

DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST  
Form N-CSR  
February 02, 2012

UNITED STATES  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20549

FORM N-CSR

Investment Company Act file number: 811-05655

DWS Municipal Income Trust  
(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in Charter)

345 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10154-0004  
(Address of Principal Executive Offices) (Zip Code)

Registrant's Telephone Number, including Area Code: (212) 250-3220

Paul Schubert  
60 Wall Street  
New York, NY 10005  
(Name and Address of Agent for Service)

Date of fiscal year end: 11/30

Date of reporting period: 11/30/2011

ITEM 1. REPORT TO STOCKHOLDERS

NOVEMBER 30, 2011  
Annual Report  
to Shareholders

DWS Municipal Income Trust  
Ticker Symbol: KTF

Contents

4	Portfolio Management Review
9	Performance Summary
11	Portfolio Summary
13	Investment Portfolio
24	Statement of Assets and Liabilities
25	Statement of Operations
26	Statement of Cash Flows
27	Statement of Changes in Net Assets
28	Financial Highlights
30	Notes to Financial Statements

38 Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm

39 Tax Information

40 Dividend Reinvestment Plan

42 Investment Management Agreement Approval

46 Board Members and Officers

51 Additional Information

The fund's investment objective is to provide a high level of current income exempt from federal income tax.

Closed-end funds, unlike open-end funds, are not continuously offered. There is a one time public offering and once issued, shares of closed-end funds are sold in the open market through a stock exchange. Shares of closed-end funds frequently trade at a discount to net asset value. The price of the fund's shares is determined by a number of factors, several of which are beyond the control of the fund. Therefore, the fund cannot predict whether its shares will trade at, below or above net asset value.

Bond investments are subject to interest-rate and credit risks. When interest rates rise, bond prices generally fall. Credit risk refers to the ability of an issuer to make timely payments of principal and interest. Investing in derivatives entails special risks relating to liquidity, leverage and credit that may reduce returns and/or increase volatility. Leverage results in additional risks and can magnify the effect of any losses. Although the fund seeks income that is federally tax-free, a portion of the fund's distributions may be subject to federal, state and local taxes, including the alternative minimum tax.

DWS Investments is part of Deutsche Bank's Asset Management division and, within the U.S., represents the retail asset management activities of Deutsche Bank AG, Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas, Deutsche Investment Management Americas Inc. and DWS Trust Company.

NOT FDIC/NCUA INSURED NO BANK GUARANTEE MAY LOSE VALUE NOT A DEPOSIT NOT INSURED BY ANY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY

Portfolio Management Review

Overview of Market and Fund Performance

Performance is historical and does not guarantee future results. Investment return and principal fluctuate, so your shares may be worth more or less when sold. Current performance may differ from performance data shown. Please visit [www.dws-investments.com](http://www.dws-investments.com) for the fund's most recent month-end performance. Fund performance includes reinvestment of all distributions.

DWS Municipal Income Trust returned 12.03% at net asset value for the annual period ended November 30, 2011. The fund's benchmark, the unmanaged Barclays Capital Municipal Bond Index, returned 6.53% for the 12-month period ended November 30, 2011.<sup>1</sup> The fund ranked at the top the Morningstar Closed-End Municipal National Intermediate Funds category during the one-year period (as of 11/30/11, total returns based on net asset value out of 16 funds).<sup>2</sup> The average return based on net asset value of the funds in the Morningstar Closed-End Municipal National Intermediate Funds category during the past 12 months ended November 30, 2011 was 7.95%. The fund's return based on market value was 16.69%. Municipals overall outperformed the broad taxable bond market, as measured by the Barclays Capital Aggregate Bond Index, which returned 5.52% for the same period.<sup>3</sup> Over the period, the fund's traded shares went from a slight premium of 0.75% to a premium of 4.94%. The fund maintained its dividend of 7 cents per share through the fiscal period.

As the period ended November 30, 2011 opened, negative news concerning budget struggles continued to surround the municipal market, with California, Illinois and Puerto Rico providing many of the headlines. In addition,

municipal market sentiment was impacted by speculation that the November 2010 congressional election results could mean reduced federal aid for states and localities. Adding to pressure on municipal prices, issuance spiked higher in late 2010, as the pending December 31, 2010 expiration of the Build America Bonds program created under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act caused issuers to predict higher future tax-exempt supply and interest rates going forward.

As 2011 progressed, the municipal market rebounded, helped in large part by a sharp drop in supply. In addition, given very low U.S. Treasury bond rates, demand from institutional buyers crossing over from the taxable market contributed at times to support for municipal prices. These factors helped to counteract outflows from tax-free mutual funds for much of the period. Municipals also benefited as market interest rate levels led by U.S. Treasuries dropped on broader concerns over global growth and European sovereign debt.<sup>4</sup>

Given moderate inflation and concerns over growth and employment, the U.S. Federal Reserve (the Fed) kept the target for its benchmark short-term interest rate between 0% and 0.25% for the entire period. Municipal yields opened the period at relatively low levels by historical standards and declined across all maturities for the 12 months. With short rates anchored by the Fed, the municipal yield curve remained quite steep during the period. (When the yield curve is steep, it means that longer-term bonds provide a greater yield advantage vs. short-term bonds.)<sup>5</sup> For the full 12 months, yields on two-year municipal issues fell by 18 basis points, from 0.60% to 0.42%, while bonds with 30-year maturities experienced a yield decline of 44 basis points, from 4.28% to 3.84%, resulting in a flattening of 26 basis points between two and 30 years. (100 basis points equals one percentage point. See the graph on the next page for municipal bond yield changes from the beginning to the end of the period.)

Municipal Bond Yield Curve (as of 11/30/10 and 11/30/11)

Source: Thompson Reuters

This chart is for illustrative purposes only and is not intended to represent the yield of any DWS fund. Performance is historical and does not guarantee future results.

For the 12-month period, most municipal market credit spreads — the incremental yield offered by lower-quality issues vs. AAA-rated issues — widened, reflecting broader credit market concerns.<sup>6</sup> However, while there were a handful of prominent issuer bankruptcies, such as Jefferson County, Alabama and American Airlines, the impact on the overall market was negligible and earlier fears of widespread defaults did not materialize.

#### Positive Contributors to Performance

The fund has the ability to leverage returns to shareholders through the issuance of preferred shares whose dividend rate is tied to short-term interest rates.<sup>7</sup> With the Fed anchoring short-term rates near zero, the fund's cost of borrowing remained very low for the 12-month period, helping performance. In addition, the fund has achieved leverage through tender option bond programs under which high-quality municipal bonds are placed into a trust and serve as backing for the trust to issue short-term variable rate notes. The proceeds from these variable rate notes are then used to purchase additional bonds, increasing the fund's market exposure and income generation. This approach has also benefited from prevailing near-zero short-term rates.

Given a steep yield curve and Fed policy oriented toward keeping interest rates low, the fund maintained significant exposure to bonds with remaining maturities in the 20-to-30-year range. This helped performance as longer-term issues benefited the most from falling interest rates and rising bond prices.

While credit-oriented segments broadly underperformed, the story was mixed and the fund had exposure to such areas as BBB-rated hospital bonds and health-care-related issues that outperformed.

#### Negative Contributors to Performance

The fund had very low exposure to tobacco-related bonds, constraining returns to a degree, as the sector was one of the top-performing areas of the municipal market over the period. Our exposure to tobacco was, in part, limited by the fund's investment policy that generally requires that the fund invests substantially all of its net assets in tax-exempt municipal securities that are valued as investment grade at the time of purchase.

#### Outlook and Positioning

At the end of November 2011, the 10-year municipal yield of 2.22% was 106% of the 2.09% yield on comparable-maturity U.S. Treasuries, as compared to 94% twelve months earlier. The municipal yield curve remains steep, and we are currently maintaining significant exposure to bonds in the 20-to-30-year maturity range.

The Fed has committed to maintaining its zero-interest-rate policy through at least the middle of 2013, which we believe is conducive to our current investment approach.

We will continue to take a prudent approach to investing in the municipal market, while seeking to provide a high level of current income exempt from federal income tax.

#### Investment Advisor

Deutsche Investment Management Americas Inc. ("DIMA" or the "Advisor"), which is part of Deutsche Asset Management, is the investment advisor for DWS Municipal Income Trust. DIMA and its predecessors have more than 80 years of experience managing mutual funds and DIMA provides a full range of investment advisory services to both institutional and retail clients.

DIMA is an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of Deutsche Bank AG. Deutsche Bank AG is a major global banking institution engaged in a wide variety of financial services, including investment management, retail, private and commercial banking, investment banking and insurance.

DWS Investments is the retail brand name in the U.S. for the asset management activities of Deutsche Bank AG and DIMA. As such, DWS is committed to delivering the investing expertise, insight and resources of this global investment platform to American investors.

#### Portfolio Management Team

Philip G. Condon, Managing Director

Co-Lead Portfolio Manager of the fund. Joined the fund in 1998.

- Head of U.S. Retail Fixed Income Funds.
- Joined Deutsche Asset Management in 1983.
- Over 35 years of investment industry experience.
- BA and MBA, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Michael J. Generazo, Director

Co-Lead Portfolio Manager of the fund. Joined the fund in 2010.

## Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

- Joined Deutsche Asset Management in 1999.
- Over 18 years of investment industry experience.
- BS, Bryant College; MBA, Suffolk University.

The views expressed reflect those of the portfolio management team only through the end of the period of the report as stated on the cover. The management team's views are subject to change at any time based on market and other conditions and should not be construed as a recommendation. Past performance is no guarantee of future results. Current and future portfolio holdings are subject to risk.

1 The Barclays Capital Municipal Bond Index is an unmanaged, unleveraged, market-value-weighted measure of municipal bonds issued across the United States. Index issues have a credit rating of at least Baa and a maturity of at least two years. Index returns do not reflect any fees or expenses and it is not possible to invest directly into an index.

2 Source: Morningstar, Inc. Rankings are historical and do not guarantee future results. As of November 30, 2011, DWS Municipal Income Trust ranked as follows in the Morningstar Closed-End Municipal National Intermediate Funds category: 1-year, 1/16; 3-year, 1/14; 5-year, 1/14; and 10-year, 1/12. Rankings represent a fund's total return based on net asset value.

3 The Barclays Capital Aggregate Bond Index is an unmanaged, unleveraged index representing domestic taxable investment-grade bonds, with index components for government and corporate securities, mortgage pass-through securities and asset-backed securities with average maturities of 1 year or more. Index returns do not reflect fees or expenses and it is not possible to invest directly into an index.

4 "Sovereign debt" refers to government bonds issued in a foreign currency.

5 The yield curve is a graphical representation of how yields on bonds of different maturities compare. Normally, yield curves slant up, as bonds with longer maturities typically offer higher yields than short-term bonds.

6 Credit quality measures a bond issuer's ability to repay interest and principal in a timely manner. Rating agencies assign letter designations, such as AAA, AA and so forth. The lower the rating, the higher the probability of default. Credit quality does not remove market risk and is subject to change.

7 Leverage is the use of various financial instruments or borrowed capital, such as margin, to increase an investment's potential return.

### Performance Summary November 30, 2011

Performance is historical, assumes reinvestment of all dividend and capital gain distributions, and does not guarantee future results. Investment return and principal value fluctuate with changing market conditions so that, when sold, shares may be worth more or less than their original cost. Current performance may be lower or higher than the performance data quoted. Please visit [www.dws-investments.com](http://www.dws-investments.com) for the Fund's most recent month-end performance.

Fund specific data and performance are provided for informational purposes only and are not intended for trading purposes.

#### Average Annual Total Returns as of 11/30/11

DWS Municipal Income Trust	1-Year	3-Year	5-Year	10-Year
Based on Net Asset Value(a)	12.03%	17.06%	7.44%	7.28%
Based on Market Price(a)	16.69%	25.59%	10.73%	8.27%
Barclays Capital Municipal Bond Index(b)	6.53%	8.41%	4.75%	5.08%

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Morningstar Closed-End Municipal National Intermediate Funds Category(c)	7.95%	11.24%	4.38%	5.30%
--	-------	--------	-------	-------

(a) Total return based on net asset value reflects changes in the Fund's net asset value during each period. Total return based on market price reflects changes in market price. Each figure assumes that dividend and capital gain distributions, if any, were reinvested. These figures will differ depending upon the level of any discount from or premium to net asset value at which the Fund's shares traded during the period.

(b) The Barclays Capital Municipal Bond Index is an unmanaged, unleveraged, market-value-weighted measure of municipal bonds issued across the United States. Index issues have a credit rating of at least Baa and a maturity of at least two years. Index returns do not reflect any fees or expenses and it is not possible to invest directly into an index.

(c) Morningstar's Closed-End Municipal National Intermediate Funds category represents muni national intermediate portfolios that invest in bonds issued by various state and local governments to fund public projects. The income from these bonds is generally free from federal taxes. To lower risk, these portfolios spread their assets across many states and sectors. These portfolios have durations of 4.5 to 7.0 years (or, if duration is unavailable, average maturities of five to 12 years). Morningstar figures represent the average of the total returns based on net asset value reported by all of the closed-end funds designated by Morningstar, Inc. as falling into the Closed-End Municipal National Intermediate Funds category. Category returns assume reinvestment of all distributions. It is not possible to invest directly in a Morningstar category.

Net Asset Value and Market Price

	As of 11/30/11	As of 11/30/10
Net Asset Value	\$12.56	\$12.03
Market Price	\$13.18	\$12.12

Prices and net asset value fluctuate and are not guaranteed.

Distribution Information

Twelve Months as of 11/30/11:

Income Dividends (common shareholders)	\$ .84	
November Income Dividend (common shareholders)	\$ .07	
Current Annualized Distribution Rate (based on Net Asset Value) as of 11/30/11+	6.69	%
Current Annualized Distribution Rate (based on Market Price) as of 11/30/11+	6.37	%
Tax Equivalent Distribution Rate (based on Net Asset Value) as of 11/30/11+	10.29	%
Tax Equivalent Distribution Rate (based on Market Price) as of 11/30/11+	9.80	%

+ Current annualized distribution rate is the latest monthly dividend shown as an annualized percentage of net asset value/market price on November 30, 2011. Distribution rate simply measures the level of dividends and is not a complete measure of performance. Tax equivalent distribution rate is based on the Fund's distribution rate and a marginal income tax rate of 35%. Distribution rates are historical, not guaranteed and will fluctuate.

Morningstar Rankings — Closed-End Municipal National Intermediate Funds Category as of 11/30/11

Period	Rank		Number of Funds Tracked	Percentile Ranking (%)
1-Year	1	of	16	1
3-Year	1	of	14	1
5-Year	1	of	14	1
10-Year	1	of	12	1

Source: Morningstar, Inc. Rankings are historical and do not guarantee future results. Rankings are based on net asset value total return with distributions reinvested.

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Portfolio Summary

Asset Allocation (As a % of Investment Portfolio)	11/30/11	11/30/10
Revenue Bonds	72%	70%
General Obligation Bonds	13%	14%
Lease Obligations	9%	8%
ETM/Prerefunded Bonds	6%	8%
	100%	100%

Quality	11/30/11	11/30/10
AAA	12%	15%
AA	29%	27%
A	44%	43%
BBB	15%	12%
BB	—	3%
	100%	100%

Top Five State/Territory Allocations (As a % of Investment Portfolio) 11/30/11 11/30/10

California	14%	16%
New York	14%	13%
Florida	11%	9%
Texas	10%	9%
Illinois	7%	4%

Asset allocation, quality and top five state/territory allocations are subject to change.

The quality ratings represent the lower of Moody's Investors Service, Inc. ("Moody's") or Standard & Poor's Corporation ("S&P") credit ratings. The ratings of Moody's and S&P represent their opinions as to the quality of the securities they rate. Credit quality measures a bond issuer's ability to repay interest and principal in a timely manner. Ratings are relative and subjective and are not absolute standards of quality. Credit quality does not remove market risk and is subject to change.

	11/30/11	11/30/10
Interest Rate Sensitivity		
Effective Maturity	7.4 years	9.5 years
Effective Duration	7.6 years	8.2 years

Effective maturity is the weighted average of the maturity date of bonds held by the Fund taking into consideration any available maturity shortening features.

Effective duration is an approximate measure of the Fund's sensitivity to interest rate changes taking into consideration any maturity shortening features.

Interest rate sensitivity is subject to change.

For more complete details about the Fund's investment portfolio, see page [13](#). A Fact Sheet is available upon request. Please see the Additional Information section for contact information.

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Following the Fund's fiscal first and third quarter-end, a complete portfolio holdings listing is filed with the SEC on Form N-Q. The form will be available on the SEC's Web site at [www.sec.gov](http://www.sec.gov), and it also may be reviewed and copied at the SEC's Public Reference Room in Washington, D.C. Information on the operation of the SEC's Public Reference Room may be obtained by calling (800) SEC-0330. The Fund's portfolio holdings as of the month-end are posted on [www.dws-investments.com](http://www.dws-investments.com) on or after the last day of the following month. More frequent posting of portfolio holdings information may be made from time to time on [www.dws-investments.com](http://www.dws-investments.com).

