MORGAN STANLEY QUALITY MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST Form N-CSR January 09, 2009

# 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: 811-06591

Morgan Stanley Quality Municipal Income Trust

(Exact name of registrant as specified in charter)

522 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York (Address of principal executive offices)

10036 (Zip code)

Randy Takian

522 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10036

(Name and address of agent for service)

Registrant s telephone number, including area code: 212-296-6990

Date of fiscal year end: October 31, 2008 Date of reporting period: October 31, 2008

Item 1 Report to Shareholders

#### INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT

Welcome, Shareholder:

In this report, you Il learn about how your investment in Morgan Stanley Quality Municipal Income Trust performed during the annual period. We will provide an overview of the market conditions, and discuss some of the factors that affected performance during the reporting period. In addition, this report includes the Trust s financial statements and a list of Trust investments.

Market forecasts provided in this report may not necessarily come to pass. There is no assurance that the Trust will achieve its investment objective. The Trust is subject to market risk, which is the possibility that market values of securities owned by the Trust will decline and, therefore, the value of the Trust s shares may be less than what you paid for them. Accordingly, you can lose money investing in this Trust.

Income earned by certain securities in the portfolio may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax (AMT).

#### **Fund Report**

For the year ended October 31, 2008

#### **Market Conditions**

The financial markets were highly volatile throughout the reporting period as disrupted credit markets, recession fears, the declining housing market, and ongoing losses in the financial sector led to increasing investor anxiety. The third quarter of 2008, in particular, will go down as a defining moment in financial history, a period in which the industry s landscape changed in ways most would have never imagined.

As the quarter began, Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac), the two bedrock government-sponsored entities that own or guarantee about half of the nation's outstanding mortgage debt, were facing financial disintegration as the value of the agencies assets had severely eroded. At the same time, economic data was signaling slowing growth while rising food and energy prices were fueling inflation, heightening investor anxiety. In early September, deteriorating market conditions caused the U.S. Treasury to rescue both Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Shortly thereafter, these same conditions led Lehman Brothers to file for bankruptcy protection. Investor confidence plummeted, initiating a downward spiral in the market that accelerated at an alarming pace. In the weeks that followed, several other large financial institutions were forced into mergers, rescued by the government, or failed altogether.

Credit markets became nearly frozen as liquidity dried up. Overnight and short-term credit markets convulsed as banks stopped lending to both companies and each other, causing short-term borrowing costs to soar. As fear gripped the market, credit spreads dramatically widened as investors demanded substantial compensation for assuming any degree of risk. In response, government officials took various steps including a \$700 billion plan to fortify the precarious financial system.

Overall, the consolidation in the banking and brokerage industry has altered the flow of capital and resulted in a general lack of liquidity in the municipal market. The biggest issue facing the municipal market as of the end of the period is a general lack of trading as new issue offerings have been pulled and/or downsized. And, while liquidity improved in October, demand remains well below historic levels. As a result, yields on even the highest quality, most liquid municipal securities are at historic highs, with yields on 30-year high-grade municipal issues at levels well above that of comparable Treasuries.

Rising unemployment has resulted in declining tax receipts, which directly impacts the bottom line of state budgets. In fact, state budget gaps have widened substantially, with 39 states projected to face fiscal distress in 2009 and 2010.

#### **Performance Analysis**

For the 12-month period ended October 31, 2008, the net asset value (NAV) of Morgan Stanley Quality Municipal Income Trust (IQI) decreased from \$14.50 to \$11.12 per share. Based on this change plus reinvestment of tax-free dividends totaling \$0.68 per share, the Trust s total NAV return was -18.82 percent. IQI s value on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) moved from \$12.90 to \$9.21 per share during the same period. Based on this change

plus reinvestment of dividends, the Trust s total market return was -24.42 percent. IQI s NYSE market price was at a 17.18 percent discount to its NAV. During the fiscal period, the Trust purchased and retired 281,578 shares of common stock at a weighted average market discount of 10.49 percent. *Past performance is no guarantee of future results*.

The October dividend was decreased to \$0.0475 per share. The dividend reflects the current level of the Trust s net investment income. IQI s level of undistributed net investment income was \$0.058 per share on October 31, 2008 versus \$0.013 per share 12 months earlier.<sup>1</sup>

Over the course of the reporting period, we maintained an overweight to the hospital/life care and tobacco sectors, which detracted from relative performance as spreads in these sectors widened, pushing prices lower. Conversely, an overweight to the public utility sector benefited performance as the flight to quality that took place during the period helped to boost the performance of this infrastructure sector.

In the first half of the period, the Trust maintained a lower interest-rate sensitivity (as measured by duration\*), which benefited relative performance as yield rose. During the second half of the period, we increased the duration to a neutral stance in order to better position the Trust to benefit from a potential retracement in yields in the future.

The Trust s procedure for reinvesting all dividends and distributions in common shares is through purchases in the open market. This method helps support the market value of the Trust s shares. In addition, we would like to remind you that the Trustees have approved a share repurchase program whereby the Trust may, when appropriate, purchase shares in the open market or in privately negotiated transactions at a price not above market value or net asset value, whichever is lower at the time of purchase. The Trust may also utilize procedures to reduce or eliminate the amount of Auction Rate Preferred Shares (ARPS) outstanding, including their purchase in the open market or in privately negotiated transactions.

Performance data quoted represents past performance, which is no guarantee of future results, and current performance may be lower or higher than the figures shown. Investment return, net asset value and common share market price will fluctuate and Trust shares, when sold, may be worth more or less than their original cost.

There is no guarantee that any sectors mentioned will continue to perform as discussed herein or that securities in such sectors will be held by the Trust in the future.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Income earned by certain securities in the portfolio may be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax (AMT).

