Series 2, 575%, 5/01/24       2,710       2.857,939         City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, ARB:		6,435	7,204,883	
2nd Series 32, 575%, 501/18 (a)       2,290       2,433,461         Balance 2nd, 5,75%, 501/24       2,710       2,857,939         City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, ARB:       2,710       2,857,939         AMT, Series D, 500%, 5/15/36       2,000       2,233,960         AMT, Series D, 500%, 5/15/35       2,000       2,233,960         AMT, Series D, 500%, 5/15/36       1,500       1,667,445         Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles       2,590       2,877,594         International Airport, Series A:       5,25%, 5/15/29       2,890       3,307,110         City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles       3,000       3,307,110         City of San Jose California, Refunding RB, Series A, 1, AMT:       3,000       3,007,110         City of San Jose California, Refunding RB, Series A (AMBAC), 5,00%, 3/01/37       8,000       8,024,240         County of Sacamento California, Refunding RB, Series A, 5,00%, 7/01/41       2,500       2,787,925         County of Sacamento California, ARB       Senior Series A, 5,75%, 7/01/34       6,345       6,466,316         County of Sacamento California, ARB, Series A, 5,00%, 7/01/41       2,500       2,787,925         County of Sacamento California, ARB       8,200       8,720,126         S				
Balance 2nd, 5,75%, 5/01/24         2,710         2,857,939           City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, ARB:				
City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, ARB:         3.830         4.257,543           AMT, Series D, 500%, 5/15/35         2.000         2.233,960           AMT, Series D, 500%, 5/15/35         2.000         2.233,960           Los Angeles International Airport, Series D, 5.25%, 5/15/29         2,590         2,877,594           City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles         1,607,445         1,500           Los Angeles International Airport, Series A:         5,25%, 5/15/29         2,590         2,877,594           City of Los Angeles California Refunding ARB, Series A:         3,000         3,307,110         1,500           City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A:         3,785         4,205,362         6,258,498           Score California, Refunding RB, Series A (AMBAC), 5.00%, 3/01/37         8,000         8,004,240         County of Sacramento California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/34         6,345         6,466,316           County of Sacramento California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/34         6,345         6,466,316         County of Sacramento California, ARB         Series S, 5.75%, 7/01/39         2,650         2,803,223         Senior Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/39         8,200         8,700,126         Senior Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/39         2,650         2,803,823         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39         4,995		,		
AMT, Serios Series A, 5.00%, 5/15/40 3.830 4.257,543 AMT, Series D, 5.00%, 5/15/35 2.000 2.233,960 AMT, Series D, 5.00%, 5/15/35 1.500 1.657,445 Los Angeles International Airport, Senior Series D, 5.25%, 5/15/29 2.590 2.877,594 City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles International Airport, Series A: 5.25%, 5/15/39 5.845 6.328,498 Senior, 5.00%, 5/15/40 3.000 3.307,110 City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT: 5.25%, 3/01/23 3.785 4.205,362 3.785 4.205,362 3.785 4.205,362 3.785 4.205,362 County of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A, 5.00%, 3/01/37 8.000 8.024,240 County of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Senior S.00%, 3/01/37 8.000 8.024,240 County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2.500 2.787,925 County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2.500 8.720,126 Senior Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/38 8.200 8.720,126 Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28 3.12,75 4.069,509 Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28 3.13,275 4.069,509 Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/30 Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 8/01/19 Senior Series		2,710	2,857,939	
AMT, Series D, 500%, 5/15/35       2,000       2.233,960         AMT, Series D, 500%, 5/15/36       1,500       1,667,445         Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles       1,500       1,667,445         International Airport, Series A:       5,25%, 5/15/29       2,2390       2,877,594         Settion Stress A:       5,25%, 5/15/39       5,845       6,328,498         Senior, 5,00%, 5/15/40       3,000       3,307,110       City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT:         5,25%, 3/01/23       3,785       4,205,362         6,25%, 3/01/34       1,400       1,607,564         City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A (AMBAC), 5,00%, 3/01/37       8,000       8,024,240         County of Sacramento California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/34       6,345       6,466,316         County of Sacramento California, ARB;       2,500       2,787,925         County of Sacramento California, ARB;       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series B, A/T (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       2,650       2,803,223         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,8000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,800       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       4,995       5,208,786 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