Investment Portfolio as of November 30, 2011

	Principal Amount (\$)	Value (\$)
Municipal Bonds and Notes 115.1%		
Alabama 0.2%		
Camden, AL, Industrial Development Board Revenue, Series B, AMT, Prerefunded, 6.375%, 12/1/2024	1,000,000	1,113,480
Arizona 1.1%		
Arizona, Salt Verde Financial Corp., Gas Revenue:		
5.0%, 12/1/2037	1,050,000	965,832
5.5%, 12/1/2029	1,400,000	1,402,100
Phoenix, AZ, Civic Improvement Corp., Airport Revenue, Series A, 5.0%, 7/1/2040	3,000,000	3,036,420
		5,404,352
California 21.2%		
California, ABAG Finance Authority for Non-Profit Corps., Multi-Family Housing Revenue, California Hill Apartments, Series A, AMT, 0.15%*, 12/15/2032, LIQ: Fannie Mae	2,200,000	2,200,000
California, Bay Area Toll Authority, Toll Bridge Revenue, San Francisco Bay Area, Series F-1, 5.125%, 4/1/2039	5,000,000	5,234,150
California, Health Facilities Financing Authority Revenue, Catholic Healthcare West, Series A, 6.0%, 7/1/2039	3,500,000	3,758,510
California, M-S-R Energy Authority, Series A, 7.0%, 11/1/2034	3,180,000	3,687,655
California, San Geronio Memorial Healthcare, Election of 2006, Series C, 7.2%, 8/1/2039	5,000,000	5,425,150
California, South Bayside Waste Management Authority, Solid Waste Enterprise Revenue, Shoreway Environmental Center, Series A, 6.25%, 9/1/2029	5,345,000	5,728,771
California, Special Assessment Revenue, Golden State Tobacco Securitization Corp., Series 2003-A-1, Prerefunded, 6.75%, 6/1/2039	11,730,000	12,819,013
California, State General Obligation:		
5.5%, 3/1/2040	1,370,000	1,433,184
6.0%, 4/1/2038	10,000,000	11,069,200
California, State Public Works Board, Lease Revenue, Capital Projects, Series I-1, 6.375%, 11/1/2034	2,000,000	2,176,560
California, State Public Works Board, Lease Revenue, Department of Corrections, Series C, 5.5%, 6/1/2021	2,500,000	2,586,575
California, State Public Works Board, Lease Revenue, Department of General Services, Buildings 8 & 9, Series A, 6.25%, 4/1/2034	6,640,000	7,129,169
California, Statewide Communities Development Authority Revenue, American Baptist Homes of the West, 6.25%, 10/1/2039, GTY:		
American Baptist Homes of the Midwest	1,250,000	1,257,163



Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Corona-Norco, CA, Unified School District, Election of 2006, Series A, 5.0%, 8/1/2031, INS: AGMC	5,130,000	5,299,547
Kern, CA, High School District, Election of 2004, Series B, 5.0%, 8/1/2030, INS: AGMC	13,270,000	13,655,626
Los Angeles, CA, Community College District, Election of 2008, Series C, 5.25%, 8/1/2039	3,000,000	3,268,830
Los Angeles, CA, Department of Airports Revenue, Los Angeles International Airport, Series B, 5.0%, 5/15/2035	8,500,000	8,762,905
Port Oakland, CA, Series A, AMT, 5.0%, 11/1/2027, INS: NATL	5,850,000	5,764,590
San Diego, CA, Community College District, Election of 2006, 5.0%, 8/1/2036	2,850,000	3,021,342
		104,277,940
Colorado 1.4%		
Colorado, E-470 Public Highway Authority Revenue, Series A-1, 5.5%, 9/1/2024, INS: NATL	2,500,000	2,492,975
Colorado, Health Facilities Authority Revenue, Covenant Retirement Communities, Inc., 5.0%, 12/1/2035	2,500,000	2,134,800
Colorado, Single Family Housing Revenue, Series B2, AMT, 7.25%, 10/1/2031	100,000	102,852
Colorado, State Educational & Cultural Facilities Authority Revenue, National Jewish Federation, Series D3, 0.11%*, 12/1/2037, GTY: Milwaukee Jewish Federation, Inc., LOC: JPMorgan Chase Bank NA	2,000,000	2,000,000
		6,730,627
Florida 10.8%		
Miami-Dade County, FL, Aviation Revenue, Series A, 5.5%, 10/1/2041	10,000,000	10,336,500
Miami-Dade County, FL, Aviation Revenue, Miami International Airport: Series A, AMT, 5.25%, 10/1/2033, INS: AGC	8,500,000	8,564,855
Series A-1, 5.375%, 10/1/2035	2,000,000	2,068,060
Miami-Dade County, FL, Educational Facilities Authority Revenue, University of Miami, Series A, 5.75%, 4/1/2028	3,000,000	3,187,890
Miami-Dade County, FL, Expressway Authority, Toll Systems Revenue, Series A, 5.0%, 7/1/2035, INS: AGMC	3,000,000	3,100,350
North Brevard County, FL, Hospital District Revenue, Parrish Medical Center Project: 5.5%, 10/1/2028	5,290,000	5,402,783
5.75%, 10/1/2038	5,000,000	5,128,650
Orlando & Orange County, FL, Expressway Authority Revenue: Series C, 5.0%, 7/1/2035	2,705,000	2,801,325
Series A, 5.0%, 7/1/2040	11,895,000	12,250,185
		52,840,598
Georgia 7.3%		
Atlanta, GA, Airport Revenue, Series A, 5.0%, 1/1/2035	1,030,000	1,057,171
Atlanta, GA, Water & Wastewater Revenue, Series A, 6.25%, 11/1/2039	5,815,000	6,431,332
Gainesville & Hall County, GA, Hospital Authority Revenue, Anticipation Certificates, Northeast Georgia Healthcare, Series A, 5.5%, 2/15/2045	2,135,000	2,153,745
Georgia, Main Street Natural Gas, Inc., Gas Project Revenue: Series A, 5.0%, 3/15/2020	7,250,000	7,853,273
Series A, 5.5%, 9/15/2024	5,000,000	4,984,350

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Series A, 5.5%, 9/15/2028	10,000,000	9,715,500
Georgia, Medical Center Hospital Authority Revenue, Anticipation Certificates, Columbus Regional Healthcare Systems, 6.5%, 8/1/2038, INS: AGC	3,300,000	3,599,970 35,795,341
Hawaii 2.7%		
Hawaii, State Airports Systems Revenue, Series A, 5.0%, 7/1/2039	4,200,000	4,289,502
Hawaii, State Department of Budget & Finance, Special Purpose Revenue, Hawaiian Electric Co., Inc.:		
Series D, AMT, 6.15%, 1/1/2020, INS: AMBAC	2,195,000	2,212,560
6.5%, 7/1/2039, GTY: Hawaiian Electric Co., Inc.	1,000,000	1,082,530
Honolulu City & County, HI, Wastewater Systems Revenue, Series A, 5.25%, 7/1/2036	5,215,000	5,692,746 13,277,338
Idaho 1.0%		
Idaho, Health Facilities Authority Revenue, St. Luke's Regional Medical Center:		
5.0%, 7/1/2035, INS: AGMC	2,500,000	2,567,500
6.75%, 11/1/2037	2,135,000	2,368,953 4,936,453
Illinois 10.9%		
Chicago, IL, Airport Revenue, O'Hare International Airport: AMT, 5.5%, 1/1/2014, INS: AMBAC	10,000,000	10,031,800
Series A, 5.75%, 1/1/2039	5,000,000	5,436,400
Series B, 6.0%, 1/1/2041	9,000,000	9,944,280
Chicago, IL, General Obligation, Series A, 5.25%, 1/1/2035	2,025,000	2,083,118
Illinois, Finance Authority Revenue, Advocate Health Care Network: Series B, 5.375%, 4/1/2044	2,500,000	2,566,850
Series D, 6.5%, 11/1/2038	1,000,000	1,106,160
Illinois, Finance Authority Revenue, Elmhurst Memorial Healthcare, Series A, 5.625%, 1/1/2037	3,000,000	3,002,880
Illinois, Finance Authority Revenue, Memorial Health Systems, 5.5%, 4/1/2039	4,200,000	4,226,082
Illinois, Finance Authority Revenue, Northwest Community Hospital, Series A, 5.5%, 7/1/2038	5,750,000	5,881,847
Illinois, Finance Authority Revenue, Roosevelt University Project, 6.5%, 4/1/2044	3,000,000	3,128,520
Illinois, Metropolitan Pier & Exposition Authority, Dedicated State Tax Revenue, McCormick Place, Series B, 5.0%, 6/15/2050, INS: AGMC	3,000,000	2,893,260
Illinois, Railsplitter Tobacco Settlement Authority, 6.0%, 6/1/2028	915,000	964,776
Illinois, State Toll Highway Authority, Senior Priority, Series A-2A, 0.12%*, 7/1/2030, LOC: Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi UFJ	1,010,000	1,010,000
University of Illinois, Auxiliary Facilities Systems, Series A, 5.25%, 4/1/2041	1,250,000	1,296,125 53,572,098
Indiana 0.4%		
Indiana, Finance Authority Hospital Revenue, Deaconess Hospital Obligation, Series A, 6.75%, 3/1/2039	1,745,000	1,925,904
Kentucky 1.9%		
Kentucky, Economic Development Finance Authority, Louisville Arena Project Revenue, Series A-1, 6.0%, 12/1/2042, INS: AGC	4,000,000	4,225,400

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Louisville & Jefferson County, KY, Metropolitan Government Health Systems Revenue, Norton Healthcare, Inc., 5.0%, 10/1/2030	5,000,000	4,918,800 9,144,200
Louisiana 1.1%		
Louisiana, Public Facilities Authority, Hospital Revenue, Lafayette General Medical Center, 5.5%, 11/1/2040	3,000,000	3,057,510
Louisiana, St. John Baptist Parish Revenue, Marathon Oil Corp., Series A, 5.125%, 6/1/2037	2,315,000	2,280,969 5,338,479
Maryland 0.6%		
Maryland, State Health & Higher Educational Facilities Authority Revenue, Anne Arundel Health Systems, Series A, 6.75%, 7/1/2039	1,100,000	1,240,569
Maryland, State Health & Higher Educational Facilities Authority Revenue, Washington County Hospital, 5.75%, 1/1/2033	1,500,000	1,515,615 2,756,184
Massachusetts 1.6%		
Massachusetts, Airport Revenue, U.S. Airways, Inc. Project, Series A, AMT, 5.875%, 9/1/2023, INS: NATL	5,000,000	4,412,950
Massachusetts, State Health & Educational Facilities Authority Revenue, Suffolk University, Series A, 5.75%, 7/1/2039	3,570,000	3,588,314 8,001,264
Michigan 3.9%		
Michigan, State Building Authority Revenue, Series I-A, 5.375%, 10/15/2041	7,500,000	7,996,575
Michigan, State Building Authority Revenue, Facilities Program: Series H, 5.125%, 10/15/2033	2,495,000	2,584,745
Michigan, State Building Authority Revenue, Facilities Program: Series I, 6.0%, 10/15/2038	1,000,000	1,097,390
Michigan, State Hospital Finance Authority Revenue, Henry Ford Health Hospital, 5.75%, 11/15/2039	5,000,000	5,133,000
Royal Oak, MI, Hospital Finance Authority Revenue, William Beaumont Hospital, 8.25%, 9/1/2039	1,800,000	2,140,074 18,951,784
Minnesota 0.3%		
Minneapolis, MN, Health Care Systems Revenue, Fairview Health Services, Series A, 6.75%, 11/15/2032	1,140,000	1,264,830
Mississippi 0.3%		
Warren County, MS, Gulf Opportunity Zone, International Paper Co., Series A, 6.5%, 9/1/2032	1,525,000	1,634,465
Nevada 2.9%		
Clark County, NV, Airport Revenue, Series B, 5.125%, 7/1/2036	4,305,000	4,410,731
Henderson, NV, Health Care Facility Revenue, Catholic Healthcare West, Series B, 5.25%, 7/1/2031	10,000,000	10,054,800 14,465,531
New Jersey 4.8%		
New Jersey, Economic Development Authority Revenue, Cigarette Tax, 5.75%, 6/15/2034	1,090,000	1,051,959
New Jersey, Hospital & Healthcare Revenue, General Hospital Center at Passaic, ETM, 6.75%, 7/1/2019, INS: AGMC	5,000,000	6,297,200
New Jersey, Industrial Development Revenue, Economic Development Authority, Harrogate, Inc., Series A, 5.875%, 12/1/2026	1,400,000	1,295,112
	1,300,000	1,336,049

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

New Jersey, Resource Recovery Revenue, Tobacco Settlement Financing Corp., Prerefunded, 5.75%, 6/1/2032		
New Jersey, State Transportation Trust Fund Authority, Transportation Systems:		
Series A, 5.5%, 6/15/2041	5,460,000	5,881,840
Series B, 5.5%, 6/15/2031 (a)	1,200,000	1,302,408
Series A, 6.0%, 12/15/2038	1,955,000	2,166,922
Series A, Prerefunded, 6.0%, 12/15/2038	1,045,000	1,350,851
New Jersey, State Turnpike Authority Revenue, Series E, 5.25%, 1/1/2040	1,750,000	1,836,922
New Jersey, Tobacco Settlement Financing Corp., Series 1-A, 5.0%, 6/1/2041	1,700,000	1,179,103
		23,698,366
New York 5.6%		
New York, State Agency General Obligation Lease, Higher Education Revenue, Dormitory Authority, City University, Series A, 5.625%, 7/1/2016	1,500,000	1,686,645
New York, State Environmental Facilities Corp., State Clean Water & Drinking Revolving Funds, New York City Municipal Water Finance Authority Projects, 5.0%, 6/15/2036	2,000,000	2,140,100
New York, State Housing Finance Agency Revenue, 400 East 84th Street Associates, Series A, 144A, AMT, 0.12%*, 5/15/2033, LIQ: Fannie Mae	1,800,000	1,800,000
New York, Tobacco Settlement Financing Corp., Series B-1C, 5.5%, 6/1/2019	15,500,000	16,481,305
New York City, NY, Municipal Water Finance Authority, Water & Sewer Revenue, Second General Resolution, Series EE, 5.375%, 6/15/2043	3,750,000	4,047,825
Niagara Falls, NY, School District General Obligation, 5.6%, 6/15/2014, INS: AGMC	1,180,000	1,330,639
		27,486,514
North Carolina 1.0%		
North Carolina, Capital Educational Facilities Finance Agency Revenue, High Point University Project, 0.15%*, 12/1/2028, LOC: Branch Banking & Trust	530,000	530,000
North Carolina, Electric Revenue, Municipal Power Agency, Series C, 5.375%, 1/1/2017	1,000,000	1,043,410
North Carolina, Medical Care Commission, Health Care Facilities Revenue, University Health System, Series D, 6.25%, 12/1/2033	3,000,000	3,330,420
		4,903,830
North Dakota 0.7%		
Fargo, ND, Sanford Health Systems Revenue, 6.25%, 11/1/2031	3,240,000	3,576,215
Ohio 2.2%		
Lucas County, OH, Hospital Revenue, Promedica Healthcare, Series A, 6.5%, 11/15/2037	1,500,000	1,712,085
Ohio, State Hospital Facility Revenue, Cleveland Clinic Health: Series A, 5.5%, 1/1/2039	5,000,000	5,215,550
Series B, 5.5%, 1/1/2039	3,500,000	3,650,885
		10,578,520
Pennsylvania 2.4%		
	1,700,000	1,779,866

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Allegheny County, PA, Hospital Development Authority Revenue, University of Pittsburgh Medical, 5.625%, 8/15/2039		
Franklin County, PA, Industrial Development Authority Revenue, Chambersburg Hospital Project, 5.375%, 7/1/2042	7,000,000	7,033,110
Philadelphia, PA, Airport Revenue, Series A, 5.0%, 6/15/2035	2,835,000	2,855,525
		11,668,501
Puerto Rico 4.1%		
Puerto Rico, Sales Tax Financing Corp., Sales Tax Revenue:		
Series A, 5.375%, 8/1/2039	3,200,000	3,300,000
Series A, 6.5%, 8/1/2044	15,000,000	16,973,250
		20,273,250
Rhode Island 0.4%		
Rhode Island, Health & Educational Building Corp., Higher Education Facility Revenue, University of Rhode Island, Series A, 6.25%, 9/15/2034	2,000,000	2,218,120
South Carolina 2.1%		
Greenwood County, SC, Hospital & Healthcare Revenue, South Carolina Memorial Hospital, 5.5%, 10/1/2031	1,500,000	1,500,600
South Carolina, Jobs Economic Development Authority, Hospital Facilities Revenue, Palmetto Health Alliance, Series C, Prerefunded, 7.0%, 8/1/2030	5,420,000	6,004,710
South Carolina, State Ports Authority Revenue, 5.25%, 7/1/2040	2,550,000	2,680,228
		10,185,538
Tennessee 3.1%		
Clarksville, TN, Natural Gas Acquisition Corp., Gas Revenue, 5.0%, 12/15/2021	2,000,000	1,971,400
Jackson, TN, Hospital Revenue, Jackson-Madison Project, 5.625%, 4/1/2038	4,000,000	4,157,120
Shelby County, TN, Health, Educational & Housing Facility Board, Hospital Revenue, Methodist Health Care, Prerefunded, 6.5%, 9/1/2026	7,000,000	7,326,690
Sullivan County, TN, Health, Educational & Housing Facilities Board, Hospital Revenue, Wellmont Health Systems Project, Series C, 5.25%, 9/1/2036	2,050,000	1,919,210
		15,374,420
Texas 13.6%		
Harris County, TX, Health Facilities Development Corp., Hospital Revenue, Memorial Hermann Healthcare System, Series B, 7.25%, 12/1/2035	1,000,000	1,124,970
Harris County, TX, Houston Port Authority, Series A, AMT, 6.25%, 10/1/2029	3,000,000	3,439,830
Houston, TX, Airport Revenue, People Mover Project, Series A, AMT, 5.5%, 7/15/2017, INS: AGMC	3,300,000	3,308,019
North Texas, Tollway Authority Revenue:		
First Tier, Series A, 5.625%, 1/1/2033	3,500,000	3,695,055
Second Tier, Series F, 5.75%, 1/1/2038	6,500,000	6,730,360
First Tier, 6.0%, 1/1/2043	5,000,000	5,408,700
North Texas, Tollway Authority Revenue, Special Project Systems, Series D, 5.0%, 9/1/2032	2,000,000	2,096,620
Texas, Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport Revenue:		
Series A, 5.25%, 11/1/2038	4,000,000	4,207,760
Series A, AMT, 5.875%, 11/1/2016, INS: FGIC, NATL	4,205,000	4,221,189