<sup>\*</sup> A measure of the sensitivity of a bond s price to changes in interest rates, expressed in years. Each year of duration represents an expected 1 percent change in the price of a bond for every 1 percent change in interest rates. The longer a bond s duration, the greater the effect of interest-rate movements on its price. Typically, trusts with shorter durations perform better in rising-interest-rate environments, while trusts with longer durations perform better when rates decline. Duration calculations are adjusted for leverage.

Water & Sewer         15.4%           Transportation         11.1           General Obligation         11.1           Other Revenue         9.8           Hospital         9.5           LONG-TERM CREDIT ANALYSIS           as of 10/31/08           Aa/AAA         25.3%           A/A         49.8           A/A         10.1           Bas/BB B         11.5           N/R         1.6           N/R         1.6           N/R         1.7           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           California         31.6           New York         24.3           Texas         23.7           New Jersey         13.1           Florida         8.2           Hawaii         7.1           Washington         7.1           Indiana         6.0           Ohio         5.8           Ohio         5.7           South Carolina         5.1           Newada         4.8           Georgia         4.5           Illinois         4.4           Maryland         3.4<	TOP FIVE SECTORS as of 10/31/08	
Transportation         11.4           General Obligation         11.1           Other Revenue         9.8           Hospital         9.5           LONG-TERM CREDIT ANALYSIS           as of 10/31/08           Aaa/AA         25.3%           Aa/AA         10.1           Baa/BBB         11.5           Ba/BB Or Less         1.6           N/R         1.7           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASS		15.4%
General Obligation         11.1           Other Revenue         9.8           Hospital         9.5           LONG-TERM CREDIT ANALYSIS         3.0           as of 10/31/08         3.2           Aa/AA         49.8           A/A         10.1           Baa/BBB         11.5           Ba/BB or Less         1.6           N/R         1.7           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         31.6           California         31.6           New York         24.3           Texas         23.7           New Jersey         13.1           Florida         8.2           Hawaii         7.1           Mashington         7.1           Indiana         5.8           Ohio         5.7           South Carolina         5.7           Ohio         5.7           Michigan         5.1           Nevada         4.8           Georgia         4.5           Illinois         4.4           Maryland         3.2           Colorado         3.2           Tennessee         2.9           District of Columbia <th></th> <th></th>		
Other Revenue         9.8           Hospital         9.5           LONG-TERM CREDIT ANALYSIS         25.3%           Aaa/AA         49.8           A/A         10.1           Baa/BBB         11.5           Ba/BB Or Less         1.6           N/R         1.7           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         31.6 %           California         31.6 %           New York         24.3           Texas         23.7           New Jersey         31.1           Florida         8.2           Hawaii         7.1           Washington         7.1           Indiana         6.0           Arizona         5.8           Ohio         5.7           South Carolina         5.7           Michigan         5.1           Nevada         4.8           Georgia         4.5           Illinois         4.4           Maryland         3.4           Colorado         3.2           Temessee         2.9           District of Columbia         1.7           Connecticut         1.5           Virginia		
Hospital		
LONG-TERM CREDIT ANALYSIS   as of 10/31/08   32.5.3%   49.8   4		
as of 10/31/08         25.34           Aa/AAA         49.8           A/A         10.1           Baa/BBB         11.5           Ba/BB or Less         1.6           N/R         1.7           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           California           New York         24.3           Texas         23.7           New Jersey         13.1           Florida         8.2           Hawaii         7.1           Indiana         6.0           Arizona         5.8           Ohio         5.7           South Carolina         5.7           Michigan         5.1           Nevada         4.8           Georgia         4.5           Illinois         4.4           Maryland         3.4           Colorado         3.2           Tennessee         2.9           District of Columbia         2.0           Kentucky         1.9           North Carolina         1.7           Connecticut         1.5           Virgini	Tiospital	7.5
Aaa/AA         49.8           Aa/A         49.8           A/A         10.1           Baa/BBB         11.5           Ba/BB or Less         1.6           N/R         1.7           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08 <t< th=""><th>LONG-TERM CREDIT ANALYSIS</th><th></th></t<>	LONG-TERM CREDIT ANALYSIS	
Aa/AA         49.8           A/A         10.1           Baa/BBB         11.5           N/R         1.6           N/R         1.6           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         31.6 %           New York         24.3           Texas         23.7           New Jersey         13.1           Florida         8.2           Hawaii         7.1           Washington         7.1           Indiana         6.0           Arizona         5.8           Ohio         5.7           South Carolina         5.7           Michigan         5.1           Nevada         4.8           Georgia         4.5           Illinois         4.4           Maryland         3.4           Colorado         3.2           Tennessee         2.9           District of Columbia         2.0           Kentucky         1.9           North Carolina         1.7           Connecticut         1.5           Virginia         1.4           Alabama         1.4           Idaho         1.4	as of 10/31/08	
A/A       10.1         Bax/BBB       11.5         Ba/BB or Less       1.6         N/R       1.7         SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         As All Summary Of Investments and Inves	Aaa/AAA	25.3%
Baa/BBB         11.5           Ba/BB or Less         1.6           N/R         1.7           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         3.1.6           California         31.6           New York         24.3           Texas         23.7           New Jersey         13.1           Florida         8.2           Hawaii         7.1           Washington         7.1           Indiana         6.0           Arizona         5.8           Ohio         5.7           South Carolina         5.7           Michigan         5.7           Michigan         5.1           Nevada         4.8           Georgia         4.5           Illinois         4.5           Maryland         3.4           Colorado         3.2           Tennessee         2.9           District of Columbia         2.0           Kentucky         1.9           North Carolina         1.7           Connecticut         1.5           Virginia         1.4           Alabama         1.4           Misssouri         1.2 </th <th>Aa/AA</th> <th>49.8</th>	Aa/AA	49.8
Ba/BB or Less         1.6           N/R         1.7           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         31.6 %           California         31.6 %           New York         24.3           Texas         23.7           New Jersey         13.1           Florida         8.2           Hawaii         7.1           Mashington         7.1           Indiana         6.0           Arizona         5.8           Ohio         5.7           South Carolina         5.7           Michigan         5.1           Newada         4.8           Georgia         4.5           Illinois         4.4           Maryland         3.4           Colorado         3.2           Tennessee         2.9           District of Columbia         2.0           Kentucky         1.9 %           North Carolina         1.5           Virginia         1.4           Alabama         1.4           Idaho         1.4           Missouri         1.2           New Mexico         1.2           Montana         1.1 <th>A/A</th> <th>10.1</th>	A/A	10.1
N/R         1.7           SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08         31.6 %           New York         24.3           Texas         23.7           New Jersey         13.1           Florida         8.2           Hawaii         7.1           Washington         7.1           Indiana         6.0           Arizona         5.8           Ohio         5.7           South Carolina         5.7           Michigan         5.1           Nevada         4.8           Georgia         4.5           Illinois         4.4           Maryland         3.4           Colorado         3.2           Tennessee         2.9           District of Columbia         2.0           Kentucky         1.9 %           North Carolina         1.7           Connecticut         1.5           Virginia         1.4           Alabama         1.4           Idaho         1.4           Missouri         1.2           New Mexico         1.2           Montana         1.1	Baa/BBB	11.5
SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS BY STATE CLASSIFICATION as of 10/31/08           California         31.6 %           New York         24.3           Texas         23.7           New Jersey         13.1           Florida         8.2           Hawaii         7.1           Washington         7.1           Indiana         6.0           Arizona         5.8           Ohio         5.7           South Carolina         5.7           Michigan         5.1           Nevada         4.8           Georgia         4.5           Illinois         4.4           Maryland         3.4           Colorado         3.2           Tennessee         2.9           District of Columbia         2.0           Kentucky         1.9 %           North Carolina         1.7           Connecticut         1.5           Virginia         1.4           Alabama         1.4           Idaho         1.4           Misssouri         1.2           Montana         1.1	Ba/BB or Less	1.6
California         31.6 %           New York         24.3 messes           Texas         23.7 messes           Horida         8.2 messes           Hawaii         7.1 messes           Ohio         5.7 messes           Ohio         5.7 messes           Michigan         5.1 messes           Georgia         4.5 messes           Illinois         4.4 messes           Colorado         3.2 messes           Colorado         3.2 messes           District of Columbia         2.0 messes           Kentucky         1.9 messes           Vornt Carolina         1.5 messes           Connecticut         1.5 messes           Virginia         1.4 messes           Virginia         1.2 messes     <	N/R	1.7
California         31.6 %           New York         24.3 messes           Texas         23.7 messes           Horida         8.2 messes           Hawaii         7.1 messes           Ohio         5.7 messes           Ohio         5.7 messes           Michigan         5.1 messes           Georgia         4.5 messes           Illinois         4.4 messes           Colorado         3.2 messes           Colorado         3.2 messes           District of Columbia         2.0 messes           Kentucky         1.9 messes           Vornt Carolina         1.5 messes           Connecticut         1.5 messes           Virginia         1.4 messes           Virginia         1.2 messes     <		
New York       24.3         Texas       23.7         New Jersey       13.1         Florida       8.2         Hawaii       7.1         Washington       7.1         Indiana       6.0         Arizona       5.8         Ohio       5.7         South Carolina       5.7         Michigan       5.1         Nevada       4.8         Georgia       4.5         Illinois       4.4         Maryland       3.4         Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1		
Texas         23.7           New Jersey         13.1           Florida         8.2           Hawaii         7.1           Washington         7.1           Indiana         6.0           Arizona         5.8           Ohio         5.7           South Carolina         5.7           Michigan         5.1           Nevada         4.8           Georgia         4.5           Illinois         4.4           Maryland         3.4           Colorado         3.2           Tennessee         2.9           District of Columbia         2.0           Kentucky         1.9           North Carolina         1.7           Connecticut         1.5           Virginia         1.4           Alabama         1.4           Idaho         1.4           Misssouri         1.2           Now Mexico         1.2           Montana         1.1		
New Jersey         13.1           Florida         8.2           Hawaii         7.1           Washington         7.1           Indiana         6.0           Arizona         5.8           Ohio         5.7           South Carolina         5.7           Michigan         5.1           Nevada         4.8           Georgia         4.5           Illinois         4.4           Maryland         3.4           Colorado         3.2           Tennessee         2.9           District of Columbia         2.0           Kentucky         1.9           North Carolina         1.7           Connecticut         1.5           Virginia         1.4           Alabama         1.4           Idaho         1.4           Misssouri         1.2           New Mexico         1.2           Montana         1.1		
Florida         8.2           Hawaii         7.1           Washington         7.1           Indiana         6.0           Arizona         5.8           Ohio         5.7           South Carolina         5.7           Michigan         5.1           Nevada         4.8           Georgia         4.5           Illinois         4.4           Maryland         3.4           Colorado         3.2           Tennessee         2.9           District of Columbia         2.0           Kentucky         1.9           North Carolina         1.7           Connecticut         1.5           Virginia         1.4           Alabama         1.4           Idaho         1.4           Misssouri         1.2           New Mexico         1.2           Montana         1.1		
Hawaii       7.1         Washington       7.1         Indiana       6.0         Arizona       5.8         Ohio       5.7         South Carolina       5.7         Michigan       5.1         Nevada       4.8         Georgia       4.5         Illinois       4.4         Maryland       3.4         Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1		
Washington       7.1         Indiana       6.0         Arizona       5.8         Ohio       5.7         South Carolina       5.7         Michigan       5.1         Nevada       4.8         Georgia       4.5         Illinois       4.5         Maryland       3.4         Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1		
Indiana       6.0         Arizona       5.8         Ohio       5.7         South Carolina       5.7         Michigan       5.1         Nevada       4.8         Georgia       4.5         Illinois       4.4         Maryland       3.4         Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1		
Arizona       5.8         Ohio       5.7         South Carolina       5.7         Michigan       5.1         Nevada       4.8         Georgia       4.5         Illinois       4.4         Maryland       3.4         Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1		
Ohio       5.7         South Carolina       5.7         Michigan       5.1         Nevada       4.8         Georgia       4.5         Illinois       4.4         Maryland       3.4         Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9 %         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1	Indiana	6.0
South Carolina       5.7         Michigan       5.1         Nevada       4.8         Georgia       4.5         Illinois       4.4         Maryland       3.4         Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9 %         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1	Arizona	5.8
Michigan       5.1         Nevada       4.8         Georgia       4.5         Illinois       4.4         Maryland       3.4         Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9 %         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1	Ohio	5.7
Nevada       4.8         Georgia       4.5         Illinois       4.4         Maryland       3.4         Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9 %         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1	South Carolina	5.7
Georgia       4.5         Illinois       4.4         Maryland       3.4         Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9 %         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1	Michigan	5.1
Illinois       4.4         Maryland       3.4         Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9 %         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1	Nevada	4.8
Illinois       4.4         Maryland       3.4         Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9 %         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1	Georgia	4.5
Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9 %         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1		4.4
Colorado       3.2         Tennessee       2.9         District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9 %         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1	Maryland	3.4
District of Columbia       2.0         Kentucky       1.9 %         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1	·	3.2
Kentucky       1.9 %         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1	Tennessee	2.9
Kentucky       1.9 %         North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1	District of Columbia	2.0
North Carolina       1.7         Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1		
Connecticut       1.5         Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1		
Virginia       1.4         Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1	Connecticut	1.5
Alabama       1.4         Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1		
Idaho       1.4         Misssouri       1.2         New Mexico       1.2         Montana       1.1		
Misssouri1.2New Mexico1.2Montana1.1		
New Mexico 1.2 Montana 1.1		
Montana 1.1		
1 Chilisylvania 0.0	Pennsylvania	0.8