AMT, Series D, 5.00%, 5/15/36 1,500 1,667,445 Los Angeles International Airport, Senior Series D, 5.25%, 5/15/29 2,590 2,877,594 City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles International Airport, Series A: 5.25%, 5/15/39 5,845 6,328,498 Senior, 5.00%, 5/15/40 3,000 3,307,110 City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT: 5.25%, 3/01/23 3,785 4,205,362 6.25%, 3/01/23 1,400 1,607,564 City of San Jose California, Refunding RB, Series A (AMBAC), 5.00%, 3/01/37 8,000 8,024,240 County of Orange California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2,500 2,787,925 County of Orange California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2,500 2,787,925 County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2,500 2,787,925 County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2,500 2,787,925 County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2,500 2,787,925 County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2,500 2,787,925 County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2,500 2,787,925 County of Sacramento California, RBC Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33 18,200 Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33 18,200 Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/31 Subordinate Revenue, Sub-Series B, 5.00%, 7/01/41 1,250 1,388,675 County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40 4,545 5,230,659 Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RF, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40 4,545 5,230,659 Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RF, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40 4,545 5,230,659 County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40 4,545 5,230,659 Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RF, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40 4,545 5,230,659 Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RF, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40 4,		,		
Los Angeles International Airport, Senior Series D, 5.25%, 5/15/29 2,590 2,877,594 City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles International Airport, Series A: 5.25%, 5/15/39 5,845 6,328,498 Senior, 5.00%, 5/15/40 3,000 3,307,110 City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT: 5.25%, 3/01/23 3,785 4,205,362 6.25%, 3/01/24 1,400 1,607,564 City of San Jose California, Refunding RB, Series A (AMBAC), 5.00%, 3/01/37 8,000 8,224,240 County of Orange California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2,500 2,787,925 County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41 2,500 2,787,925 Senior Series A (AGC), 5.50%, 7/01/18 (a) Senior Series A, 5.75%, 7/01/39 2,650 2,803,223 Senior Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/39 2,650 2,803,223 Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28 13,275 14,069,509 Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/30 18,000 Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/31 18,000 Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/34 1,250 County of Sacramento California Areport System Subordinate Revenue, Sub-Series B, 5.00%, 7/01/41 Sub-Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39 Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.		,	, ,	
City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles         International Airport, Series A:         5.25%, 5/15/39       5,845       6,328,498         Senior, 5.00%, 5/15/40       3,000       3,307,110         City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT:		,		
International Airport, Series A:         5.25%, 5/15/39         5,845         6,328,498           Scenior, 5.00%, 5/15/40         3,000         3,307,110           City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT:	Los Angeles International Airport, Senior Series D, 5.25%, 5/15/29	2,590	2,877,594	
5.25%, 5/15/39       5,845       6,328,498         Senior, 5.00%, 5/15/40       3,000       3,307,110         City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT:       3,785       4,205,362         5.25%, 3/01/23       3,785       4,205,362         6.25%, 3/01/34       1,400       1,607,564         City of San Jose California, Refunding RB, Series A (AMBAC), 5.00%, 3/01/37       8,000       8,024,240         County of Orange California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41       2,500       2,787,925         County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/14       2,500       2,787,925         County of Sacramento California, ARB       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series A, (ACC), 5.50%, 7/01/18 (a)       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       2,650       2,803,223         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       4,995       5,208,786         County of San Bernardino California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System       300       6,079,018         Voort of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)       5,530       6,079,018         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series	City of Los Angeles California Department of Airports, Refunding ARB, Los Angeles			
Senior, 5.00%, 5/15/40         3,000         3,307,110           City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT:	International Airport, Series A:			