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Texas, Industrial Development Revenue, Waste Disposal Authority, Series A, AMT, 6.1%, 8/1/2024	2,000,000	2,050,220
Texas, Municipal Gas Acquisition & Supply Corp. I, Gas Supply Revenue:		
Series B, 0.782%** , 12/15/2017	7,970,000	7,223,450
Series B, 0.933%** , 12/15/2026	1,500,000	1,044,405
Series D, 6.25%, 12/15/2026	5,000,000	5,256,900
Texas, SA Energy Acquisition Public Facility Corp., Gas Supply Revenue:		
5.5%, 8/1/2021	1,155,000	1,173,665
5.5%, 8/1/2025	7,250,000	7,260,295
Texas, Southwest Higher Education Authority, Inc., Southern Methodist University Project, 5.0%, 10/1/2035	1,600,000	1,665,392
West Harris County, TX, Regional Water Authority, Water Systems Revenue, 5.0%, 12/15/2035	6,500,000	6,835,790
		66,742,620
Vermont 0.1%		
Vermont, State Educational & Health Buildings Financing Agency Revenue, Fletcher Allen Health Care, Series A, 0.1%* , 12/1/2030, LOC: TD Bank NA	500,000	500,000
Virginia 0.3%		
Washington County, VA, Industrial Development Authority, Hospital Facility Revenue, Mountain States Health Alliance, Series C, 7.75%, 7/1/2038	1,370,000	1,555,238
Washington 3.0%		
Port of Seattle, WA, Special Assessment Revenue, Series B, AMT, 5.75%, 9/1/2013, INS: NATL, LIQ: Safeco Insurance Company of America	1,045,000	1,047,079
Washington, State Health Care Facilities Authority Revenue, Virginia Mason Medical Center, Series A, 6.125%, 8/15/2037	6,000,000	6,085,740
Washington, State Health Care Facilities Authority, Swedish Health Services, Series A, 6.75%, 11/15/2041	1,825,000	2,019,089
Washington, State Motor Vehicle Tax-Senior 520 Corridor Program, Series C, 5.0%, 6/1/2031	5,000,000	5,431,200
		14,583,108
Wisconsin 2.1%		
Badge, WI, Tobacco Asset Securitization Corp., Prerefunded, 6.125%, 6/1/2027	1,700,000	1,750,116
Wisconsin, State Health & Educational Facilities Authority Revenue, Aurora Health Care, Inc., Series A, 5.6%, 2/15/2029	5,765,000	5,766,441
Wisconsin, State Health & Educational Facilities Authority Revenue, Prohealth Care, Inc., Series A, 0.15%* , 8/1/2030, LOC: U.S. Bank NA	1,000,000	1,000,000
Wisconsin, State Health & Educational Facilities Authority Revenue, Prohealth Care, Inc. Obligation Group, 6.625%, 2/15/2039	1,555,000	1,680,333
		10,196,890
Total Municipal Bonds and Notes (Cost \$518,515,777)		564,971,998
Municipal Inverse Floating Rate Notes (b) 52.6%		
California 2.1%		
California, San Francisco Bay Area Toll Authority, Toll Bridge Revenue, Series F, 5.0%, 4/1/2031 (c)	10,000,000	10,589,528

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Trust: California, San Francisco Bay Area Toll Authority, Toll Bridge Revenue, Series 1962-5, 144A, 13.693%, 4/1/2031, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 3 to 1		
Florida 7.0%		
Miami-Dade County, FL, Transit Sales Surtax Revenue, 5.0%, 7/1/2023, INS: AGMC (c)	3,740,000	3,941,162
Miami-Dade County, FL, Transit Sales Surtax Revenue, 5.0%, 7/1/2024, INS: AGMC (c)	3,915,000	4,125,575
Miami-Dade County, FL, Transit Sales Surtax Revenue, 5.0%, 7/1/2025, INS: AGMC (c)	4,122,500	4,344,236
Miami-Dade County, FL, Transit Sales Surtax Revenue, 5.0%, 7/1/2026, INS: AGMC (c)	4,317,500	4,549,724
Miami-Dade County, FL, Transit Sales Surtax Revenue, 5.0%, 7/1/2032, INS: AGMC (c)	16,470,000	17,355,868
Trust: Miami-Dade County, FL, Transit Improvements, Series 2008-1160, 144A, 9.261%, 7/1/2023, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 2 to 1		
		34,316,565
Massachusetts 5.0%		
Massachusetts, State Water Pollution Abatement Trust, Series 13, 5.0%, 8/1/2032 (c)	18,250,000	19,426,423
Massachusetts, State Water Pollution Abatement Trust, Series 13, 5.0%, 8/1/2037 (c)	5,000,000	5,322,308
Trust: Massachusetts, State Pollution Control, Water Utility Improvements, Series 3159, 144A, 13.632%, 8/1/2032, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 3 to 1		
		24,748,731
Nevada 6.2%		
Clark County, NV, General Obligation, Limited Tax-Bond Bank, 5.0%, 6/1/2028 (c)	9,447,355	9,973,468
Clark County, NV, General Obligation, Limited Tax-Bond Bank, 5.0%, 6/1/2029 (c)	9,919,723	10,472,141
Clark County, NV, General Obligation, Limited Tax-Bond Bank, 5.0%, 6/1/2030 (c)	9,627,878	10,164,044
Trust: Clark County, NV, General Obligation, Series 3158, 144A, 13.633%, 6/1/2028, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 3 to 1		
		30,609,653
New York 17.1%		
New York, State Dormitory Authority, State Personal Income Tax Revenue, Series A, 5.0%, 3/15/2026 (c)	13,500,000	14,970,825
Trust: New York, State Dormitory Authority Revenue, Series 2008-1189, 144A, 9.22%, 3/15/2026, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 2 to 1		
New York, State Dormitory Authority, State Personal Income Tax Revenue, Series A, 5.0%, 3/15/2026 (c)	10,000,000	11,047,724
Trust: New York, State Dormitory Authority Revenue, Series 3160, 144A, 13.634%, 3/15/2026, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 3 to 1		
New York, State Dormitory Authority, State Personal Income Tax Revenue, Series A, 5.0%, 3/15/2024 (c)	10,000,000	11,192,600
Trust: New York, State Dormitory Authority Revenue, Secondary Issues, Series 1955-3, 144A, 18.05%, 3/15/2024, Leverage Factor at		

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

purchase date: 4 to 1		
New York, State Dormitory Authority Revenues, State Supported Debt, University Dormitory Facilities, 5.0%, 7/1/2025 (c)	5,425,000	5,814,206
New York, State Dormitory Authority Revenues, State Supported Debt, University Dormitory Facilities, 5.0%, 7/1/2027 (c)	8,080,000	8,659,684
Trust: New York, State Dormitory Authority Revenues, Series 3169, 144A, 13.63%, 7/1/2025, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 3 to 1		
New York, Triborough Bridge & Tunnel Authority Revenues, Series C, 5.0%, 11/15/2033 (c)	12,000,000	12,907,200
Trust: New York, Triborough Bridge & Tunnel Authority Revenues, Series 2008-1188, 144A, 9.22%, 11/15/2033, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 2 to 1		
New York City, NY, Transitional Finance Authority Revenue, Series C-1, 5.0%, 11/1/2027 (c)	17,560,000	19,239,790
Trust: New York City, NY, Series 2008-1190, 144A, 9.22%, 11/1/2027, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 2 to 1		83,832,029
Pennsylvania 2.3%		
Pennsylvania, State General Obligation, Second Series, 5.0%, 1/1/2025 (c)	10,000,000	11,140,100
Trust: Pennsylvania, State General Obligation, Public Transit Improvements, Series 2008-1146, 144A, 9.22%, 1/1/2025, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 2 to 1		
Tennessee 7.0%		
Nashville & Davidson County, TN, Metropolitan Government, 5.0%, 1/1/2027 (c)	10,756,695	11,729,614
Trust: Nashville & Davidson County, TN, Metropolitan Government, Series 2631-3, 144A, 18.045%, 1/1/2027, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 4 to 1		
Nashville & Davidson County, TN, Metropolitan Government, 5.0%, 1/1/2026 (c)	10,200,000	11,192,970
Trust: Nashville & Davidson County, TN, Metropolitan Government, Series 2631-2, 144A, 18.05%, 1/1/2026, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 4 to 1		
Nashville & Davidson County, TN, Metropolitan Government, 5.0%, 1/1/2028 (c)	10,564,925	11,453,232
Trust: Nashville & Davidson County, TN, Metropolitan Government, Series 2631-4, 144A, 18.058%, 1/1/2028, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 4 to 1		34,375,816
Texas 2.3%		
Texas, State General Obligation, Transportation Commission Mobility Fund, 5.0%, 4/1/2025 (c)	10,000,000	11,150,800
Trust: Texas, State General Obligation, Series 2008-1147, 144A, 9.22%, 4/1/2025, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 2 to 1		
Virginia 3.6%		
Virginia, State Resource Authority, Clean Water Revenue, 5.0%, 10/1/2027 (c)	8,190,000	9,084,270
Virginia, State Resource Authority, Clean Water Revenue, 5.0%, 3/25/2028 (c)	7,630,000	8,463,124



Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Trust: Virginia, State Resource Authority, Clean Water Revenue, Series 2917, 144A, 11.237%, 10/1/2027, Leverage Factor at purchase date: 2.5 to 1

	17,547,394
Total Municipal Inverse Floating Rate Notes (Cost \$242,963,926)	258,310,616

	% of Net Assets	Value (\$)
Total Investment Portfolio (Cost \$761,479,703)+	167.7	823,282,614
Other Assets and Liabilities, Net	(27.2 )	(133,451,929)
Preferred Shares, at Redemption Value	(40.5 )	(198,750,000)
Net Assets Applicable to Common Shareholders	100.0	491,080,685

\* Variable rate demand notes are securities whose interest rates are reset periodically at market levels. These securities are often payable on demand and are shown at their current rate as of November 30, 2011.

\*\* Floating rate securities' yields vary with a designated market index or market rate, such as the coupon-equivalent of the U.S. Treasury bill rate. These securities are shown at their current rate as of November 30, 2011.

+ The cost for federal income tax purposes was \$759,236,327. At November 30, 2011, net unrealized appreciation for all securities based on tax cost was \$64,046,287. This consisted of aggregate gross unrealized appreciation for all securities in which there was an excess of value over tax cost of \$66,412,277 and aggregate gross unrealized depreciation for all securities in which there was an excess of tax cost over value of \$2,365,990.

(a) When-issued security.

(b) Securities represent the underlying municipal obligations of inverse floating rate obligations held by the Fund.

(c) Security forms part of the below tender option bond trust. Principal Amount and Value shown take into account the leverage factor.

144A: Security exempt from registration under Rule 144A of the Securities Act of 1933. These securities may be resold in transactions exempt from registration, normally to qualified institutional buyers.

AGC: Assured Guaranty Corp.

AGMC: Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp.

AMBAC: Ambac Financial Group, Inc.

AMT: Subject to alternative minimum tax.

ETM: Bonds bearing the description ETM (escrow to maturity) are collateralized usually by U.S. Treasury securities which are held in escrow and used to pay principal and interest on bonds so designated.

FGIC: Financial Guaranty Insurance Co.

GTY: Guaranty Agreement

INS: Insured

LIQ: Liquidity Facility

LOC: Letter of Credit

NATL: National Public Finance Guarantee Corp.

Prerefunded: Bonds which are prerefunded are collateralized usually by U.S. Treasury securities which are held in escrow and used to pay principal and interest on tax-exempt issues and to retire the bonds in full at the earliest refunding date.

#### Fair Value Measurements

Various inputs are used in determining the value of the Fund's investments. These inputs are summarized in three broad levels. Level 1 includes quoted prices in active markets for identical securities. Level 2 includes other significant observable inputs (including quoted prices for similar securities, interest rates, prepayment speeds and credit risk). Level 3 includes significant unobservable inputs (including the Fund's own assumptions in determining the fair value of investments). The inputs or methodology used for valuing securities are not necessarily an indication of the risk associated with investing in those securities.

The following is a summary of the inputs used as of November 30, 2011 in valuing the Fund's investments. For information on the Fund's policy regarding the valuation of investments, please refer to the Security Valuation section of Note A in the accompanying Notes to Financial Statements.

Assets	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total
Municipal Investments (d)	\$—	\$823,282,614	\$—	\$823,282,614
Total	\$—	\$823,282,614	\$—	\$823,282,614

There have been no transfers between Level 1 and Level 2 fair value measurements during the year ended November 30, 2011.

(d) See Investment Portfolio for additional detailed categorizations.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.

#### Statement of Assets and Liabilities

as of November 30, 2011

##### Assets

Investments in non-affiliated securities, at value (cost \$761,479,703)	\$823,282,614
Cash	106,686
Receivable for investments sold	1,070,000
Interest receivable	12,558,265
Other assets	153,711
Total assets	837,171,276

##### Liabilities

Payable for investments purchased — when-issued securities	1,271,196
Payable for floating rate notes issued	145,596,576
Distributions payable	1,036
Accrued management fee	312,543
Other accrued expenses and payables	159,240

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Total liabilities	147,340,591
Remarketed preferred shares, at redemption value	198,750,000
Net assets applicable to common shareholders, at value	\$491,080,685
Net Assets Applicable to Common Shareholders Consist of	
Undistributed net investment income	16,013,995
Net unrealized appreciation (depreciation) on investments	61,802,911
Accumulated net realized gain (loss)	(10,944,422 )
Paid-in capital	424,208,201
Net assets applicable to common shareholders, at value	\$491,080,685
Net Asset Value	
Net Asset Value per common share (\$491,080,685 ÷ 39,111,469 outstanding shares of beneficial interest, \$.01 par value, unlimited number of common shares authorized)	\$12.56

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.

Statement of Operations

for the year ended November 30, 2011

Investment Income

Income:

Interest \$42,149,649

Expenses:

Management fee 3,656,391

Services to shareholders 64,163

Custodian fee 10,514

Professional fees 81,258

Reports to shareholders 111,166

Trustees' fees and expenses 14,274

Interest expense and fees on floating rate notes issued 1,171,994

Remarketing agent fee 496,887

Stock exchange listing fees 40,559

Other 104,031

Total expenses 5,751,237

Net investment income 36,398,412

Realized and Unrealized Gain (Loss)

Net realized gain (loss) from investments (1,118,083 )

Change in net unrealized appreciation (depreciation) on investments 18,472,809

Net gain (loss) 17,354,726

Net increase (decrease) in net assets resulting from operations \$53,753,138

Distributions to Remarketed Preferred Shareholders (441,372 )

Net increase (decrease) in net assets applicable to common shareholders \$53,311,766

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.

Statement of Cash Flows

for the year ended November 30, 2011

Increase (Decrease) in Cash:

Cash Flows from Operating Activities

Net increase (decrease) in net assets resulting from operations (excluding distributions to

Remarketed Preferred Shareholders) \$53,753,138

Adjustments to reconcile net increase (decrease) in net assets resulting from operations to net cash provided by operating activities: (268,629,559)

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Purchases of long-term investments	
Net amortization/accretion of premium/(accretion of discount)	(135,475 )
Proceeds from sales and maturities of long-term investments	275,817,390
(Increase) decrease in interest receivable	(404,636 )
(Increase) decrease in other assets	(150,180 )
(Increase) decrease in receivable for investments sold	1,654,825
Increase (decrease) in payable for investments — when-issued securities purchased	(5,995,660 )
Increase (decrease) in accrued expenses and payables	(291,369 )
Change in net unrealized (appreciation) depreciation on investments	(18,472,809 )
Net realized (gain) loss from investments	1,118,083
Cash provided (used) by operating activities	38,263,748
Cash Flows from Financing Activities	
Net increase (decrease) in cash overdraft	(546,722 )
Distributions paid (net of reinvestment of distributions)	(32,610,340 )
Increase (decrease) in payable for floating rate notes issued	(5,000,000 )
Cash provided (used) for financing activities	(38,157,062 )
Increase (decrease) in cash	106,686
Cash at beginning of period	—
Cash at end of period	\$106,686
Supplemental Disclosure of Non-Cash Financing Activities:	
Reinvestment of distributions	\$662,845
Interest expense and fees on floating rate notes issued	\$(1,171,994 )

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.

Statement of Changes in Net Assets

	Years Ended November 30,	
	2011	2010
Increase (Decrease) in Net Assets		
Operations:		
Net investment income (loss)	\$36,398,412	\$36,542,445
Net realized gain (loss)	(1,118,083 )	514,510
Change in net unrealized appreciation (depreciation)	18,472,809	(126,362 )
Net increase (decrease) in net assets resulting from operations	53,753,138	36,930,593
Distributions to Remarketed Preferred Shareholders	(441,372 )	(579,705 )
Net increase (decrease) in net assets applicable to common shareholders	53,311,766	36,350,888
Distributions to common shareholders from:		
Net investment income	(32,829,776 )	(32,760,745 )
Fund share transactions:		
Net proceeds from shares issued to common shareholders in reinvestment of distributions	662,845	1,019,172
Net increase (decrease) in net assets from Fund share transactions	662,845	1,019,172
Increase (decrease) in net assets	21,144,835	4,609,315
Net assets at beginning of period applicable to common shareholders	469,935,850	465,326,535
Net assets at end of period applicable to common shareholders (including undistributed net investment income of \$16,013,995 and \$13,330,652, respectively)	\$491,080,685	\$469,935,850
Other Information		
Common shares outstanding at beginning of period	39,055,581	38,973,231
Shares issued to common shareholders in reinvestment of distributions	55,888	82,350
Common shares outstanding at end of period	39,111,469	39,055,581

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.