Kansas	0.8
Alaska	0.8
North Dakota	0.7
Minnesota	0.7
Vermont	0.6
Oklahoma	0.4
Delaware	0.2
Total Long-Term Investments	186.4
Short-Term Investment	1.6
Liability for Floating Rate Note and Dealer Trusts Obligations	(32.5)
Other Assets in Excess of Liabilities	3.6
Preferred Shares of Beneficial Interest	(59.1)
Net Assets Applicable to Common Shareholders	100.0 %

Does not include open long and short futures contracts with an underlying face value amount of \$456,667,094 with unrealized depreciation of \$9,499.

Subject to change daily. Provided for informational purposes only and should not be deemed as a recommendation to buy or sell the securities mentioned or securities in the sectors shown above. Top five sectors are as a percentage of total investments. Long-term credit analysis are as a percentage of long-term investments. Summary of investments by state classification are as a percentage of net assets applicable to common shareholders. Securities are classified by sectors that represent broad groupings of related industries. Morgan Stanley is a full-service securities firm engaged in securities trading and brokerage activities, investment banking, research and analysis, financing and financial advisory services. Rating allocations based upon ratings as issued by Standard and Poor s and Moody s, respectively.

#### For More Information About Portfolio Holdings

Each Morgan Stanley trust provides a complete schedule of portfolio holdings in its semiannual and annual reports within 60 days of the end of the trust s second and fourth fiscal quarters. The semiannual reports and the annual reports are filed electronically with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) on Form N-CSRS and Form N-CSR, respectively. Morgan Stanley also delivers the semiannual and annual reports to trust shareholders and makes these reports available on its public web site, www.morganstanley.com. Each Morgan Stanley trust also files a complete schedule of portfolio holdings with the SEC for the trust s first and third fiscal quarters on Form N-Q. Morgan Stanley does not deliver the reports for the first and third fiscal quarters to shareholders, nor are the reports posted to the Morgan Stanley public web site. You may, however, obtain the Form N-Q filings (as well as the Form N-CSR and N-CSRS filings) by accessing the SEC s web site, http://www.sec.gov. You may also review and copy them at the SEC s public reference room in Washington, DC. Information on the operation of the SEC s public reference room may be obtained by calling the SEC at (800) SEC-0330. You can also request copies of these materials, upon payment of a duplicating fee, by electronic request at the SEC s e-mail address (publicinfo@sec.gov) or by writing the public reference section of the SEC, Washington, DC 20549-0102.

#### **Investment Advisory Agreement Approval**

#### Nature, Extent and Quality of Services

The Board reviewed and considered the nature and extent of the investment advisory services provided by the Investment Adviser (as defined herein) under the advisory agreement, including portfolio management, investment research and fixed income securities trading. The Board also reviewed and considered the nature and extent of the non-advisory, administrative services provided by the Trust's Administrator (as defined herein) under the administration agreement, including accounting, clerical, bookkeeping, compliance, business management and planning, and the provision of supplies, office space and utilities at the Investment Adviser's expense. (The Investment Adviser and the Administrator together are referred to as the Adviser and the advisory and administration agreements together are referred to as the Management Agreement. ) The Board also compared the nature of the services provided by the Adviser with similar services provided by non-affiliated advisers as reported to the Board by Lipper Inc. (Lipper).