City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT:       3,785       4,205,362         5.25%, 3/01/23       3,785       4,205,362         6.25%, 3/01/34       1,400       1,607,564         City of San Jose California, Refunding RB, Series A (AMBAC), 5.00%, 3/01/37       8,000       8,024,240         County of Orange California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41       2,500       2,787,925         County of Sacramento California, RAB:       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series A, (AGC), 5.50%, 7/01/18 (a)       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28       13,275       14,006,9509         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       12,800       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       12,500       13,88,675         County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System       35,300       6,079,018         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40       4,545       5,230,659         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 500       5,473,70       5,00%, 8/01/44         Sould Senior Series S, 10,00/136       2,200       2,473,570       2,473,570	5.25%, 5/15/39	5,845	6,328,498	
5.25%, 3/01/23       3,785       4,205,362         6.25%, 3/01/24       1,400       1,607,564         City of San Jose California, Refunding RB, Series A (AMBAC), 5,00%, 3/01/37       8,000       8,024,240         County of Orange California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41       6,345       6,466,316         County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41       2,500       2,787,925         County of Sacramento California, ARB:	Senior, 5.00%, 5/15/40	3,000	3,307,110	
6.25%, 3/01/34       1,400       1,607,564         City of San Jose California, Refunding RB, Series A, (AMBAC), 5.00%, 3/01/37       8,000       8,024,240         County of Orange California, Refunding ARB, Series S, 5.75%, 7/01/34       6,345       6,466,316         County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41       2,500       2,787,925         County of Sacramento California, ARB:       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/39       2,650       2,803,223         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28       13,275       14,069,509         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       4,995       5,208,786         County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System       8000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       4,995       5,208,786         County of Sacramento California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40       4,545       5,230,659         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)       5,530       6,079,018         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT,       500       547,370         5.00%, 8/01/44       500       547,370         County of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT,       500	City of San Jose California, Refunding ARB, Series A-1, AMT:			
City of San Jose California, Refunding RB, Series A (AMBAC), 5.00%, 3/01/37       8,000       8,024,240         County of Orange California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/34       6,345       6,446,316         County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41       2,500       2,787,925         County of Sacramento California, ARB:       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series A, (AGC), 5.50%, 7/01/18 (a)       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28       13,275       14,069,509         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/13       18,000       13,875         County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System	5.25%, 3/01/23	3,785	4,205,362	
County of Orange California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/34       6,345       6,466,316         County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41       2,500       2,787,925         County of Sacramento California, ARB:       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series A, (AGC), 5.50%, 7/01/18 (a)       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series B, AST5%, 7/01/39       2,650       2,803,223         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28       13,275       14,069,509         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       4,995       5,208,786         County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System       3000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, 5.00%, 7/01/41       1,250       1,388,675         County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40       4,545       5,230,659         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)       5,530       6,079,018         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT,       500       547,370         Solow, 8/01/44       500       547,370         Villittis       23,7%       2,200       2,473,570         City of Los Angeles C	6.25%, 3/01/34	1,400	1,607,564	
County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41         2,500         2,787,925           County of Sacramento California, ARB:         8,200         8,720,126           Senior Series A, (AGC), 5.50%, 7/01/39         2,650         2,803,223           Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28         13,275         14,069,509           Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33         18,000         18,904,860           Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33         18,000         18,904,860           Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39         4,995         5,208,786           County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System         5         5           Subordinate Revenue, Sub-Series B, 5.00%, 7/01/41         1,250         1,388,675           County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40         4,545         5,230,659           Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)         5,530         6,079,018           Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT,         500         547,370           Utilities         23.7%         137,786,089         137,786,089           Utilities         2,200         2,473,570         2,473,570           City of Los Angeles California De	City of San Jose California, Refunding RB, Series A (AMBAC), 5.00%, 3/01/37	8,000	8,024,240	