Financial Highlights

	Years Ended November 30,				
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Selected Per Share Data Applicable to Common Shareholders					
Net asset value, beginning of period	\$ 12.03	\$ 11.94	\$ 9.72	\$ 11.79	\$ 12.17
Income (loss) from investment operations:					
Net investment income <sup>a</sup>	.93	.94	1.01	.91	.85
Net realized and unrealized gain (loss)	.45	.00	* 2.03	(2.15 )	(.38 )
Total from investment operations	1.38	.94	3.04	(1.24 )	.47
Distributions to Remarketed Preferred Shareholders from net investment income (common share equivalent)	(.01 )	(.01 )	(.04 )	(.24 )	(.27 )
Net increase (decrease) in net assets from operations applicable to common shareholders	1.37	.93	3.00	(1.48 )	.20
Less distributions applicable to common shareholders from:					
Net investment income	(.84 )	(.84 )	(.78 )	(.59 )	(.58 )
Reimbursement by Advisor	—	—	—	—	.00
Net asset value, end of period	\$ 12.56	\$ 12.03	\$ 11.94	\$ 9.72	\$ 11.79
Market price, end of period	\$ 13.18	\$ 12.12	\$ 11.36	\$ 8.26	\$ 10.43
Total Return					
Based on net asset value (%) <sup>c</sup>	12.03	7.94	32.65	(12.55 ) <sup>b</sup>	2.04
Based on market price (%) <sup>c</sup>	16.69	14.30	48.52	(16.00 )	.06
Ratios to Average Net Assets and Supplemental Data					
Net assets, end of period (\$ millions)	491	470	465	379	459
Ratio of expenses before fee reductions (%) (based on net assets of common shares, including interest expense) <sup>e,f</sup>	1.23	1.24	1.49	2.04	1.39
Ratio of expenses after fee reductions (%) (based on net assets of common shares, including interest expense) <sup>e,g</sup>	1.23	1.24	1.49	2.03	1.38
Ratio of expenses after fee reductions (%) (based on net assets of common shares, excluding interest expense) <sup>h</sup>	.98	.98	1.14	1.15	1.10
Financial Highlights (continued)					
	Years Ended November 30,				
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Ratio of net investment income (%) (based on net assets of common shares)	7.81	7.61	9.17	8.08	7.19

Ratio of net investment income (%) (based on net assets of common and remarketed preferred shares)	5.47	5.38	5.83	5.04	4.57
Portfolio turnover rate (%)	33	34	61	119	57
Remarketed preferred shares information at end of period:					
Aggregate amount outstanding (\$ millions)	199	199	199	265	265
Asset coverage per share (\$) <sup>i</sup>	17,354	16,822	16,706	12,151	13,667
Liquidation and market price per share (\$)	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000

a Based on average common shares outstanding during the period.

b Total return would have been lower had certain fees not been reduced.

c Total return based on net asset value reflects changes in the Fund's net asset value during each period. Total return based on market price reflects changes in market price. Each figure assumes that dividend and capital gains distributions, if any, were reinvested. These figures will differ depending upon the level of any discount from or premium to net asset value at which the Fund's shares traded during the period.

d Includes a non-recurring reimbursement of \$175,116 from the Advisor for a fee previously charged to the Fund. Excluding this non-recurring reimbursement, total return would have been 0.04% lower.

e Interest expense represents interest and fees on short-term floating rate notes issued in conjunction with inverse floating rate securities. Interest income from such transactions is included in income from investment operations.

f The ratio of expenses before fee reductions (based on net assets of common and remarketed preferred shares, including interest expense) were 0.87%, 0.88%, 0.95%, 1.28% and 0.88% for the periods ended November 30, 2011, 2010, 2009, 2008 and 2007, respectively.

g The ratio of expenses after fee reductions (based on net assets of common and remarketed preferred shares, including interest expense) were 0.87%, 0.88%, 0.95%, 1.27% and 0.88% for the periods ended November 30, 2011, 2010, 2009, 2008 and 2007, respectively.

h The ratio of expenses after fee reductions (based on net assets of common and remarketed preferred shares, excluding interest expense) were 0.69%, 0.69%, 0.72%, 0.72% and 0.70% for the periods ended November 30, 2011, 2010, 2009, 2008 and 2007, respectively.

i Asset coverage per share equals net assets of common shares plus the redemption value of the remarketed preferred shares divided by the total number of remarketed preferred shares outstanding at the end of the period.

\* Amount is less than \$.005.

## Notes to Financial Statements

### A. Organization and Significant Accounting Policies

DWS Municipal Income Trust (the "Fund") is registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the "1940 Act"), as a closed-end, diversified management investment company organized as a Massachusetts business trust.

The Fund's financial statements are prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America which require the use of management estimates. Actual results could differ from those estimates. The policies described below are followed consistently by the Fund in the preparation of its financial statements.

Security Valuation. Investments are stated at value determined as of the close of regular trading on the New York Stock Exchange on each day the exchange is open for trading.

Various inputs are used in determining the value of the Fund's investments. These inputs are summarized in three broad levels. Level 1 includes quoted prices in active markets for identical securities. Level 2 includes other significant observable inputs (including quoted prices for similar securities, interest rates, prepayment speeds, and credit risk). Level 3 includes significant unobservable inputs (including the Fund's own assumptions in determining the fair value of investments). The inputs or methodology used for valuing securities are not necessarily an indication of the risk associated with investing in those securities.

Municipal debt securities are valued by independent pricing services approved by the Fund's Board, whose valuations are intended to reflect the mean between the bid and asked prices. If the pricing services are unable to provide valuations, the securities are valued at the mean of the most recent bid and asked quotations or evaluated prices, as applicable, obtained from one or more broker-dealers. Such services may use various pricing techniques which take into account appropriate factors such as yield, quality, coupon rate, maturity, type of issue, trading characteristics and other data, as well as broker quotes. These securities are generally categorized as Level 2.

Securities and other assets for which market quotations are not readily available or for which the above valuation procedures are deemed not to reflect fair value are valued in a manner that is intended to reflect their fair value as determined in accordance with procedures approved by the Board and are generally categorized as Level 3. In accordance with the Fund's valuation procedures, factors used in determining value may include, but are not limited to, the type of the security; the size of the holding; the initial cost of the security; the existence of any contractual restrictions on the security's disposition; the price and extent of public trading in similar securities of the issuer or of comparable companies; quotations or evaluated prices from broker-dealers and/or pricing services; information obtained from the issuer, analysts, and/or the appropriate stock exchange (for exchange-traded securities); an analysis of the company's or issuer's financial statements; an evaluation of the forces that influence the issuer and the market(s) in which the security is purchased and sold and with respect to debt securities; the maturity, coupon, creditworthiness, currency denomination and the movement of the market in which the security is normally traded. The value determined under these procedures may differ from published values for the same securities.

Disclosure about the classification of fair value measurements is included in a table following the Fund's Investment Portfolio.

New Accounting Pronouncement. In May 2011, Accounting Standards Update 2011-04 (ASU 2011-04), Amendments to Achieve Common Fair Value Measurement and Disclosure Requirements in U.S. GAAP and IFRSs, was issued and is effective during interim and annual periods beginning after December 15, 2011. ASU 2011-04 amends Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) Topic 820, Fair Value Measurement. The amendments are the result of the work by the Financial Accounting Standards Board and the International Accounting Standards Board to develop common requirements for measuring fair value and for disclosing information about fair value measurements in accordance with GAAP. Management is currently evaluating the application of ASU 2011-04 and its impact, if any, on the Fund's financial statements.

When Issued/Delayed Delivery Securities. The Fund may purchase or sell securities with delivery or payment to occur at a later date beyond the normal settlement period. At the time the Fund enters into a commitment to purchase or sell a security, the transaction is recorded and the value of the transaction is reflected in the net asset value. The price of such security and the date when the security will be delivered and paid for are fixed at the time the transaction is negotiated. The value of the security may vary with market fluctuations. At the time the Fund enters into a purchase transaction it is required to segregate cash or other liquid assets at least equal to the amount of the commitment.

Certain risks may arise upon entering into when-issued or delayed delivery transaction from the potential inability of counterparties to meet the terms of their contracts or if the issuer does not issue the securities due to political,

economic, or other factors. Additionally, losses may arise due to changes in the value of the underlying securities.

**Inverse Floaters.** The Fund invests in inverse floaters. Inverse floaters are debt instruments with a weekly floating rate of interest that bears an inverse relationship to changes in the short-term interest rate market. Inverse floaters are created by depositing a fixed-rate municipal bond into a special purpose trust (the "Trust"). In turn the Trust issues a short-term floating rate note and an inverse floater. The income stream from the underlying bond in the Trust is divided between the floating rate note and the inverse floater. The income provided by the inverse floater bears an inverse relationship with the short-term rate paid to the floating rate note holder. The short-term floating rate note is issued in a face amount equal to some fraction of the underlying bond's par amount and is paid to a third party, usually a tax-exempt money market fund, at rates that generally reset weekly. The inverse floater earns all of the interest from the underlying fixed-rate bond less the amount of interest paid on the floating rate note and the expenses of the Trust. The inverse floater represents an investment in the underlying bond on a leveraged basis; the Fund bears all of the price risk of the underlying bond in the Trust and receives all the benefits from any potential appreciation of the underlying bond's value.

By holding the inverse floater, the Fund has the right to collapse the Trust by causing the holders of the floating rate instrument to tender their notes at par and have the broker transfer the underlying bond to the Fund. The floating rate note holder can also elect to tender the note for redemption at par at each reset date. The Fund accounts for these transactions as a form of secured borrowing, by reflecting the value of the underlying bond in the investments of the Fund and the amount owed to the floating rate note holder as a liability under the caption "Payable for floating rate notes issued" in the Statement of Assets and Liabilities. Income earned on the underlying bond is included in interest income, and interest paid on the floaters and the expenses of the Trust are included in "Interest expense and fees on floating rate notes issued" in the Statement of Operations.

The Fund may enter into shortfall and forbearance agreements by which the Fund agrees to reimburse the Trust, in certain circumstances, for the difference between the liquidation value of the underlying bond held by the Trust and the liquidation value of the floating rate notes plus any shortfalls in interest cash flows. This could potentially expose the Fund to losses in excess of the value of the Fund's inverse floater investments. In addition, the value of inverse floaters may decrease significantly when interest rates increase. The market for inverse floaters may be more volatile and less liquid than other municipal bonds of comparable maturity. The Trust could be terminated outside of the Fund's control, resulting in a reduction of leverage and disposal of portfolio investments at inopportune times and prices. Investments in inverse floaters generally involve greater risk than in an investment in fixed-rate bonds.

The weighted average outstanding daily balance of the floating rate notes during the year ended November 30, 2011 was approximately \$147,446,000, with a weighted average interest rate of 0.79%.

**Federal Income Taxes.** The Fund's policy is to comply with the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, which are applicable to regulated investment companies, and to distribute all of its taxable and tax-exempt income to its shareholders.

At November 30, 2011, the Fund had a net tax basis capital loss carryforward of approximately \$12,943,000, which may be applied against any realized net taxable capital gains of each succeeding year until fully utilized or until November 30, 2014 (\$912,000), November 30, 2016 (\$7,370,000), November 30, 2017 (\$2,864,000), November 30, 2018 (\$500,000) and November 30, 2019 (\$1,297,000), the respective expiration dates, whichever occurs first.

During the year ended November 30, 2011, the Fund lost through expiration \$1,323,000 of prior year capital loss carryforward.

On December 22, 2010, the Regulated Investment Company Modernization Act of 2010 (the "Act") was enacted. Under the Act, net capital losses may be carried forward indefinitely, and their character is retained as short-term and/or long-term losses. Previously, net capital losses were carried forward for eight years and treated as short-term



losses. As a transition rule, the Act requires that post-enactment net capital losses be used before pre-enactment net capital losses. As a result of this ordering rule, pre-enactment capital loss carryforwards may expire unused, whereas under the previous rules these losses may have been utilized. This change is effective for fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment.

The Fund has reviewed the tax positions for the open tax years as of November 30, 2011 and has determined that no provision for income tax is required in the Fund's financial statements. The Fund's federal tax returns for the prior three fiscal years remain open subject to examination by the Internal Revenue Service.

**Distribution of Income and Gains.** Net investment income of the Fund is declared and distributed to shareholders monthly. Net realized gains from investment transactions, in excess of available capital loss carryforwards, would be taxable to the Fund if not distributed, and, therefore, will be distributed to shareholders at least annually.

The timing and characterization of certain income and capital gains distributions are determined annually in accordance with federal tax regulations, which may differ from accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. These differences primarily relate to certain securities sold at a loss and accretion of market discount on debt securities. As a result, net investment income (loss) and net realized gain (loss) on investment transactions for a reporting period may differ significantly from distributions during such period. Accordingly, the Fund may periodically make reclassifications among certain of its capital accounts without impacting the net asset value of the Fund.

At November 30, 2011, the Fund's components of distributable earnings (accumulated losses) on a tax basis were as follows:

Undistributed tax-exempt income	\$15,669,159
Undistributed ordinary income	\$345,872
Capital loss carryforwards	\$(12,943,000)
Net unrealized appreciation (depreciation) on investments	\$64,046,287

In addition, the tax character of distributions paid to shareholders by the Fund is summarized as follows:

	Years Ended November 30,	
	2011	2010
Distributions from tax-exempt income	\$33,271,148	\$33,340,450

**Remarketed Preferred Shares.** The Fund has issued and outstanding 8,100 Series A, 8,025 Series B, 8,100 Series C, 8,025 Series D and 7,500 Series E remarketed preferred shares ("Remarketed Preferred Shares"), each at a liquidation value of \$5,000 per share. The Remarketed Preferred Shares are senior to and have certain class specific preferences over the common shares. The dividend rate on each series of Remarketed Preferred Shares is set through a remarketing process, and the dividends are generally paid every seven days. The remarketing agent receives an annualized fee from the Fund of 0.25% times the liquidation value of the Fund's Remarketed Preferred Shares (remarketing agent fee) and is responsible for the payment of any commissions to broker-dealers participating in the remarketing process based on shares sold. Currently, the remarketing agent is the only participating broker-dealer.

For remarketing to be successful, the number of Remarketed Preferred Shares bid must meet or exceed the number of Remarketed Preferred Shares being offered for sale. Since February 2008, remarketings of the Remarketed Preferred Shares have failed. Under the terms of the Remarketed Preferred Shares designation statement, in the event of a failed remarketing, the Remarketed Preferred Shares' dividend rate adjusts to a "maximum rate." Based on current Remarketed Preferred Share ratings, the maximum rate is 125% of the Commercial Paper Rate (generally defined as the 60-day AA/Aa commercial paper rate). The next succeeding dividend period following the remarketing failure automatically adjusts to a 7-day period, which continues until the next successful remarketing. Remarketed preferred shareholders may offer their shares for sale at the next scheduled remarketing, subject to the same risk that the subsequent remarketing will not attract sufficient demand for a successful remarketing to occur. Broker-dealers may

also try to facilitate secondary trading in the Remarketed Preferred Shares, although such secondary trading may be limited and may only be available for shareholders willing to sell at a discount.

While prolonged remarketing failures have affected the liquidity for the Remarketed Preferred Shares, a failed remarketing does not represent a default on or loss of capital of, the Fund's Remarketed Preferred Shares and the remarketed preferred shareholders have continued to receive dividends at the previously defined "maximum rate." Prolonged remarketing failures may increase the cost of leverage to the Fund.

During the year ended November 30, 2011, the dividend rates ranged from 0.088% to 0.400% for Series A, 0.088% to 0.400% for Series B, 0.088% to 0.400% for Series C, 0.088% to 0.400% for Series D and 0.125% to 0.300% for Series E. The 1940 Act requires that the remarketed preferred shareholders of the Fund, voting as a separate class, have the right to: a) elect at least two trustees at all times, and b) elect a majority of the trustees at any time when dividends on the Remarketed Preferred Shares are unpaid for two full years. Unless otherwise required by law or under the terms of the Remarketed Preferred Shares designation statement, each remarketed preferred shareholder is entitled to one vote and remarketed preferred shareholders will vote together with common shareholders as a single class.

Leverage involves risks and special considerations for the Fund's common shareholders, including the likelihood of greater volatility of net asset value and market price of, and dividends on, the Fund's common shares than a comparable portfolio without leverage; the risk that fluctuations in interest rates will reduce the return to common shareholders; and the effect of leverage in a declining market, which is likely to cause a greater decline in the net asset value of the Fund's common shares than if the Fund were not leveraged, which may result in a greater decline in the market price of the Fund's common shares. Changes in the value of the Fund's portfolio will be borne entirely by the common shareholders. If there is a net decrease (or increase) in the value of the Fund's investment portfolio, leverage will decrease (or increase) the net asset value per share to a greater extent than if leverage were not used. It is also possible that the Fund will be required to sell assets at a time when it would otherwise not do so, possibly at a loss, in order to redeem Remarketed Preferred Shares to comply with asset coverage or other restrictions imposed by the rating agencies that rate the Remarketed Preferred Shares. The Fund is subject to certain restrictions on its investments imposed by guidelines of the rating agencies. These guidelines may impose asset coverage or portfolio composition requirements that are more stringent than those imposed on the Fund by the 1940 Act. There is no assurance that the Fund's leveraging strategy will be successful.

**Statement of Cash Flows.** Information on financial transactions which have been settled through the receipt and disbursement of cash is presented in the Statement of Cash Flows. The cash amount shown in the Statement of Cash Flows represents the cash at the Fund's custodian bank at November 30, 2011.