The Board reviewed and considered the qualifications of the portfolio managers, the senior administrative managers and other key personnel of the Adviser who provide the administrative and advisory services to the Trust. The Board determined that the Adviser s portfolio managers and key personnel are well qualified by education and/or training and experience to perform the services in an efficient and professional manner. The Board concluded that the nature and extent of the advisory and administrative services provided were necessary and appropriate for the conduct of the business and investment activities of the Trust. The Board also concluded that the overall quality of the advisory and administrative services was satisfactory.

#### Performance Relative to Comparable Funds Managed by Other Advisers

On a regular basis, the Board reviews the performance of all funds in the Morgan Stanley Fund Complex, including the Trust, compared to their peers, paying specific attention to the underperforming funds. In addition, the Board specifically reviewed the Trust sperformance for the one-, three- and five-year periods ended December 31, 2007 as shown in a report provided by Lipper (the Lipper Report), compared to the performance of comparable funds selected by Lipper (the performance peer group). The Board also discussed with the Adviser the performance goals and the actual results achieved in managing the Trust. The Board concluded that the Trust sperformance was acceptable.

#### Fees Relative to Other Proprietary Funds Managed by the Adviser with Comparable Investment Strategies

The Board reviewed the advisory and administrative fee (together, the management fee ) rate paid by the Trust under the Management Agreement. The Board noted that the management fee rate was comparable to

the management fee rates charged by the Adviser to other proprietary funds it manages with investment strategies comparable to those of the Trust.

#### Fees and Expenses Relative to Comparable Funds Managed by Other Advisers

The Board reviewed the management fee rate and total expense ratio of the Trust as compared to the average management fee rate and average total expense ratio for funds, selected by Lipper (the expense peer group), managed by other advisers with investment strategies comparable to those of the Trust, as shown in the Lipper Report. The Board concluded that the Trust is management fee rate and total expense ratio were competitive with those of its expense peer group.

#### **Breakpoints and Economies of Scale**

The Board reviewed the structure of the Trust s management fee schedule under the Management Agreement and noted that it does not include any breakpoints. The Board considered that the Trust is a closed-end fund and, therefore, that the Trust s assets are not likely to grow with new sales or grow significantly as a result of capital appreciation. The Board concluded that the economies of scale for the Trust were not a factor that needed to be considered at the present time.

#### **Profitability of the Adviser and Affiliates**

The Board considered information concerning the costs incurred and profits realized by the Adviser and affiliates during the last year from their relationship with the Trust and during the last two years from their relationship with the Morgan Stanley Fund Complex and reviewed with the Adviser the cost allocation methodology used to determine the profitability of the Adviser and affiliates. Based on its review of the information it received, the Board concluded that the profits earned by the Adviser and affiliates were not excessive in light of the advisory, administrative and other services provided to the Trust.

#### **Fall-Out Benefits**

The Board considered so-called fall-out benefits derived by the Adviser and affiliates from their relationship with the Trust and the Morgan Stanley Fund Complex, such as float benefits derived from handling of checks for purchases and sales of Trust shares, through a broker-dealer affiliate of the Adviser. The Board also considered that, from time to time, the Adviser may, directly or indirectly, effect trades on behalf of certain Morgan Stanley Funds through various electronic communications networks or other alternative trading systems in which the Adviser s affiliates have ownership interests and/or board seats. The Board concluded that the fall-out benefits were relatively small.

#### **Soft Dollar Benefits**

The Board considered whether the Adviser realizes any benefits from commissions paid to brokers who execute securities transactions for the Trust (soft dollars). The Board noted that the Trust invests only in fixed income securities, which do not generate soft dollars.

#### Adviser Financially Sound and Financially Capable of Meeting the Trust s Needs

The Board considered whether the Adviser is financially sound and has the resources necessary to perform its obligations under the Management Agreement. The Board concluded that the Adviser has the financial resources necessary to fulfill its obligations under the Management Agreement.

#### Historical Relationship Between the Trust and the Adviser

The Board also reviewed and considered the historical relationship between the Trust and the Adviser, including the organizational structure of the Adviser, the policies and procedures formulated and adopted by the Adviser for managing the Trust s operations and the Board s confidence in the competence and integrity of the senior managers and key personnel of the Adviser. The Board concluded that it is beneficial for the Trust to continue its relationship with the Adviser.

#### **Other Factors and Current Trends**

The Board considered the controls and procedures adopted and implemented by the Adviser and monitored by the Trust s Chief Compliance Officer and concluded that the conduct of business by the Adviser indicates a good faith effort on its part to adhere to high ethical standards in the conduct of the Trust s business.

#### **General Conclusion**

After considering and weighing all of the above factors, the Board concluded that it would be in the best interest of the Trust and its shareholders to approve renewal of the Management Agreement for another year.