County of Sacramento California, ARB:       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series A (AGC), 5.50%, 7/01/18 (a)       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/39       2,650       2,803,223         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28       13,275       14,069,509         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       4,995       5,208,786         County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System       1,250       1,388,675         County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40       4,545       5,230,659         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RE funding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)       5,530       6,079,018         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT,       500       547,370         Subork, 8/01/44       500       547,370         I37,786,089         Utilities 23.7%       137,786,089         City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A,         5.38%, 1/01/36       2,200       2,473,570         City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A:         5.38%, 7/01/38       9,375       10,064,250<	County of Orange California, ARB, Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/34	6,345	6,466,316	
County of Sacramento California, ARB:       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series A (AGC), 5.50%, 7/01/18 (a)       8,200       8,720,126         Senior Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/39       2,650       2,803,223         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28       13,275       14,069,509         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       4,995       5,208,786         County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System       1,250       1,388,675         County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40       4,545       5,230,659         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RE funding RB, Series A, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)       5,530       6,079,018         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT,       500       547,370         Subork, 8/01/44       500       547,370         I37,786,089         Utilities 23.7%       137,786,089         City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A,         5.38%, 1/01/36       2,200       2,473,570         City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A:         5.38%, 7/01/38       9,375       10,064,250<	County of Sacramento California, Refunding ARB, Senior Series A, 5.00%, 7/01/41	2,500	2,787,925	
Senior Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/39       2,650       2,803,223         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28       13,275       14,069,509         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       4,995       5,208,786         County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System       34,995       5,230,659         Subordinate Revenue, Sub-Series B, 5.00%, 7/01/41       1,250       1,388,675       5,230,659         Port of Los Angeles California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40       4,545       5,230,659         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)       5,530       6,079,018         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT,       500       547,370         Utilities 23.7%       137,786,089       137,786,089         Utilities 23.7%       137,786,089       137,786,089         City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A:       2,200       2,473,570         City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A:       9,375       10,064,250				
Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28       13,275       14,069,509         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       4,995       5,208,786         County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System       1,250       1,388,675         County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40       4,545       5,230,659         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)       5,530       6,079,018         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT,       500       547,370         Utilities       23.7%       137,786,089         Utilities       23.7%       2,200       2,473,570         City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A:       5,38%, 10/01/36       2,200       2,473,570         City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A:       5,38%, 10,064,250       10,064,250	Senior Series A (AGC), 5.50%, 7/01/18 (a)	8,200	8,720,126	
Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.75%, 7/01/28       13,275       14,069,509         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       4,995       5,208,786         County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System       1,250       1,388,675         County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40       4,545       5,230,659         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)       5,530       6,079,018         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT,       500       547,370         Vilities       23.7%       137,786,089         Vulities       23.7%       2,200       2,473,570         City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A:       5,38%, 1/0/1/36       2,200       2,473,570	Senior Series B, 5.75%, 7/01/39	2,650	2,803,223	
Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33       18,000       18,904,860         Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/39       4,995       5,208,786         County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System       1,250       1,388,675         Subordinate Revenue, Sub-Series B, 5.00%, 7/01/41       1,250       1,388,675         County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40       4,545       5,230,659         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)       5,530       6,079,018         Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT,       500       547,370         Vililities       23.7%       137,786,089         Utilities       23.7%       2,200       2,473,570         City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A:       5,38%, 10/01/36       2,200       2,473,570         City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A:       5,38%, 7/01/38       9,375       10,064,250		13,275	14,069,509	
Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/394,9955,208,786County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System1,2501,388,675Subordinate Revenue, Sub-Series B, 5.00%, 7/01/411,2501,388,675County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/404,5455,230,659Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)5,5306,079,018Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT,500547,3705.00%, 8/01/44500547,370Utilities 23.7%Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/362,2002,473,570City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A: 5.38%, 7/01/389,37510,064,250	Senior Series B, AMT (AGM), 5.25%, 7/01/33	18,000	18,904,860	
County of Sacramento California Airport System Revenue, Refunding ARB, Airport System Subordinate Revenue, Sub-Series B, 5.00%, 7/01/41  1,250 1,388,675 County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/40 4,545 5,230,659 Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a) 5,530 6,079,018 Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 8/01/44 500 547,370 Utilities 23.7% Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/36 2,200 2,473,570 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A: 5.38%, 7/01/38 9,375 10,064,250		4,995	5,208,786	
Subordinate Revenue, Sub-Series B, 5.00%, 7/01/411,2501,388,675County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/404,5455,230,659Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)5,5306,079,018Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 8/01/44500547,370Utilities23.7%137,786,089Utilities23.7%2,2002,473,570City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A: 5.38%, 7/01/389,37510,064,250				
County of San Bernardino California Transportation Authority, RB, Series A, 5.25%, 3/01/404,5455,230,659Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a)5,5306,079,018Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 8/01/44500547,370137,786,089Utilities 23.7%Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/362,2002,473,570City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A: 5.38%, 7/01/389,37510,064,250		1,250	1,388,675	
Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, RB, Series B, 5.25%, 8/01/19 (a) 5,530 6,079,018 Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 500 547,370 Utilities 23.7% Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5,38%, 10/01/36 2,200 2,473,570 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A: 5,38%, 7/01/38 9,375 10,064,250		4,545	5,230.659	
Port of Los Angeles California Harbor Department, Refunding RB, Series A, AMT, 5.00%, 8/01/44 500 547,370 Utilities 23.7% Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/36 2,200 2,473,570 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A: 5.38%, 7/01/38 9,375 10,064,250		,		
5.00%, 8/01/44 500 547,370 137,786,089 Utilities 23.7% Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/36 2,200 2,473,570 City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A: 5.38%, 7/01/38 9,375 10,064,250	6	-,	.,,	
Utilities137,786,089Utilities23.7%Anabeim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/362,2002,873,5702,473,570City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A: 5.38%, 7/01/389,37510,064,250		500	547 370	
Utilities23.7%Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/362,2002,2002,473,570City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A: 5.38%, 7/01/389,37510,064,250		200	011,070	
Utilities23.7%Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/362,2002,2002,473,570City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A: 5.38%, 7/01/389,37510,064,250				
Anaheim Public Financing Authority, RB, Electric System Distribution Facilities, Series A, 5.38%, 10/01/362,2002,473,570City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A: 5.38%, 7/01/389,37510,064,250			137,786,089	
5.38%, 10/01/36       2,200       2,473,570         City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A:       9,375       10,064,250         5.38%, 7/01/38       9,375       10,064,250				
City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, RB, Series A:5.38%, 7/01/389,37510,064,250				
5.38%, 7/01/38 9,375 10,064,250		2,200	2,473,570	
5.00%, 7/01/41 1,705 1,952,788		,	, ,	
	5.00%, 7/01/41	1,705	1,952,788	

See Notes to Financial Statements.

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 31, 2017

# Schedule of Investments (continued)

### BR MuniHoldings California Quality Fund, Inc. (MUC)

	Pa	r		
Municipal Bonds	(00	0)	Value	
California (continued) Utilities (continued)				
City of Los Angeles California Department of Water & Power, Refunding RB, Series A: 5.25%, 7/01/39	\$ 16.0	00 \$	18,078,240	
5.00%, 7/01/46	1,8		2,105,422	
City of Los Angeles California Wastewater System, Refunding RB, Sub-Series A, 5.00%, 6/01/28	2,0	00	2,206,560	
City of San Francisco California Public Utilities Commission Water Revenue, RB: Series A, 5.00%, 11/01/39	5.2	15	5,812,194	
Series B, 5.00%, 11/01/19 (a)	10,0		11,040,100	