**Contingencies.** In the normal course of business, the Fund may enter into contracts with service providers that contain general indemnification clauses. The Fund's maximum exposure under these arrangements is unknown as this would involve future claims that may be made against the Fund that have not yet been made. However, based on experience, the Fund expects the risk of loss to be remote.

**Other.** Investment transactions are accounted for on a trade date plus one basis for daily net asset value calculations. However, for financial reporting purposes, investment transactions are reported on trade date. Interest income is recorded on the accrual basis. Realized gains and losses from investment transactions are recorded on an identified cost basis and may include proceeds from litigation. All premiums and discounts are amortized/accreted for financial reporting purposes, with the exception of securities in default of principal.

#### B. Purchases and Sales of Securities

During the year ended November 30, 2011, purchases and sales of investment securities (excluding short-term investments) aggregated \$268,629,559 and \$275,817,390, respectively.

### C. Related Parties

**Management Agreement.** Under the Investment Management Agreement with Deutsche Investment Management Americas Inc. ("DIMA" or the "Advisor"), an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of Deutsche Bank AG, the Advisor directs the investments of the Fund in accordance with its investment objectives, policies and restrictions. The Advisor determines the securities, instruments and other contracts relating to investments to be purchased, sold or entered into by the Fund. In addition to portfolio management services, the Advisor provides certain administrative services in accordance with the Investment Management Agreement. The management fee payable under the Investment Management Agreement is equal to an annualized rate of 0.55% of the Fund's average weekly net assets, computed and accrued daily and payable monthly. Average weekly net assets, for purposes of determining the management fee, means the average weekly value of the total assets of the Fund, minus the sum of accrued liabilities of the Fund (other than the liquidation value of the Remarketed Preferred Shares).

**Service Provider Fees.** DWS Investments Service Company ("DISC"), an affiliate of the Advisor, is the transfer agent, dividend-paying agent and shareholder service agent for the Fund. Pursuant to a sub-transfer agency agreement between DISC and DST Systems, Inc. ("DST"), DISC has delegated certain transfer agent, dividend-paying agent and shareholder service agent functions to DST. DISC compensates DST out of the shareholder servicing fee it receives from the Fund. For the year ended November 30, 2011, the amount charged to the Fund by DISC aggregated \$37,001, of which is \$8,029 is unpaid.

**Typesetting and Filing Service Fees.** Under an agreement with DIMA, DIMA is compensated for providing typesetting and certain regulatory filing services to the Fund. For the year ended November 30, 2011, the amount charged to the Fund by DIMA included in the Statement of Operations under "reports to shareholders" aggregated \$13,311, of which \$7,378 is unpaid.

**Trustees' Fees and Expenses.** The Fund paid each Trustee not affiliated with the Advisor retainer fees plus specified amounts for various committee services and for the Board Chairperson.

**Other Related Parties.** Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas, an affiliate of the Advisor, charges an administration fee for the remarketed preferred shares. For the year ended November 30, 2011, the amount charged to the Fund by Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas included in the Statement of Operations under "other" aggregated \$25,000, all of which was paid.

### D. Share Repurchases

The Fund is authorized to effect periodic repurchases of its outstanding shares in the open market from time to time when the Fund's shares trade at a discount to their net asset value. During the year ended November 30, 2011, the Fund did not repurchase shares.

### Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm

To the Board of Trustees and Shareholders of DWS Municipal Income Trust:

We have audited the accompanying statement of assets and liabilities of DWS Municipal Income Trust (the "Fund"), including the investment portfolio, as of November 30, 2011, and the related statements of operations and cash flows for the year then ended, the statement of changes in net assets for each of the two years in the period then ended, and the financial highlights for each of the five years in the period then ended. These financial statements and financial highlights are the responsibility of the Fund's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements and financial highlights based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements and financial highlights are free of material misstatement. We were not engaged to perform an audit of the Fund's internal control over financial reporting. Our audits included consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Fund's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements and financial highlights, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, and evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. Our procedures included confirmation of securities owned as of November 30, 2011, by correspondence with the custodian and brokers or by other appropriate auditing procedures where replies from brokers were not received. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements and financial highlights referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of DWS Municipal Income Trust at November 30, 2011, the results of its operations and its cash flows for the year then ended, the changes in its net assets for each of the two years in the period then ended, and the financial highlights for each of the five years in the period then ended, in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

Boston, Massachusetts  
January 24, 2012

#### Tax Information (Unaudited)

Of the dividends paid from net investment income for the taxable year ended November 30, 2011, 100% are designated as exempt-interest dividends for federal income tax purposes.

Please contact a tax advisor if you have questions about federal or state income tax laws, or on how to prepare your tax returns. If you have specific questions about your account, please call (800) 294-4366.

#### Dividend Reinvestment Plan

A summary of the Fund's Dividend Reinvestment Plan (the "Plan") is set forth below. Shareholders may obtain a copy of the entire Plan by visiting the Fund's Web site at [www.dws-investments.com](http://www.dws-investments.com) or by writing or calling DWS Investment Service Company ("DISC") at:

P.O. Box 219066

Kansas City, Missouri 64121-9066

(800) 294-4366

If you wish to participate in the Plan and your shares are held in your own name, simply contact DISC for the appropriate form. If your shares are held in the name of a broker or other nominee, you should contact the broker or nominee in whose name your shares are held to determine whether and how you may participate in the Plan. The Fund's transfer agent and dividend disbursing agent (the "Transfer Agent") will establish a Dividend Investment Account (the "Account") for each shareholder participating in the Plan. The Transfer Agent will credit to the Account of each participant any cash dividends and capital gains distributions (collectively, "Distributions") paid on shares of the Fund (the "Shares"). Shares in a participant's Account are transferable upon proper written instructions to the Transfer Agent. Upon request to the Transfer Agent, a certificate for any or all full Shares in a participant's Account will be sent to the participant.

If, on the record date for a Distribution (the "Record Date"), Shares are trading at a discount from net asset value per Share, funds credited to a participant's Account will be used to purchase Shares (the "Purchase"). The Plan Agent (currently Computershare Inc.) will attempt, commencing five days prior to the Payment Date and ending at the close of business on the Payment Date ("Payment Date" as used herein shall mean the last business day of the month in which such Record Date occurs), to acquire Shares in the open market. If and to the extent that the Plan Agent is unable to acquire sufficient Shares to satisfy the Distribution by the close of business on the Payment Date, the Fund will issue to the Plan Agent, Shares valued at net asset value per Share in the aggregate amount of the remaining value of the Distribution. If, on the Record Date, Shares are trading at a premium over net asset value per Share, the Fund will issue on the Payment Date Shares valued at net asset value per Share on the Record Date to the Transfer Agent in the aggregate amount of the funds credited to the participants' Accounts. The Fund will increase the price at which Shares may be issued under the Plan to 95% of the fair market value of the shares on the Record Date if the net asset value per Share of the Shares on the Record Date is less than 95% of the fair market value of the Shares on the Record Date.

Although the Fund seeks income that is exempt from federal income tax, a portion of the Distributions may be subject to federal, state and local taxes, including the alternative minimum tax. The reinvestment of Distributions does not relieve the participant of any tax that may be payable on the Distributions. The Transfer Agent will report to each participant the taxable amount of Distributions credited to his or her account. Participants will be treated for federal income tax purposes as receiving the amount of the Distributions made by the Fund, which amount generally will be either equal to the amount of the cash distribution the shareholder would have received if the shareholder had elected to receive cash or, for shares issued by the Fund, the fair market value of the shares issued to the shareholder.

The cost of Shares acquired for each participant's Account in connection with a Purchase shall be determined by the average cost per Share, including brokerage commissions, of the Shares acquired in connection with that Purchase. There will be no brokerage charges with respect to Shares issued directly by the Fund as a result of Distributions. However, each participant will pay a pro rata share of brokerage commissions incurred with respect to open market purchases. Brokerage charges for purchasing small amounts of Shares for individual Accounts through the Plan will probably be less than the usual brokerage charges for such transactions, as the Plan Agent will be purchasing Shares for all participants in blocks and prorating the lower commission thus attainable.

A participant may from time to time make voluntary cash contributions to his Account in a minimum amount of \$100 (no more than \$500 may be contributed per month). Participants making voluntary cash investments will be charged a \$0.75 service fee for each such investment and will be responsible for their pro rata share of brokerage commissions. Please contact DISC for more information on voluntary cash contributions.

The Fund reserves the right to amend the Plan, including provisions with respect to any Distribution paid, subsequent to notice thereof sent to participants in the Plan at least ninety days before the record date for such Distribution, except when such amendment is necessary or appropriate to comply with applicable law or the rules or policies of the Securities and Exchange Commission or any other regulatory authority, in which case such amendment shall be effective as soon as practicable. The Plan may be terminated by the Fund.

Shareholders may withdraw from the Plan at any time by giving the Transfer Agent a written notice. A notice of withdrawal will be effective for the next Distribution following receipt of the notice by the Transfer Agent provided the notice is received by the Transfer Agent at least ten days prior to the Record Date for the Distribution. When a participant withdraws from the Plan, or when the Plan is terminated by the Fund, the participant will receive a certificate for full Shares in the Account, plus a check for any fractional Shares based on market price; or, if a participant so desires, the Transfer Agent will notify the Plan Agent to sell his Shares in the Plan and send the proceeds to the participant, less brokerage commissions and a \$2.50 service fee.

Shareholders will receive tax information annually for personal records and to assist in preparation of their federal income tax returns.

#### Investment Management Agreement Approval

The Board of Trustees approved the renewal of DWS Municipal Income Trust's investment management agreement (the "Agreement") with Deutsche Investment Management Americas Inc. ("DWS") in September 2011.

In terms of the process that the Board followed prior to approving the Agreement, shareholders should know that:

- In September 2011, all of the Fund's Trustees were independent of DWS and its affiliates.
- The Trustees met frequently during the past year to discuss fund matters and dedicated a substantial amount of time to contract review matters. Over the course of several months, the Board's Contract Committee, in coordination with the Board's Fixed Income and Quant Oversight Committee, reviewed comprehensive materials received from DWS, independent third parties and independent counsel. These materials included an analysis of the Fund's performance, fees and expenses, and profitability compiled by the Fund's independent fee consultant. The Board also received extensive information throughout the year regarding performance of the Fund.
- The Independent Trustees regularly meet privately with their independent counsel to discuss contract review and other matters. In addition, the Independent Trustees were also advised by the Fund's independent fee consultant in the course of their review of the Fund's contractual arrangements and considered a comprehensive report prepared by the independent fee consultant in connection with their deliberations (the "IFC Report").
- In connection with reviewing the Agreement, the Board also reviewed the terms of the Fund's transfer agency agreement and other material service agreements.
- Based on its evaluation of the information provided, the Contract Committee presented its findings and recommendations to the Board. The Board then reviewed the Contract Committee's findings and recommendations.

In connection with the contract review process, the Contract Committee and the Board considered the factors discussed below, among others. The Board also considered that DWS and its predecessors have managed the Fund since its inception, and the Board believes that a long-term relationship with a capable, conscientious advisor is in the best interests of the Fund. The Board considered, generally, that shareholders chose to invest or remain invested in the Fund knowing that DWS managed the Fund. DWS is part of Deutsche Bank, a major global banking institution that is engaged in a wide range of financial services. The Board believes that there are significant advantages to being part of a global asset management business that offers a wide range of investing expertise and resources, including hundreds of portfolio managers and analysts with research capabilities in many countries throughout the world.

While shareholders may focus primarily on fund performance and fees, the Fund's Board considers these and many other factors, including the quality and integrity of DWS's personnel and such other issues as back-office operations, fund valuations, and compliance policies and procedures.

Nature, Quality and Extent of Services. The Board considered the terms of the Agreement, including the scope of advisory services provided under the Agreement. The Board noted that, under the Agreement, DWS provides portfolio management and administrative services to the Fund. The Board considered the experience and skills of senior management and investment personnel, the resources made available to such personnel, the ability of DWS to attract and retain high-quality personnel, and the organizational depth and stability of DWS. The Board reviewed the Fund's performance over short-term and long-term periods and compared those returns to various agreed-upon performance measures, including market indices and a peer universe compiled by the independent fee consultant using information supplied by Lipper Inc. ("Lipper"). The Board also noted that it has put into place a process of identifying "Focus

Funds" (e.g., funds performing poorly relative to their benchmark or a peer universe compiled by an independent fund data service), and receives more frequent reporting and information from DWS regarding such funds, along with DWS's remedial plans to address underperformance. The Board believes this process is an effective manner of identifying and addressing underperforming funds. Based on the information provided, the Board noted that for the one-, three- and five-year periods ended December 31, 2010, the Fund's performance was in the 3rd quartile, 1st quartile and 1st quartile, respectively, of the applicable Lipper universe (the 1st quartile being the best performers and the 4th quartile being the worst performers). The Board also observed that the Fund has underperformed its benchmark in the one-year period and has outperformed its benchmark in the three- and five-year periods ended December 31, 2010.

On the basis of this evaluation and the ongoing review of investment results by the Board, the Board concluded that the nature, quality and extent of services provided by DWS historically have been and continue to be satisfactory.

Fees and Expenses. The Board considered the Fund's investment management fee schedule, operating expenses and total expense ratios, and comparative information provided by Lipper and the independent fee consultant regarding investment management fee rates paid to other investment advisors by similar funds (1st quartile being the most favorable and 4th quartile being the least favorable). With respect to management fees paid to other investment advisors by similar funds, the Board noted that the contractual fee rates paid by the Fund were lower than the median (1st quartile) of the applicable Lipper peer group (based on Lipper data provided as of December 31, 2010). The Board noted that the Fund's total operating expenses excluding certain investment related expenses and based on managed assets were expected to be lower than the median (2nd quartile) of the applicable Lipper expense universe (based on Lipper data provided as of December 31, 2010). The Board considered the Fund's management fee rate as compared to fees charged by DWS and certain of its affiliates for comparable funds and considered differences in fund and fee structures between the DWS Funds. The Board also considered how the Fund's total operating expenses compared to the total operating expenses of a more customized peer group selected by Lipper (based on such factors as asset size).

The information considered by the Board as part of its review of management fees included information regarding fees charged by DWS and its affiliates to similar institutional accounts and to similar funds offered primarily to European investors ("DWS Europe funds"), in each case as applicable. The Board observed that advisory fee rates for institutional accounts generally were lower than the management fees charged by similarly managed DWS U.S. mutual funds ("DWS Funds"), but also took note of the differences in services provided to DWS Funds as compared to institutional accounts. In the case of DWS Europe funds, the Board observed that fee rates for DWS Europe funds generally were higher than for similarly managed DWS Funds, but noted that differences in the types of services provided to DWS Funds relative to DWS Europe funds made it difficult to compare such fees.

On the basis of the information provided, the Board concluded that management fees were reasonable and appropriate in light of the nature, quality and extent of services provided by DWS. The Board concluded that the Fund's fee schedule represents an appropriate sharing between the Fund and DWS of such economies of scale as may exist in the management of the Fund at current asset levels.

Profitability. The Board reviewed detailed information regarding revenues received by DWS under the Agreement. The Board considered the estimated costs and pre-tax profits realized by DWS from advising the DWS Funds, as well as estimates of the pre-tax profits attributable to managing the Fund in particular. The Board also received information regarding the estimated enterprise-wide profitability of DWS and its affiliates with respect to all fund services in totality and by fund. The Board and the independent fee consultant reviewed DWS's methodology in allocating its costs to the management of the Fund. Based on the information provided, the Board concluded that the pre-tax profits realized by DWS in connection with the management of the Fund were not unreasonable. The Board also reviewed information regarding the profitability of certain similar investment management firms. The Board noted that while information regarding the profitability of such firms is limited (and in some cases is not necessarily prepared on a comparable basis), DWS and its affiliates' overall profitability with respect to the DWS fund complex (after taking

into account distribution and other services provided to the funds by DWS and its affiliates) was lower than the overall profitability levels of many comparable firms for which such data was available.

**Other Benefits to DWS and Its Affiliates.** The Board also considered the character and amount of other incidental benefits received by DWS and its affiliates. The Board also considered benefits to DWS related to brokerage and soft-dollar allocations, including allocating brokerage to pay for research generated by parties other than the executing broker dealers, which pertain primarily to funds investing in equity securities, along with the incidental public relations benefits to DWS related to DWS Funds advertising and cross-selling opportunities among DWS products and services. The Board concluded that management fees were reasonable in light of these fallout benefits.

**Compliance.** The Board considered the significant attention and resources dedicated by DWS to documenting and enhancing its compliance processes in recent years. The Board noted in particular (i) the experience and seniority of both DWS's chief compliance officer and the Fund's chief compliance officer; (ii) the large number of DWS compliance personnel; and (iii) the substantial commitment of resources by DWS and its affiliates to compliance matters.

Based on all of the information considered and the conclusions reached, the Board unanimously determined that the continuation of the Agreement is in the best interests of the Fund. In making this determination, the Board did not give particular weight to any single factor identified above. The Board considered these factors over the course of numerous meetings, certain of which were in executive session with only the Independent Trustees and their counsel present. It is possible that individual Trustees may have weighed these factors differently in reaching their individual decisions to approve the continuation of the Agreement.

#### Board Members and Officers

The following table presents certain information regarding the Board Members and Officers of the fund as of November 30, 2011. Each Board Member's year of birth is set forth in parentheses after his or her name. Unless otherwise noted, (i) each Board Member has engaged in the principal occupation(s) noted in the table for at least the most recent five years, although not necessarily in the same capacity; and (ii) the address of each Independent Board Member is c/o Paul K. Freeman, Independent Chairman, DWS Funds, PO Box 101833, Denver, CO 80250-1833. The Board is divided into three classes of Board Members, Class I, Class II and Class III. At each annual meeting of shareholders of the Trust, the class of Board Members elected at such meeting is elected to hold office until the annual meeting held in the third succeeding year and until the election and qualification of such Board Member's successor, if any, or until such Board Member sooner dies, resigns, retires or is removed. In addition, the holders of the Remarketed Preferred Shares, voting as a separate class, are entitled to elect two Board Members. The Board Members elected by the holders of the Remarketed Preferred Shares, voting as a separate class, are elected to hold office until the next annual meeting and until the election and qualification of such Board Member's successor, if any, or until such Board Member sooner dies, resigns, retires or is removed. The Board Members may also serve in similar capacities with other funds in the fund complex. The Length of Time Served represents the year in which the Board Member joined the board of one or more DWS funds now overseen by the Board.