PRINCIPAL AMOUNT IN THOUSANDS		COUPON RATE	MATURITY DATE	VALUE
THOUSANDS	Tax-Exempt Municipal Bonds (186.4%)	KAIL	DATE	VALCE
	Alabama (1.4%)			
	University of Alabama, Ser 2004-A			
\$ 3,700	(MBIA Insd)	5.25 %	07/01/22	\$ 3,696,152
	Alaska (0.8%)			
	Northern Tobacco Securitization			
4.000	Corporation, Asset Backed	<b>7</b> .00	06101116	2 120 000
4,000	Ser 2006 A	5.00	06/01/46	2,128,000
	Arizona (5.8%)			
	Arizona Transportation Board, Highway			
2,000	Refg Ser 2002 A	5.25	07/01/19	2,077,820
2,000	Phoenix Civic Improvement Corporation,	3.23	07/01/19	2,011,020
3,000	Airport Ser 2002 B (AMT) (FGIC Insd)	5.25	07/01/32	2,348,010
2,000	Phoenix Civic Improvement Corporation,	2.22	******	_, ,
3,800	Jr Lien Water Ser 2002 (FGIC Insd)	5.00	07/01/26	3,628,050
,	Salt River Project Agricultural			, ,
	Improvement & Power District, 2002			
6,000	Ser B (a)	5.00	01/01/31	5,816,207
	Surprise Municipal Property			
2,000	Corporation, Ser 2007	4.90	04/01/32	1,411,540
				15,281,627
	California (31.6%)			
	California Economic Recovery,			
10,000	Ser 2004 A (a)	5.00	07/01/16	10,342,200
10,000	California Health Facilities Financing	5.00	07/01/10	10,542,200
	Authority, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center			
2,000	Ser 2005	5.00	11/15/34	1,591,980
_,,	California Health Facilities Financing			-,-,-,-
	Authority, Kaiser Permanente			
2,000	Ser 2006 A	5.25	04/01/39	1,647,560
,	California Infrastructure & Economic			, ,
	Development Bank, The Scripps			
3,000	Research Institute Ser 2005 A	5.00	07/01/29	2,812,410
	California Infrastructure & Economic			
	Development Bank, Bay Area Toll			
5,000	Bridges First Lien Ser 2003 A (a)	5.00	01/01/28	(b) 5,064,430
6,000	California Pollution Control Financing	6.875	11/01/27	4,581,540
	Authority, Keller Canyon Landfill			

	Co/Browning-Ferris Industries Inc			
	Ser 1992 (AMT)			
	California Statewide Communities			
	Development, Baptist University			
4,000	Ser 2007 A	5.40	11/01/27	2,747,080
	California Statewide Communities			
	Development, John Muir Health			
5,000	Ser 2006 A	5.00	08/15/32	4,025,650
	California, Various Purpose Dtd			
5,000	05/01/03	5.25	02/01/19	5,038,650
	California, Various Purpose Dtd			
16,000	11/01/06 (a)	4.50	10/01/36	12,254,400
	Golden State Tobacco Securitization			
	Corporation, Enhanced Asset Backed			
6,000	Ser 2005 A (AMBAC Insd)	5.00	06/01/29	4,773,120
	Golden State Tobacco Securitization			
	Corporation, Enhanced Asset Backed			
4,000	Ser 2007 A	5.75	06/01/47	2,633,120
	Golden State Tobacco Securitization			
	Corporation, Enhanced Asset Backed			
8,000	Ser 2007 A-1	5.125	06/01/47	4,724,000
4,000	Los Angeles, Ser 2004 A (MBIA Insd)	5.00	09/01/24	3,943,800

See Notes to Financial Statements

PRINCIPAL AMOUNT IN THOUSANDS		COUPON RATE	MATURITY DATE	VALUE
	Port of Oakland, Ser 2002 L (AMT)			
\$ 4,000	(FGIC Insd)	5.00 %	11/01/32	\$ 3,008,960
	San Diego County, Burnham Institute for			
1,000	Medical Research Ser 2006 (COPs)	5.00	09/01/34	711,500
	San Diego County Water Authority,			
3,720	Ser 2002 A (COPs) (MBIA Insd)	5.00	05/01/27	3,551,447
	San Francisco City & County, Laguna			
	Honda Hospital Refg Ser 2008-R3 (AGC			
960	Insd) (a)	5.00	06/15/28	921,005
	Silicon Valley Tobacco Securitization			
	Authority Tobacco Settlement, Santa			
	Clara Tobacco Securitization Corp			
16,000	Ser 2007 (g)	0.00	06/01/36	1,107,360
	Tobacco Securitization Authority of			
	Northern California, Sacramento County			
	Tobacco Securitization Corporation			
5,000	Ser 2006 A-1	5.00	06/01/37	3,007,500
2.760	University of California, Ser 2007-J	4.50	05/15/01	2 20 7 662
2,760	(FSA Insd) (a)	4.50	05/15/31	2,305,663
2.240	University of California, Ser 2007-J	4.50	05/15/25	1 020 562
2,240	(FSA Insd) (a)	4.50	05/15/35	1,829,563
				82,622,938
				02,022,930
	Colorado (3.2%)			
	Boulder County, University Corp for			
	Atmospheric Research Ser 2002 (MBIA			
1,750	Insd)	5.375	09/01/18	1,784,108
-,,	Boulder County, University Corp for		0,7,0=,-0	-,, -,,
	Atmospheric Research Ser 2002 (MBIA			
1,750	Insd)	5.375	09/01/21	1,756,772
	Colorado Educational & Cultural			
	Facilities Authority, Peak to Peak			
	Charter School Refg & Impr Ser 2004			
2,000	(XLCA Insd)	5.25	08/15/34	1,789,820
	Colorado Health Facilities Authority,			
2,000	Adventist/Sunbelt Ser 2006 D	5.25	11/15/35	1,627,220
	Denver Convention Center Hotel			
1,590	Authority, Refg Ser 2006 (XLCA Insd)	5.00	12/01/30	1,236,511
	Public Authority for Colorado Energy,			
265	Natural Gas Ser 2008	6.25	11/15/28	207,437

				8,401,868
5,000	Connecticut (1.5%) Connecticut Housing Finance Authority, SubSer A-2 (AMT)	5.15	05/15/38	3,786,650
1,000	Delaware (0.2%) New Castle County, Newark Charter School Inc Ser 2006	5.00	09/01/36	649,000
6,000	District of Columbia (2.0%) District of Columbia Ballpark, Ser 2006 B-1 (FGIC Insd)	5.00	02/01/31	5,091,780
	Florida (8.2%) Broward County School Board,			
2,000	Ser 2001 A (COPs) (FSA Insd) Broward County Water & Sewer Utility,	5.00	07/01/26	1,847,320
3,500	Ser 2003 (MBIA Insd) Highlands County Health Facilities	5.00	10/01/24	3,366,055
75	Authority, Adventist Health/Sunbelt Ser 2006 C Highlands County Health Facilities	5.25	11/15/16	(b) 81,325
2,925	Authority, Adventist Health/Sunbelt Ser 2006 C Jacksonville Electric Authority, St Johns	5.25	11/15/36	2,282,202
3,300	Power Park Refg Issue 2 Ser 17	5.00	10/01/18	3,324,783

See Notes to Financial Statements

PRINCIPAL AMOUNT IN THOUSANDS		COUPON RATE	MATURITY DATE	VALUE
	Lee County Industrial Development Authority, Shell Point Village/ The		2.2.2	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
\$ 1,500	Alliance Community for Retirement Living Inc, Ser 2006 South Miami Health Facilities Authority,	5.125 %	11/15/36	\$ 965,430
12,000	Baptist Health South Florida Ser 2007 (a)	5.00	08/15/42	9,656,363
				21,523,478
	Georgia (4.5%)			
3,000	Atlanta, Airport Ser 2004 J (FSA Insd) Georgia State Road & Tollway	5.00	01/01/34	2,669,610
6,000	Authority, Ser 2004 Georgia State Road & Tollway	5.00	10/01/22	6,010,080
3,000	Authority, Ser 2004	5.00	10/01/23	2,996,760
				11,676,450
	Hawaii (7.1%)			
8,000	Hawaii, 1992 Ser BZ	6.00	10/01/11	8,651,280
	Honolulu City & County, Ser 2003 A		0.0.4.0.4	0.0=6.400
10,000	(MBIA Insd) (a)	5.25	03/01/26	9,876,100
				18,527,380
	Idaho (1.4%)			
	Idaho Housing Agency, 1992 Ser E			
90	(AMT)	6.75	07/01/12	91,079
	Idaho Housing & Finance Association,			
835	2000 Ser E (AMT)	6.00	01/01/32	835,768
2.600	Idaho Housing & Finance Association,	5.25	07/15/22	2 (71 440
2,600	2008 Ser A	5.25	07/15/23	2,671,448
				3,598,295
	Illinois (4.4%)			
	Chicago O Hare Int 1 Airport, Third Lien			
4,000	Ser 2003 B-2 (AMT) (FSA Insd)	5.75	01/01/23	3,614,680
6,000	Illinois, First Ser 2002 (MBIA Insd)	5.375	07/01/20	6,102,240
2,000	Schaumburg, Ser 2004 B (FGIC Insd)	5.25	12/01/34	1,888,800
				11,605,720

	Indiana (6.0%) Indiana Bond Bank, Revolving			
10,000	Fund Ser 2001 A	5.00	02/01/23	9,908,800
	Indiana Health & Educational Facility			
6,000	Financing Authority, Clarian Health	5.05	00/15/40	4.446.060
6,000	Ser 2006 A Marion County Convention &	5.25	02/15/40	4,446,960
	Recreational Facilities Authority,			
1,400	Refg Ser 2003 A (AMBAC Insd)	5.00	06/01/21	1,374,310
				15,730,070
	Kansas (0.8%)			
	University of Kansas Hospital Authority,			
3,000	KU Health Ser 2002	4.50	09/01/32	2,136,180
	Kentucky (1.9)			
	Louisville & Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District, Ser 1999 A			
5,000	(FGIC Insd)	5.75	05/15/33	4,999,850

See Notes to Financial Statements

PRINCIPAL AMOUNT IN THOUSANDS		COUPON RATE	MATURITY DATE	VALUE
1110 05/11 (25)	Maryland (3.4%)	WIII.	DITTE	VILLEE
	Baltimore County, Oak Crest Village			
\$ 2,000	Ser 2007 A	5.00 %	01/01/37	\$ 1,496,960
	Maryland Health & Higher Educational			
	Facilities Authority, King Farm			
3,000	Presbyterian Community 2006 Ser B	5.00	01/01/17	2,355,750
	Maryland Health & Higher Educational			
1,500	Facilities Authority, University of Maryland Medical Ser 2002	6.00	07/01/12	(b) 1,638,975
1,300	Maryland Health & Higher Educational	0.00	07/01/12	(0) 1,036,973
	Facilities Authority, University of			
2,000	Maryland Medical Ser 2006 A	5.00	07/01/41	1,515,340
2,000	Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal	2.00	07701711	1,515,510
	Authority, Montgomery County Ser 2003			
2,000	(AMT) (AMBAC Insd)	5.50	04/01/16	1,940,720
				8,947,745
	Michigan (5.1%)			
6,000	Michigan Hospital Finance Authority,	<i>5.05</i>	11/15/46	4 501 500
6,000	Henry Ford Health Refg Ser 2006 A Michigan Strategic Fund, Detroit Edison	5.25	11/15/46	4,501,500
5,000	Co Ser 2001 C (AMT)	5.65	09/01/29	4,183,800
5,000	Wayne County, Detroit Metropolitan	5.05	07/01/27	4,103,000
	Wayne County Airport Refg Ser 2002 D			
3,000	(AMT) (FGIC Insd)	5.50	12/01/17	2,815,410
	Wayne State University, Refg Ser 2008			
1,855	(FSA Insd)	5.00	11/15/25	1,813,355
				13,314,065
	Minnesota (0.7%)			
2,000	Western Minnesota Municipal Power Agency, 2003 Ser A (MBIA Insd)	5.00	01/01/30	1 766 240
2,000	Agency, 2003 Set A (MBIA filsu)	3.00	01/01/30	1,766,240
	Missouri (1.2%)			
	Gravois Bluffs Transportation			
	Development District, Sales Tax			
2,250	Ser 2007	4.75	05/01/32	1,840,725
	Missouri Health & Educational Facilities			
	Authority, Lutheran Senior Services			
1,500	Ser 2005 A	5.375	02/01/35	1,143,270