#### Independent Board Members

Name, Year of Birth, Position with the Fund and Length of Time Served <sup>1</sup>	Business Experience and Directorships During the Past Five Years	Number of Funds in DWS Fund Complex Overseen	Other Directorships Held by Board Member
Paul K. Freeman (1950) Chairperson since 2009 Board Member since 1993	Consultant, World Bank/Inter-American Development Bank; Executive and Governing Council of the Independent Directors Council (education committees); formerly: Project Leader,	112	—



Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

	International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (1998-2001); Chief Executive Officer, The Eric Group, Inc. (environmental insurance) (1986-1998)		
John W. Ballantine (1946) Board Member since 1999	Retired; formerly, Executive Vice President and Chief Risk Management Officer, First Chicago NBD Corporation/The First National Bank of Chicago (1996-1998); Executive Vice President and Head of International Banking (1995-1996). Directorships: Chairman of the Board, Healthways, Inc. (provider of disease and care management services); Portland General Electric (utility company); Stockwell Capital Investments PLC (private equity); former Directorships: First Oak Brook Bancshares, Inc. and Oak Brook Bank; Prisma Energy International Vice Chair and former President, WGBH Educational Foundation. Directorships: Association of Public Television Stations; Public Radio International; Public Radio Exchange (PRX); The PBS Foundation; former Directorships: Boston Museum of Science; American Public Television; Concord Academy; New England Aquarium; Mass. Corporation for Educational Telecommunications; Committee for Economic Development; Public Broadcasting Service	112	—
Henry P. Becton, Jr. (1943) Board Member since 1990	Directorships: Association of Public Television Stations; Public Radio International; Public Radio Exchange (PRX); The PBS Foundation; former Directorships: Boston Museum of Science; American Public Television; Concord Academy; New England Aquarium; Mass. Corporation for Educational Telecommunications; Committee for Economic Development; Public Broadcasting Service	112	Lead Director, Becton Dickinson and Company <sup>2</sup> (medical technology company); Lead Director, Belo Corporation <sup>2</sup> (media company)
Dawn-Marie Driscoll (1946) Board Member since 1987	President, Driscoll Associates (consulting firm); Executive Fellow, Center for Business Ethics, Bentley University; formerly, Partner, Palmer & Dodge (1988-1990); Vice President of Corporate Affairs and General Counsel, Filene's (1978-1988). Directorships: Director of ICI Mutual Insurance Company (since 2007); Advisory Board, Center for Business Ethics, Bentley University; Trustee, Southwest Florida Community Foundation (charitable organization); former Directorships: Investment Company	112	Trustee, Sun Capital Advisers, Inc. (22 open-end mutual funds advised by Sun Capital Advisers, Inc.) (since 2007)

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

<p>Keith R. Fox, CFA (1954) Board Member since 1996</p>	<p>Institute (audit, executive, nominating committees) and Independent Directors Council (governance, executive committees) Managing General Partner, Exeter Capital Partners (a series of private investment funds) (since 1986). Directorships: Progressive International Corporation (kitchen goods importer and distributor); BoxTop Media Inc. (advertising); The Kennel Shop (retailer); former Chairman, National Association of Small Business Investment Companies</p>	<p>112</p>	<p>Trustee, Sun Capital Advisers, Inc. (22 open-end mutual funds advised by Sun Capital Advisers, Inc.) (since 2011)</p>
<p>Kenneth C. Froewiss (1945) Board Member since 2001</p>	<p>Adjunct Professor of Finance, NYU Stern School of Business (September 2009-present; Clinical Professor from 1997-September 2009); Member, Finance Committee, Association for Asian Studies (2002-present); Director, Mitsui Sumitomo Insurance Group (US) (2004-present); prior thereto, Managing Director, J.P. Morgan (investment banking firm) (until 1996)</p>	<p>112</p>	<p>—</p>
<p>Richard J. Herring (1946) Board Member since 1990</p>	<p>Jacob Safra Professor of International Banking and Professor, Finance Department, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania (since July 1972); Co-Director, Wharton Financial Institutions Center (since July 2000); Co-Chair, U.S. Shadow Financial Regulatory Committee; Executive Director, Financial Economists Roundtable; formerly: Vice Dean and Director, Wharton Undergraduate Division (July 1995-June 2000); Director, Lauder Institute of International Management Studies (July 2000-June 2006)</p>	<p>112</p>	<p>Director, Japan Equity Fund, Inc. (since September 2007), Thai Capital Fund, Inc. (since September 2007), Singapore Fund, Inc. (since September 2007), Independent Director of Barclays Bank Delaware (since September 2010)</p>
<p>William McClayton (1944) Board Member since 2004</p>	<p>Private equity investor (since October 2009); previously, Managing Director, Diamond Management &amp; Technology Consultants, Inc. (global consulting firm) (2001-2009); Directorship: Board of Managers, YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago; formerly:</p>	<p>112</p>	<p>—</p>

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

	Senior Partner, Arthur Andersen LLP (accounting) (1966-2001); Trustee, Ravinia Festival		
Rebecca W. Rimel (1951) Board Member since 1995	President and Chief Executive Officer, The Pew Charitable Trusts (charitable organization) (1994 to present); Trustee, Thomas Jefferson Foundation (charitable organization) (1994 to present); Trustee, Executive Committee, Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce (2001-2007); formerly: Executive Vice President, The Glenmede Trust Company (investment trust and wealth management) (1983-2004); Board Member, Investor Education (charitable organization) (2004-2005); Trustee, Pro Publica (charitable organization) (2007-2010)	112	Director, CardioNet, Inc. (health care) (2009- present); Director, Viasys Health Care2 (January 2007- June 2007)
William N. Searcy, Jr. (1946) Board Member since 1993	Private investor since October 2003; formerly: Pension & Savings Trust Officer, Sprint Corporation2 (telecommunications) (November 1989-September 2003)	112	Trustee, Sun Capital Advisers, Inc. (22 open-end mutual funds advised by Sun Capital Advisers, Inc.) (since 1998)
Jean Gleason Stromberg (1943) Board Member since 1997	Retired. Formerly, Consultant (1997-2001); Director, Financial Markets US Government Accountability Office (1996-1997); Partner, Fulbright & Jaworski, L.L.P. (law firm) (1978-1996). Directorships: The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation; former Directorships: Service Source, Inc., Mutual Fund Directors Forum (2002-2004), American Bar Retirement Association (funding vehicle for retirement plans) (1987-1990 and 1994-1996)	112	—
Robert H. Wadsworth (1940) Board Member since 1999	President, Robert H. Wadsworth & Associates, Inc. (consulting firm) (1983 to present); Director, The Phoenix Boys Choir Association	115	—

Officers4

Name, Year of Birth, Position with the Fund and Length of Time Served5	Principal Occupation(s) During Past 5 Years and Other Directorships Held
W. Douglas Beck, CFA6 (1967) President, 2011-present	Managing Director3, Deutsche Asset Management (2006-present); President of DWS family of funds and Head of Product Management, U.S. for DWS Investments; formerly, Executive Director, Head of

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

John Millette <sup>7</sup> (1962) Vice President and Secretary, 1999-present	Product Management (2002-2006) and President (2005-2006) of the UBS Funds at UBS Global Asset Management; Co-Head of Manager Research/Managed Solutions Group, Merrill Lynch (1998-2002) Director <sup>3</sup> , Deutsche Asset Management
Paul H. Schubert <sup>6</sup> (1963) Chief Financial Officer, 2004-present Treasurer, 2005-present	Managing Director <sup>3</sup> , Deutsche Asset Management (since July 2004); formerly, Executive Director, Head of Mutual Fund Services and Treasurer for UBS Family of Funds (1998-2004); Vice President and Director of Mutual Fund Finance at UBS Global Asset Management (1994-1998)
Caroline Pearson <sup>7</sup> (1962) Chief Legal Officer, 2010-present	Managing Director <sup>3</sup> , Deutsche Asset Management; formerly, Assistant Secretary for DWS family of funds (1997-2010)
Rita Rubin <sup>6</sup> (1970) Assistant Secretary, 2009-present	Director <sup>3</sup> and Senior Counsel, Deutsche Asset Management (since October 2007); formerly, Vice President, Morgan Stanley Investment Management (2004-2007)
Paul Antosca <sup>7</sup> (1957) Assistant Treasurer, 2007-present	Director <sup>3</sup> , Deutsche Asset Management (since 2006); Vice President, The Manufacturers Life Insurance Company (U.S.A.) (1990-2006)
Jack Clark <sup>7</sup> (1967) Assistant Treasurer, 2007-present	Director <sup>3</sup> , Deutsche Asset Management (since 2007); formerly, Vice President, State Street Corporation (2002-2007)
Diane Kenneally <sup>7</sup> (1966) Assistant Treasurer, 2007-present	Director <sup>3</sup> , Deutsche Asset Management
John Caruso <sup>6</sup> (1965) Anti-Money Laundering Compliance Officer, 2010-present	Managing Director <sup>3</sup> , Deutsche Asset Management
Robert Kloby <sup>6</sup> (1962) Chief Compliance Officer, 2006-present	Managing Director <sup>3</sup> , Deutsche Asset Management

1 The length of time served represents the year in which the Board Member joined the board of one or more DWS funds currently overseen by the Board.

2 A publicly held company with securities registered pursuant to Section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

3 Executive title, not a board directorship.

4 As a result of their respective positions held with the Advisor, these individuals are considered "interested persons" of the Advisor within the meaning of the 1940 Act. Interested persons receive no compensation from the fund.

5 The length of time served represents the year in which the officer was first elected in such capacity for one or more DWS funds.

6 Address: 60 Wall Street, New York, NY 10005.

7 Address: One Beacon Street, Boston, MA 02108.

Additional Information

Automated Information  
Line  
Web Site

DWS Investments Closed-End Fund Info Line  
(800) 349-4281  
[www.dws-investments.com](http://www.dws-investments.com)  
Obtain fact sheets, financial reports, press releases and webcasts when available.

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Written Correspondence	Deutsche Investment Management Americas Inc. 345 Park Avenue New York, NY 10154
Proxy Voting	The fund's policies and procedures for voting proxies for portfolio securities and information about how the fund voted proxies related to its portfolio securities during the 12-month period ended June 30 are available on our Web site — <a href="http://www.dws-investments.com">www.dws-investments.com</a> (click on "proxy voting" at the bottom of the page) — or on the SEC's Web site — <a href="http://www.sec.gov">www.sec.gov</a> . To obtain a written copy of the fund's policies and procedures without charge, upon request, call us toll free at (800) 621-1048.
Legal Counsel	Vedder Price P.C. 222 North LaSalle Street Chicago, IL 60601
Dividend Reinvestment Plan Agent	Computershare Inc. P.O. Box 43078 Providence, RI 02940-3078
Shareholder Service Agent and Transfer Agent	DWS Investments Service Company P.O. Box 219066 Kansas City, MO 64121-9066 (800) 294-4366
Custodian	State Street Bank and Trust Company Lafayette Corporate Center 2 Avenue De Lafayette Boston, MA 02111
Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm	Ernst & Young LLP 200 Clarendon Street Boston, MA 02116
NYSE Symbol	KTF

CUSIP Numbers	Common Shares	23338M 106
	Series A (Preferred Shares)	23338M 205
	Series B (Preferred Shares)	23338M 304
	Series C (Preferred Shares)	23338M 403
	Series D (Preferred Shares)	23338M 502
	Series E (Preferred Shares)	23338M 601

Notes

Notes

Notes

ITEM 2. CODE OF ETHICS

As of the end of the period covered by this report, the registrant has adopted a code of ethics, as defined in Item 2 of Form N-CSR, that applies to its Principal Executive Officer and Principal Financial Officer.

There have been no amendments to, or waivers from, a provision of the code of ethics during the period covered by this report that would require disclosure under Item 2.

A copy of the code of ethics is filed as an exhibit to this Form N-CSR.

ITEM 3. AUDIT COMMITTEE FINANCIAL EXPERT

The fund's audit committee is comprised solely of trustees who are "independent" (as such term has been defined by the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") in regulations implementing Section 407 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (the "Regulations")). The fund's Board of Trustees has determined that there are several "audit committee financial experts" (as such term has been defined by the Regulations) serving on the fund's audit committee including Mr. William McClayton, the chair of the fund's audit committee. An "audit committee financial expert" is not an "expert" for any purpose, including for purposes of Section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933 and the designation or identification of a person as an "audit committee financial expert" does not impose on such person any duties, obligations or liability that are greater than the duties, obligations and liability imposed on such person as a member of the audit committee and board of directors in the absence of such designation or identification. In accordance with New York Stock Exchange requirements, the Board believes that all members of the fund's audit committee are financially literate, as such qualification is interpreted by the Board in its business judgment, and that at least one member of the audit committee has accounting or related financial management expertise.

ITEM 4. PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTANT FEES AND SERVICES

DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST  
FORM N-CSR DISCLOSURE RE: AUDIT FEES

The following table shows the amount of fees that Ernst & Young LLP ("E&Y"), the Fund's Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm, billed to the Fund during the Fund's last two fiscal years. The Audit Committee approved in advance all audit services and non-audit services that E&Y provided to the Fund.

Services that the Fund's Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm Billed to the Fund

	Audit Fees Billed to Fund	Audit-Related Fees Billed to Fund	Tax Fees Billed to Fund	All Other Fees Billed to Fund
Fiscal Year Ended November 30, 2011	\$46,716	\$ 0	\$6,175	\$0
2010	\$53,953	\$ 0	\$10,466	\$0

The above “Tax Fees” were billed for professional services rendered for tax return preparation.

Services that the Fund’s Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm Billed to the Adviser and Affiliated Fund Service Providers

The following table shows the amount of fees billed by E&Y to Deutsche Investment Management Americas, Inc. (“DIMA” or the “Adviser”), and any entity controlling, controlled by or under common control with DIMA (“Control Affiliate”) that provides ongoing services to the Fund (“Affiliated Fund Service Provider”), for engagements directly related to the Fund’s operations and financial reporting, during the Fund’s last two fiscal years.

Fiscal Year Ended November 30,	Audit-Related Fees Billed to Adviser and Affiliated Fund Service Providers	Tax Fees	All Other Fees
		Billed to Adviser and Affiliated Fund Service Providers	Billed to Adviser and Affiliated Fund Service Providers
2011	\$ 0	\$285,550	\$0
2010	\$ 0	\$295,930	\$0

The above “Tax Fees” were billed in connection with tax compliance services and agreed upon procedures.

Non-Audit Services

The following table shows the amount of fees that E&Y billed during the Fund’s last two fiscal years for non-audit services. The Audit Committee pre-approved all non-audit services that E&Y provided to the Adviser and any Affiliated Fund Service Provider that related directly to the Fund’s operations and financial reporting. The Audit Committee requested and received information from E&Y about any non-audit services that E&Y rendered during the Fund’s last fiscal year to the Adviser and any Affiliated Fund Service Provider. The Committee considered this information in evaluating E&Y’s independence.

Fiscal Year Ended November 30,	Total Non-Audit Fees Billed to Fund (A)	Total Non-Audit Fees billed to Adviser and Affiliated Fund Service Providers (engagements related directly to the operations and financial reporting of the Fund) (B)	Total Non-Audit Fees billed to Adviser and Affiliated Fund Service Providers (all other engagements) (C)	Total of (A), (B) and (C)
		2011	\$6,175	
2010	\$10,466	\$ 295,930	\$ 645,807	\$952,203

All other engagement fees were billed for services in connection with agreed upon procedures and tax compliance for DIMA and other related entities that provide support for the operations of the Fund.

**Audit Committee Pre-Approval Policies and Procedures.** Generally, each Fund's Audit Committee must pre approve (i) all services to be performed for a Fund by a Fund's Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm and (ii) all non-audit services to be performed by a Fund's Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm for the DIMA Entities with respect to operations and financial reporting of the Fund, except that the Chairperson or Vice Chairperson of each Fund's Audit Committee may grant the pre-approval for non-audit services described in items (i) and (ii) above for non-prohibited services for engagements of less than \$100,000. All such delegated pre approvals shall be presented to each Fund's Audit Committee no later than the next Audit Committee meeting.

There were no amounts that were approved by the Audit Committee pursuant to the de minimis exception under Rule 2-01 of Regulation S-X.

According to the registrant's principal Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm, substantially all of the principal Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm's hours spent on auditing the registrant's financial statements were attributed to work performed by full-time permanent employees of the principal Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm.

\*\*\*

In connection with the audit of the 2010 and 2011 financial statements, the Fund entered into an engagement letter with E&Y. The terms of the engagement letter required by E&Y, and agreed to by the Audit Committee, include provisions in which the parties consent to the sole jurisdiction of federal courts in New York, Boston or the Northern District of Illinois, as well as a waiver of right to a trial by jury and an exclusion of punitive damages.

\*\*\*

E&Y advised the Fund's Audit Committee that E&Y had identified two matters that it determined to be inconsistent with the SEC's auditor independence rules.