	Missouri Housing Development Commission, Homeownership Ser 2000			
165	B-1 (AMT)	6.25	03/01/31	164,922
				3,148,917
	Montana (1.1%)			
	Montana Board of Housing, 2000 Ser B			
2,825	(AMT)	6.00	12/01/29	2,827,514
	Nevada (4.8%)			
	Clark County, Airport SubLien			
2,000	Ser 2004 A-1 (AMT) (FGIC Insd)	5.50	07/01/20	1,801,640
	Clark County, Jet Aviation Fuel Tax			
1,000	Ser 2003 C (AMT) (AMBAC Insd)	5.375	07/01/19	909,650
	Clark County, Jet Aviation Fuel Tax			
1,100	Ser 2003 C (AMT) (AMBAC Insd)	5.375	07/01/20	984,830
	Clark County, Jet Aviation Fuel Tax			
2,000	Ser 2003 C (AMT) (AMBAC Insd)	5.375	07/01/22	1,742,280

See Notes to Financial Statements

PRINCIPAL AMOUNT IN THOUSANDS		COUPON RATE	MATURITY DATE	VALUE
	Las Vegas Valley Water District, Water			
\$ 5,345	Impr Refg Ser 2003 A (FGIC Insd)	5.25 %	06/01/20	\$ 5,421,113
	Reno, Renown Regional Medical Center			
2,000	Ser 2007 A	5.25	06/01/37	1,551,680
				12,411,193
	New Jersey (13.1%)			
	New Jersey Economic Development			
2,000	Authority, Cigarette Tax Ser 2004	5.75	06/15/29	1,560,580
	New Jersey Housing Mortgage Finance			
	Authority, Home Buyer Ser 2000 CC			
1,565	(AMT) (MBIA Insd)	5.875	10/01/31	1,565,250
	New Jersey Transportation			
5,000	Trust Fund Authority, 1999 Ser A	5.75	06/15/20	5,262,250
	New Jersey Turnpike Authority,			
12,000	Ser 2003 A (FGIC Insd) (c)	5.00	01/01/27	10,805,040
	Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners,			
10,000	Ser F (FGIC Insd)	5.00	12/01/20	9,415,000
<b>~</b> 000	Tobacco Settlement Financing		0.510.1.10.5	
5,000	Corporation, Ser 2007-1 A	4.625	06/01/26	3,588,900
	Tobacco Settlement Financing		0.510.1.1.1	
6,000	Corporation, Ser 2007-1 B (g)	0.00	06/01/41	256,740
2 000	University of Medicine & Dentistry,	5.25	06/15/00	1.040.600
2,000	Ser 2004 (COPs) (MBIA Insd)	5.25	06/15/23	1,849,680
				34,303,440
	New Mexico (1.2%)			
	Rio Rancho, Water & Wastewater Refg			
3,000	Ser 1999 (AMBAC Insd)	5.25	05/15/19	3,004,350
	New York (24.3%)			
	New York City Trust for Cultural			
	Resources, Museum of Modern Art Refg			
1,935	Ser 2008 1-A (a)	5.00	04/01/26	1,855,799
1,555	New York City Trust for Cultural	2.00	0 1/ 0 1/ 20	1,000,777
	Resources, Museum of Modern Art Refg			
2,815	Ser 2008 1-A (a)	5.00	04/01/27	2,699,781
2,380	New York City, 2009 Subser A-1 (a)	5.25	08/15/27	2,295,666
2,380	New York City, 2009 Subser A-1 (a)	5.25	08/15/28	2,295,667
10,000	•	5.00	11/15/25	9,131,000

	Metropolitan Transportation Authority,			
	Transportation Refg Ser 2002 A (FGIC			
	Insd)			
	Nassau County Tobacco Settlement			
5,000	Corporation, Ser 2006 A-3	5.125	06/01/46	3,292,850
	New York City Municipal Water Finance			
3,500	Authority, Ser A-2003	5.375	06/15/19	3,616,375
	New York City Municipal Water Finance			
10,000	Authority, 2004 Ser A	5.00	06/15/35	9,135,600
	New York City Municipal Water Finance			
18,000	Authority, 2002 Ser B (a)	5.00	06/15/26	17,566,680
2,000	Seneca Nation of Indians, Ser 2007 A (d)	5.00	12/01/23	1,499,620
	Tobacco Settlement Financing			
	Corporation, State Contingency Ser 2003			
5,000	B-1C	5.50	06/01/17	5,048,800
	Triborough Bridge & Tunnel Authority,			
5,000	Refg 2002 E (MBIA Insd) (a)	5.25	11/15/22	4,991,867
				63,429,705
	North Carolina (1.7%)			
4,500	Charlotte, Water & Sewer Ser 2001	5.125	06/01/26	4,519,530
	North Dakota (0.7%)			
2,750	Ward County, Trinity Ser 2006	5.125	07/01/29	1,881,385

See Notes to Financial Statements

PRINCIPAL AMOUNT IN THOUSANDS		COUPON RATE	MATURITY DATE	VALUE
	Ohio (5.7%)			
	American Municipal Power Ohio, Inc.,			
	Prairie State Energy Campus Ser 2008 A			
\$ 5,100	(AGC Insd) (a)	5.25 %	02/15/33	\$ 4,723,024
5,370				