First, E&Y advised the Fund's Audit Committee that, in 2010, an investment advisor for a Covered Person in the Chain of Command (both as defined by SEC rules) purchased for the Covered Person's account shares of a DWS Fund that is not audited by E&Y. E&Y informed the Audit Committee that this investment constituted an investment in an affiliate of an audit client in violation of the Rule 2-01(c)(1) of Regulation S-X. E&Y advised the Audit Committee that E&Y believes its independence has not been impacted as it relates to the audit of the Fund. In reaching this conclusion, E&Y noted a number of factors, including that the purchase was by the Covered Person's investment advisor, not by the Covered Person himself and the Covered Person caused the shares of the DWS Fund to be sold immediately upon detection of the purchase.

Second, E&Y advised the Fund's Audit Committee that, in 2010, a Covered Person in the same Office (as defined by SEC rules) as the lead audit engagement partner for the Fund became a trustee and executor to an estate whose assets included shares of a DWS Fund that is not audited by E&Y. E&Y informed the Audit Committee that this investment constituted an investment in an affiliate of an audit client in violation of the Rule 2-01(c)(1) of Regulation S-X. E&Y advised the Audit Committee that E&Y believes its independence has not been impacted as it relates to the audit of the Fund. In reaching this conclusion, E&Y noted a number of factors, including that the shares of the DWS Fund were already an asset of the estate when the Covered Person became executor, the Covered Person caused the shares of the DWS Fund to be sold immediately upon detection in the estate, and the Covered Person was not involved with the provision of audit services to the Fund.



ITEM 5. AUDIT COMMITTEE OF LISTED REGISTRANTS

The registrant has a separately-designated standing audit committee established in accordance with Section 3(a)(58)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. The registrant's audit committee consists of William McClayton (Chairman), Keith R. Fox, Kenneth C. Froewiss, Henry P. Becton, Jr., Richard J. Herring and William N. Searcy.

ITEM 6. SCHEDULE OF INVESTMENTS

Not applicable

ITEM 7. DISCLOSURE OF PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR CLOSED-END MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Proxy Voting and Guidelines

I. INTRODUCTION

Deutsche Asset Management (“AM”) has adopted and implemented the following policies and procedures, which it believes are reasonably designed to ensure that proxies are voted in the best economic interest of clients, in accordance with its fiduciary duties and local regulation. These Proxy Voting Policies, Procedures and Guidelines shall apply to all accounts managed by US domiciled advisers and to all US client accounts managed by non US regional offices. Non US regional offices are required to maintain procedures and to vote proxies as may be required by law on behalf of their non US clients. In addition, AM’s proxy policies reflect the fiduciary standards and responsibilities for ERISA accounts.

The attached guidelines represent a set of global recommendations that were determined by the Global Proxy Voting Sub-Committee (“the GPVSC”). These guidelines were developed to provide AM with a comprehensive list of recommendations that represent how AM will generally vote proxies for its clients. The recommendations derived from the application of these guidelines are not intended to influence the various AM legal entities either directly or indirectly by parent or affiliated companies. In addition, the organizational structures and documents of the various AM legal entities allows, where necessary or appropriate, the execution by individual AM subsidiaries of the proxy voting rights independently of any DB parent or affiliated company. This applies in particular to non U.S. fund management companies. The individuals that make proxy voting decisions are also free to act independently, subject to the normal and customary supervision by the management/boards of these AM legal entities.

II. AM’S PROXY VOTING RESPONSIBILITIES

Proxy votes are the property of AM’s advisory clients.<sup>1</sup> As such, AM’s authority and responsibility to vote such proxies depend upon its contractual relationships with its clients. AM has delegated responsibility for effecting its advisory clients’ proxy votes to Institutional Shareholder Services (“ISS”), an independent third-party proxy voting specialist. ISS votes AM’s advisory clients’ proxies in accordance with AM’s proxy guidelines or AM’s specific instructions. Where a client has given specific instructions as to how a proxy should be voted, AM will notify ISS to carry out those instructions. Where no specific instruction exists, AM will follow the procedures in voting the proxies set forth in this document. Certain Taft-Hartley clients may direct AM to have ISS vote their proxies in accordance with Taft Hartley voting Guidelines

Clients may in certain instances contract with their custodial agent and notify AM that they wish to engage in securities lending transactions. In such cases, it is the responsibility of the custodian to deduct the number of shares that are on loan so that they do not get voted twice.

### III. POLICIES

#### 1. Proxy voting activities are conducted in the best economic interest of clients

AM has adopted the following policies and procedures to ensure that proxies are voted in accordance with the best economic interest of its clients, as determined by AM in good faith after appropriate review.

#### 2. The Global Proxy Voting Sub-Committee

The Global Proxy Voting Sub-Committee (the “GPVSC”) is an internal working group established by the applicable AM’s Investment Risk Oversight Committee pursuant to a written charter. The GPVSC is responsible for overseeing AM’s proxy voting activities, including:

- (i) adopting, monitoring and updating guidelines, attached as Exhibit A (the “Guidelines”), that provide how AM will generally vote proxies pertaining to a comprehensive list of common proxy voting matters;
- (ii) voting proxies where (A) the issues are not covered by specific client instruction or the Guidelines; (B) the Guidelines specify that the issues are to be determined on a case-by-case basis; or (C) where an exception to the Guidelines may be in the best economic interest of AM’s clients; and
- (iii) monitoring the Proxy Vendor Oversight’s proxy voting activities (see below).

AM’s Proxy Vendor Oversight, a function of AM’s Operations Group, is responsible for coordinating with ISS to administer AM’s proxy voting process and for voting proxies in accordance with any specific client instructions or, if there are none, the Guidelines, and overseeing ISS’ proxy responsibilities in this regard.

#### 3. Availability of Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures and proxy voting record

Copies of these Policies and Procedures, as they may be updated from time to time, are made available to clients as required by law and otherwise at AM’s discretion. Clients may also obtain information on how their proxies were voted by AM as required by law and otherwise at AM’s discretion; however, AM must not selectively disclose its investment company clients’ proxy voting records. The Proxy Vendor Oversight will make proxy voting reports available to advisory clients upon request. The investment companies’ proxy voting records will be disclosed to shareholders by means of publicly-available annual filings of each company’s proxy voting record for 12-month periods ended June 30 (see “Recordkeeping” below), if so required by relevant law.

### IV. PROCEDURES

The key aspects of AM’s proxy voting process are as follows:

#### 1. The GPVSC’s Proxy Voting Guidelines

The Guidelines set forth the GPVSC’s standard voting positions on a comprehensive list of common proxy voting matters. The GPVSC has developed, and continues to update the Guidelines based on consideration of current corporate governance principles, industry standards, client feedback, and the impact of the matter on issuers and the value of the investments.

The GPVSC will review the Guidelines as necessary to support the best economic interests of AM's clients and, in any event, at least annually. The GPVSC will make changes to the Guidelines, whether as a result of the annual review or otherwise, taking solely into account the best economic interests of clients. Before changing the Guidelines, the GPVSC will thoroughly review and evaluate the proposed change and the reasons therefore, and the GPVSC Chair will ask GPVSC members whether anyone outside of the AM organization (but within Deutsche Bank and its affiliates) or any entity that identifies itself as a AM advisory client has requested or attempted to influence the proposed change and whether any member has a conflict of interest with respect to the proposed change. If any such matter is reported to the GPVSC Chair, the Chair will promptly notify the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee (see below) and will defer the approval, if possible. Lastly, the GPVSC will fully document its rationale for approving any change to the Guidelines.

The Guidelines may reflect a voting position that differs from the actual practices of the public company(ies) within the Deutsche Bank organization or of the investment companies for which AM or an affiliate serves as investment adviser or sponsor. Investment companies, particularly closed-end investment companies, are different from traditional operating companies. These differences may call for differences in voting positions on the same matter. Further, the manner in which AM votes investment company proxies may differ from proposals for which a AM-advised or sponsored investment company solicits proxies from its shareholders. As reflected in the Guidelines, proxies solicited by closed-end (and open-end) investment companies are generally voted in accordance with the pre-determined guidelines of ISS. See Section IV.3.B.

Funds ("Underlying Funds") in which Topiary Fund Management Fund of Funds (each, a "Fund") invest, may from time to time seek to revise their investment terms (i.e. liquidity, fees, etc.) or investment structure. In such event, the Underlying Funds may require approval/consent from its investors to effect the relevant changes. Topiary Fund Management has adopted Proxy Voting Procedures which outline the process for these approvals.

## 2. Specific proxy voting decisions made by the GPVSC

The Proxy Vendor Oversight will refer to the GPVSC all proxy proposals (i) that are not covered by specific client instructions or the Guidelines; or (ii) that, according to the Guidelines, should be evaluated and voted on a case-by-case basis.

Additionally, if, the Proxy Vendor Oversight, the GPVSC Chair or any member of the GPVSC, a portfolio manager, a research analyst or a sub-adviser believes that voting a particular proxy in accordance with the Guidelines may not be in the best economic interests of clients, that individual may bring the matter to the attention of the GPVSC Chair and/or the Proxy Vendor Oversight.<sup>2</sup>

If the Proxy Vendor Oversight refers a proxy proposal to the GPVSC or the GPVSC determines that voting a particular proxy in accordance with the Guidelines is not in the best economic interests of clients, the GPVSC will evaluate and vote the proxy, subject to the procedures below regarding conflicts.

The GPVSC endeavors to hold meetings to decide how to vote particular proxies sufficiently before the voting deadline so that the procedures below regarding conflicts can be completed before the GPVSC's voting determination.

## 3. Certain proxy votes may not be cast

In some cases, the GPVSC may determine that it is in the best economic interests of its clients not to vote certain proxies. If the conditions below are met with regard to a proxy proposal, AM will abstain from voting:

n Neither the Guidelines nor specific client instructions cover an issue;

n ISS does not make a recommendation on the issue;

n The GPVSC cannot convene on the proxy proposal at issue to make a determination as to what would be in the client's best interest. (This could happen, for example, if the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-committee found that there was a material conflict or if despite all best efforts being made, the GPVSC quorum requirement could not be met).

In addition, it is AM's policy not to vote proxies of issuers subject to laws of those jurisdictions that impose restrictions upon selling shares after proxies are voted, in order to preserve liquidity. In other cases, it may not be possible to vote certain proxies, despite good faith efforts to do so. For example, some jurisdictions do not provide adequate notice to shareholders so that proxies may be voted on a timely basis. Voting rights on securities that have been loaned to third-parties transfer to those third-parties, with loan termination often being the only way to attempt to vote proxies on the loaned securities. Lastly, the GPVSC may determine that the costs to the client(s) associated with voting a particular proxy or group of proxies outweighs the economic benefits expected from voting the proxy or group of proxies.

The Proxy Vendor Oversight will coordinate with the GPVSC Chair regarding any specific proxies and any categories of proxies that will not or cannot be voted. The reasons for not voting any proxy shall be documented.

#### 4. Conflict of Interest Procedures

##### A. Procedures to Address Conflicts of Interest and Improper Influence

Overriding Principle. In the limited circumstances where the GPVSC votes proxies,<sup>3</sup> the GPVSC will vote those proxies in accordance with what it, in good faith, determines to be the best economic interests of AM's clients.<sup>4</sup>

Independence of the GPVSC. As a matter of Compliance policy, the GPVSC and the Proxy Vendor Oversight are structured to be independent from other parts of Deutsche Bank. Members of the GPVSC and the employee responsible for Proxy Vendor Oversight are employees of AM. As such, they may not be subject to the supervision or control of any employees of Deutsche Bank Corporate and Investment Banking division ("CIB"). Their compensation cannot be based upon their contribution to any business activity outside of AM without prior approval of Legal and Compliance. They can have no contact with employees of Deutsche Bank outside of the Private Client and Asset Management division ("PCAM") regarding specific clients, business matters or initiatives without the prior approval of Legal and Compliance. They furthermore may not discuss proxy votes with any person outside of AM (and within AM only on a need to know basis).

Conflict Review Procedures. There will be a committee (the "Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee") established within AM that will monitor for potential material conflicts of interest in connection with proxy proposals that are to be evaluated by the GPVSC. Promptly upon a determination that a vote shall be presented to the GPVSC, the GPVSC Chair shall notify the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee. The Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee shall promptly collect and review any information deemed reasonably appropriate to evaluate, in its reasonable judgment, if AM or any person participating in the proxy voting process has, or has the appearance of, a material conflict of interest. For the purposes of this policy, a conflict of interest shall be considered "material" to the extent that a reasonable person could expect the conflict to influence, or appear to influence, the GPVSC's decision on the particular vote at issue. GPVSC should provide the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee a reasonable amount of time (no less than 24 hours) to perform all necessary and appropriate reviews. To the extent that a conflicts review can not be sufficiently completed by the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee the proxies will be voted in accordance with the standard guidelines.

The information considered by the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee may include without limitation information regarding (i) AM client relationships; (ii) any relevant personal conflict known by the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee or brought to the attention of that sub-committee; (iii) and any communications with

members of the GPVSC (or anyone participating or providing information to the GPVSC) and any person outside of the AM organization (but within Deutsche Bank and its affiliates) or any entity that identifies itself as a AM advisory client regarding the vote at issue. In the context of any determination, the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee may consult with, and shall be entitled to rely upon, all applicable outside experts, including legal counsel.

Upon completion of the investigation, the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee will document its findings and conclusions. If the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee determines that (i) AM has a material conflict of interest that would prevent it from deciding how to vote the proxies concerned without further client consent or (ii) certain individuals should be recused from participating in the proxy vote at issue, the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee will so inform the GPVSC chair.

If notified that AM has a material conflict of interest as described above, the GPVSC chair will obtain instructions as to how the proxies should be voted either from (i) if time permits, the effected clients, or (ii) in accordance with the standard guidelines. If notified that certain individuals should be recused from the proxy vote at issue, the GPVSC Chair shall do so in accordance with the procedures set forth below.

Note: Any AM employee who becomes aware of a potential, material conflict of interest in respect of any proxy vote to be made on behalf of clients shall notify Compliance. Compliance shall call a meeting of the conflict review committee to evaluate such conflict and determine a recommended course of action.

Procedures to be followed by the GPVSC. At the beginning of any discussion regarding how to vote any proxy, the GPVSC Chair (or his or her delegate) will inquire as to whether any GPVSC member (whether voting or ex officio) or any person participating in the proxy voting process has a personal conflict of interest or has actual knowledge of an actual or apparent conflict that has not been reported to the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee.

The GPVSC Chair also will inquire of these same parties whether they have actual knowledge regarding whether any director, officer or employee outside of the AM organization (but within Deutsche Bank and its affiliates) or any entity that identifies itself as a AM advisory client, has: (i) requested that AM, the Proxy Vendor Oversight (or any member thereof) or a GPVSC member vote a particular proxy in a certain manner; (ii) attempted to influence AM, the Proxy Vendor Oversight (or any member thereof), a GPVSC member or any other person in connection with proxy voting activities; or (iii) otherwise communicated with a GPVSC member or any other person participating or providing information to the GPVSC regarding the particular proxy vote at issue, and which incident has not yet been reported to the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee.

If any such incidents are reported to the GPVSC Chair, the Chair will promptly notify the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee and, if possible, will delay the vote until the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee can complete the conflicts report. If a delay is not possible, the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee will instruct the GPVSC whether anyone should be recused from the proxy voting process, or whether AM should vote the proxy in accordance with the standard guidelines, seek instructions as to how to vote the proxy at issue from ISS or, if time permits, the effected clients. These inquiries and discussions will be properly reflected in the GPVSC's minutes.

Duty to Report. Any AM employee, including any GPVSC member (whether voting or ex officio), that is aware of any actual or apparent conflict of interest relevant to, or any attempt by any person outside of the AM organization (but within Deutsche Bank and its affiliates) or any entity that identifies itself as a AM advisory client to influence, how AM votes its proxies has a duty to disclose the existence of the situation to the GPVSC Chair (or his or her designee) and the details of the matter to the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee. In the case of any person participating in the deliberations on a specific vote, such disclosure should be made before engaging in any activities or participating in any discussion pertaining to that vote.

**Recusal of Members.** The GPVSC will recuse from participating in a specific proxy vote any GPVSC members (whether voting or ex officio) and/or any other person who (i) are personally involved in a material conflict of interest; or (ii) who, as determined by the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee, have actual knowledge of a circumstance or fact that could effect their independent judgment, in respect of such vote. The GPVSC will also exclude from consideration the views of any person (whether requested or volunteered) if the GPVSC or any member thereof knows, or if the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee has determined, that such other person has a material conflict of interest with respect to the particular proxy, or has attempted to influence the vote in any manner prohibited by these policies.

If, after excluding all relevant GPVSC voting members pursuant to the paragraph above, there are three or more GPVSC voting members remaining, those remaining GPVSC members will determine how to vote the proxy in accordance with these Policies and Procedures. If there are fewer than three GPVSC voting members remaining, the GPVSC Chair will vote the proxy in accordance with the standard guidelines, will obtain instructions as to how to have the proxy voted from, if time permits, the effected clients and otherwise from ISS.

#### B. Investment Companies and Affiliated Public Companies

**Investment Companies.** As reflected in the Guidelines, all proxies solicited by open-end and closed-end investment companies are voted in accordance with the pre-determined guidelines of ISS, unless the investment company client directs AM to vote differently on a specific proxy or specific categories of proxies. However, regarding investment companies for which AM or an affiliate serves as investment adviser or principal underwriter, such proxies are voted in the same proportion as the vote of all other shareholders (i.e., “mirror” or “echo” voting). Master fund proxies solicited from feeder funds are voted in accordance with applicable provisions of Section 12 of the Investment Company Act of 1940.

Subject to participation agreements with certain Exchange Traded Funds (“ETF”) issuers that have received exemptive orders from the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission allowing investing DWS funds to exceed the limits set forth in Section 12(d)(1)(A) and (B) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, DeAM will echo vote proxies for ETFs in which Deutsche Bank holds more than 25% of outstanding voting shares globally when required to do so by participation agreements and SEC orders.

**Affiliated Public Companies.** For proxies solicited by non-investment company issuers of or within the Deutsche Bank organization, e.g., Deutsche bank itself, these proxies will be voted in the same proportion as the vote of other shareholders (i.e., “mirror” or “echo” voting).

**Note:** With respect to the Central Cash Management Fund (registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940), the Fund is not required to engage in echo voting and the investment adviser will use these Guidelines, and may determine, with respect to the Central Cash Management Fund, to vote contrary to the positions in the Guidelines, consistent with the Fund’s best interest.

#### C. Other Procedures That Limit Conflicts of Interest

AM and other entities in the Deutsche Bank organization have adopted a number of policies, procedures and internal controls that are designed to avoid various conflicts of interest, including those that may arise in connection with proxy voting, including:

n **Deutsche Bank Americas Restricted Activities Policy.** This policy provides for, among other things, independence of AM employees from CIB, and information barriers between AM and other affiliates. Specifically, no AM employee may be subject to the supervision or control of any employee of CIB. No AM employee shall have his or her compensation based upon his or her contribution to any business activity within the Bank outside of the business of AM, without the prior approval of Legal or Compliance. Further, no employee of CIB shall have any

input into the compensation of a AM employee without the prior approval of Legal or Compliance. Under the information barriers section of this policy, as a general rule, AM employees who are associated with the investment process should have no contact with employees of Deutsche Bank or its affiliates, outside of PCAM, regarding specific clients, business matters, or initiatives. Further, under no circumstances should proxy votes be discussed with any Deutsche Bank employee outside of AM (and should only be discussed on a need-to-know basis within AM).

Other relevant internal policies include the Deutsche Bank Americas Code of Professional Conduct, the Deutsche Asset Management Information Sharing Procedures, the Deutsche Asset Management Code of Ethics, the Sarbanes-Oxley Senior Officer Code of Ethics, and the Deutsche Bank Group Code of Conduct. The GPVSC expects that these policies, procedures and internal controls will greatly reduce the chance that the GPVSC (or, its members) would be involved in, aware of or influenced by, an actual or apparent conflict of interest.

## V. RECORDKEEPING

At a minimum, the following types of records must be properly maintained and readily accessible in order to evidence compliance with this policy.

- n AM will maintain a record of each vote cast by AM that includes among other things, company name, meeting date, proposals presented, vote cast and shares voted.
- n The Proxy Vendor Oversight maintains records for each of the proxy ballots it votes. Specifically, the records include, but are not limited to:
  - The proxy statement (and any additional solicitation materials) and relevant portions of annual statements.
  - Any additional information considered in the voting process that may be obtained from an issuing company, its agents or proxy research firms.
    - Analyst worksheets created for stock option plan and share increase analyses.
    - Proxy Edge print-screen of actual vote election.
- n AM will retain these Policies and Procedures and the Guidelines; will maintain records of client requests for proxy voting information; and will retain any documents the Proxy Vendor Oversight or the GPVSC prepared that were material to making a voting decision or that memorialized the basis for a proxy voting decision.
- n The GPVSC also will create and maintain appropriate records documenting its compliance with these Policies and Procedures, including records of its deliberations and decisions regarding conflicts of interest and their resolution.
- n With respect to AM's investment company clients, ISS will create and maintain records of each company's proxy voting record for 12-month periods ended June 30. AM will compile the following information for each matter relating to a portfolio security considered at any shareholder meeting held during the period covered by the report and with respect to which the company was entitled to vote:
  - The name of the issuer of the portfolio security;
  - The exchange ticker symbol of the portfolio security (if symbol is available through reasonably practicable means);
  - The Council on Uniform Securities Identification Procedures number for the portfolio security (if the number is available through reasonably practicable means);

- The shareholder meeting date;
- A brief identification of the matter voted on;
- Whether the matter was proposed by the issuer or by a security holder;
  - Whether the company cast its vote on the matter;
- How the company cast its vote (e.g., for or against proposal, or abstain; for or withhold regarding election of directors); and
  - Whether the company cast its vote for or against management.

Note: This list is intended to provide guidance only in terms of the records that must be maintained in accordance with this policy. In addition, please note that records must be maintained in accordance with the applicable AM Records Management Policy.

With respect to electronically stored records, “properly maintained” is defined as complete, authentic (unalterable) usable and backed-up. At a minimum, records should be retained for a period of not less than six years (or longer, if necessary to comply with applicable regulatory requirements), the first three years in an appropriate AM office.

## VI. THE GPVSC’S OVERSIGHT ROLE

In addition to adopting the Guidelines and making proxy voting decisions on matters referred to it as set forth above, the GPVSC will monitor the proxy voting process by reviewing summary proxy information presented by ISS. The GPVSC will use this review process to determine, among other things, whether any changes should be made to the Guidelines. This review will take place at least quarterly and will be documented in the GPVSC’s minutes.

---

1 For purposes of these Policies and Procedures, “clients” refers to persons or entities: for which AM serves as investment adviser or sub-adviser; for which AM votes proxies; and that have an economic or beneficial ownership interest in the portfolio securities of issuers soliciting such proxies.

2 The Proxy Vendor Oversight generally monitors upcoming proxy solicitations for heightened attention from the press or the industry and for novel or unusual proposals or circumstances, which may prompt the Proxy Vendor Oversight to bring the solicitation to the attention of the GPVSC Chair. AM portfolio managers, AM research analysts and sub-advisers also may bring a particular proxy vote to the attention of the GPVSC Chair, as a result of their ongoing monitoring of portfolio securities held by advisory clients and/or their review of the periodic proxy voting record reports that the GPVSC Chair distributes to AM portfolio managers and AM research analysts.

3 As mentioned above, the GPVSC votes proxies (i) where neither a specific client instruction nor a Guideline directs how the proxy should be voted, (ii) where the Guidelines specify that an issue is to be determined on a case by case basis or (iii) where voting in accordance with the Guidelines may not be in the best economic interests of clients.

4 The Proxy Vendor Oversight, who serves as the non-voting secretary of the GPVSC, may receive routine calls from proxy solicitors and other parties interested in a particular proxy vote. Any contact that attempts to exert improper pressure or influence shall be reported to the Conflicts of Interest Management Sub-Committee.



Attachment A – Global Proxy Voting Guidelines

Deutsche Asset Management

Global Proxy Voting Guidelines

As Amended October 2010

[GRAPHIC OMITTED]

Table of contents

- I Board Of Directors And Executives
  - A Election Of Directors
  - B Classified Boards Of Directors
  - C Board And Committee Independence
  - D Liability And Indemnification Of Directors
  - E Qualifications Of Directors
  - F Removal Of Directors And Filling Of Vacancies
  - G Proposals To Fix The Size Of The Board
  - H Proposals to Restrict Chief Executive Officer’s Service on Multiple Boards
  - I Proposals to Restrict Supervisory Board Members Service on Multiple Boards
  - J Proposals to Establish Audit Committees
- II Capital Structure
  - A Authorization Of Additional Shares
  - B Authorization Of “Blank Check” Preferred Stock
  - C Stock Splits/Reverse Stock Splits

D Dual Class/Supervoting Stock

E Large Block Issuance

F Recapitalization Into A Single Class Of Stock

G Share Repurchases

H Reductions In Par Value

III Corporate Governance Issues

A Confidential Voting

B Cumulative Voting

C Supermajority Voting Requirements

D Shareholder Right To Vote

IV Compensation

A Establishment of a Remuneration Committee

B Executive And Director Stock Option Plans

C Employee Stock Option/Purchase Plans

D Golden Parachutes

E Proposals To Limit Benefits Or Executive Compensation

F Option Expensing

G Management board election and motion

H Remuneration (variable pay)

I Long-term incentive plans

J Shareholder Proposals Concerning “Pay For Superior Performance”

K Executive Compensation Advisory

V Anti-Takeover Related Issues

A Shareholder Rights Plans (“Poison Pills”)

B Reincorporation

C Fair-Price Proposals

D Exemption From State Takeover Laws

E Non-Financial Effects Of Takeover Bids

VI Mergers & Acquisitions

VII Social & Political Issues

A Labor & Human Rights

B Diversity & Equality

C Health & Safety

D Government/Military

E Tobacco

F Principles for Responsible Investment (“PRI”)Environmental Issues

VIII Miscellaneous Items

A Ratification Of Auditors

B Limitation Of Non-Audit Services Provided By Independent Auditor

C Audit Firm Rotation

D Transaction Of Other Business

E Motions To Adjourn The Meeting

F Bundled Proposals

G Change Of Company Name

H Proposals Related To The Annual Meeting

I Reimbursement Of Expenses Incurred From Candidate Nomination

J Investment Company Proxies

K International Proxy Voting

These Guidelines may reflect a voting position that differs from the actual practices of the public company(ies) within the Deutsche Bank organization or of the investment companies for which AM or an affiliate serves as investment adviser or sponsor.

NOTE: Because of the unique structure and regulatory scheme applicable to closed-end investment companies, the voting guidelines (particularly those related to governance issues) generally will be inapplicable to holdings of closed-end investment companies. As a result, determinations on the appropriate voting recommendation for closed-end investment company shares will be made on a case-by-case basis.

I. Board of Directors and Executives

A. Election of Directors

Routine: AM Policy is to vote “for” the uncontested election of directors. Votes for a director in an uncontested election will be withheld in cases where a director has shown an inability to perform his/her duties in the best interests of the shareholders.

Proxy contest: In a proxy contest involving election of directors, a case-by-case voting decision will be made based upon analysis of the issues involved and the merits of the incumbent and dissident slates of directors. AM will incorporate the decisions of a third party proxy research vendor, currently, Institutional Shareholder Services (“ISS”) subject to review by the Proxy Voting Sub-Committee (GPVSC) as set forth in the AM’s Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures.

Rationale: The large majority of corporate directors fulfill their fiduciary obligation and in most cases support for management’s nominees is warranted. As the issues relevant to a contested election differ in each instance, those cases must be addressed as they arise.

B. Classified Boards of Directors

AM policy is to vote against proposals to classify the board and for proposals to repeal classified boards and elect directors annually.

Rationale: Directors should be held accountable on an annual basis. By entrenching the incumbent board, a classified board may be used as an anti-takeover device to the detriment of the shareholders in a hostile take-over situation.

C. Board and Committee Independence

AM policy is to vote:

1. “For” proposals that require that a certain percentage (majority up to 66 2/3%) of members of a board of directors be comprised of independent or unaffiliated directors.
2. “For” proposals that require all members of a company's compensation, audit, nominating, or other similar committees be comprised of independent or unaffiliated directors.
3. “Against” shareholder proposals to require the addition of special interest, or constituency, representatives to boards of directors.
4. “For” separation of the Chairman and CEO positions.
5. “Against” proposals that require a company to appoint a Chairman who is an independent director.

Rationale: Board independence is a cornerstone of effective governance and accountability. A board that is sufficiently independent from management assures that shareholders' interests are adequately represented. However, the Chairman of the board must have sufficient involvement in and experience with the operations of the company to

perform the functions required of that position and lead the company.

No director qualifies as 'independent' unless the board of directors affirmatively determines that the director has no material relationship with the listed company (either directly or as a partner, shareholder or officer of an organization that has a relationship with the company).

Whether a director is in fact not "independent" will depend on the laws and regulations of the primary market for the security and the exchanges, if any, on which the security trades.

#### D. Liability and Indemnification of Directors

AM policy is to vote “for” management proposals to limit directors' liability and to broaden the indemnification of directors, unless broader indemnification or limitations on directors' liability would effect shareholders' interests in pending litigation.

Rationale: While shareholders want directors and officers to be responsible for their actions, it is not in the best interests of the shareholders for them to be to risk averse. If the risk of personal liability is too great, companies may not be able to find capable directors willing to serve. We support expanding coverage only for actions taken in good faith and not for serious violations of fiduciary obligation or negligence.

#### E. Qualifications of Directors

AM policy is to follow management’s recommended vote on either management or shareholder proposals that set retirement ages for directors or require specific levels of stock ownership by directors.

Rationale: As a general rule, the board of directors, and not the shareholders, is most qualified to establish qualification policies.

#### F. Removal of Directors and Filling of Vacancies

AM policy is to vote “against” proposals that include provisions that directors may be removed only for cause or proposals that include provisions that only continuing directors may fill board vacancies.

Rationale: Differing state statutes permit removal of directors with or without cause. Removal of directors for cause usually requires proof of self-dealing, fraud or misappropriation of corporate assets, limiting shareholders' ability to remove directors except under extreme circumstances. Removal without cause requires no such showing.

Allowing only incumbent directors to fill vacancies can serve as an anti-takeover device, precluding shareholders from filling the board until the next regular election.

#### G. Proposals to Fix the Size of the Board

AM policy is to vote:

1. “For” proposals to fix the size of the board unless: (a) no specific reason for the proposed change is given; or (b) the proposal is part of a package of takeover defenses.
2. “Against” proposals allowing management to fix the size of the board without shareholder approval.

Rationale: Absent danger of anti-takeover use, companies should be granted a reasonable amount of flexibility in fixing the size of its board.

H. Proposals to Restrict Chief Executive Officer's Service on Multiple Boards

AM policy is to vote "For" proposals to restrict a Chief Executive Officer from serving on more than three outside boards of directors.

Rationale: Chief Executive Officer must have sufficient time to ensure that shareholders' interests are represented adequately.

Note: A director's service on multiple closed-end fund boards within a fund complex are treated as service on a single Board for the purpose of the proxy voting guidelines.

I. Proposals to Restrict Supervisory Board Members Service on Multiple Boards (For FFT Securities)

AM policy is to vote "for" proposals to restrict a Supervisory Board Member from serving on more than five supervisory boards.

Rationale: We consider a strong, independent and knowledgeable supervisory board as important counter-balance to executive management to ensure that the interests of shareholders are fully reflected by the company.

Full information should be disclosed in the annual reports and accounts to allow all shareholders to judge the success of the supervisory board controlling their company.

Supervisory Board Member must have sufficient time to ensure that shareholders' interests are represented adequately.

Note: A director's service on multiple closed-end fund boards within a fund complex are treated as service on a single Board for the purpose of the proxy voting guidelines.

J. Proposals to Establish Audit Committees (For FFT and U.S. Securities)

AM policy is to vote "for" proposals that require the establishment of audit committees.

Rationale: The audit committee should deal with accounting and risk management related questions, verifies the independence of the auditor with due regard to possible conflicts of interest. It also should determine the procedure of the audit process.

II. Capital Structure

A. Authorization of Additional Shares (For U.S. Securities)

AM policy is to vote "for" proposals to increase the authorization of existing classes of stock that do not exceed a 3:1 ratio of shares authorized to shares outstanding for a large cap company, and do not exceed a 4:1 ratio of shares authorized to shares outstanding for a small-midcap company (companies having a market capitalization under one billion U.S. dollars.).

Rationale: While companies need an adequate number of shares in order to carry on business, increases requested for general financial flexibility must be limited to protect shareholders from their potential use as an anti-takeover device. Requested increases for specifically designated, reasonable business purposes (stock split, merger, etc.) will be considered in light of those purposes and the number of shares required.

B. Authorization of "Blank Check" Preferred Stock (For U.S. Securities)

AM policy is to vote:

1. “Against” proposals to create blank check preferred stock or to increase the number of authorized shares of blank check preferred stock unless the company expressly states that the stock will not be used for anti-takeover purposes and will not be issued without shareholder approval.
2. “For” proposals mandating shareholder approval of blank check stock placement.

Rationale: Shareholders should be permitted to monitor the issuance of classes of preferred stock in which the board of directors is given unfettered discretion to set voting, dividend, conversion and other rights for the shares issued.

C. Stock Splits/Reverse Stock Splits

AM policy is to vote “for” stock splits if a legitimate business purpose is set forth and the split is in the shareholders' best interests. A vote is cast “for” a reverse stock split only if the number of shares authorized is reduced in the same proportion as the reverse split or if the effective increase in authorized shares (relative to outstanding shares) complies with the proxy guidelines for common stock increases (see, Section II.A, above.)

Rationale: Generally, stock splits do not detrimentally effect shareholders. Reverse stock splits, however, may have the same result as an increase in authorized shares and should be analyzed accordingly.

D. Dual Class/Supervoting Stock

AM policy is to vote “against” proposals to create or authorize additional shares of super-voting stock or stock with unequal voting rights.

Rationale: The “one share, one vote” principal ensures that no shareholder maintains a voting interest exceeding their equity interest in the company.

E. Large Block Issuance (For U.S. Securities)

AM policy is to address large block issuances of stock on a case-by-case basis, incorporating the recommendation of an independent third party proxy research firm (currently ISS) subject to review by the GPVSC as set forth in AM's Proxy Policies and Procedures.

Additionally, AM supports proposals requiring shareholder approval of large block issuances.

Rationale: Stock issuances must be reviewed in light of the business circumstances leading to the request and the potential impact on shareholder value.

F. Recapitalization into a Single Class of Stock

AM policy is to vote “for” recapitalization plans to provide for a single class of common stock, provided the terms are fair, with no class of stock being unduly disadvantaged.

Rationale: Consolidation of multiple classes of stock is a business decision that may be left to the board and management if there is no adverse effect on shareholders.

G. Share Repurchases

AM policy is to vote “for” share repurchase plans provided all shareholders are able to participate on equal terms.

Rationale: Buybacks are generally considered beneficial to shareholders because they tend to increase returns to the remaining shareholders.

#### H. Reductions in Par Value

AM policy is to vote “for” proposals to reduce par value, provided a legitimate business purpose is stated (e.g., the reduction of corporate tax responsibility.)

Rationale: Usually, adjustments to par value are a routine financial decision with no substantial impact on shareholders.

### III. Corporate Governance Issues

#### A. Confidential Voting

AM policy is to vote “for” proposals to provide for confidential voting and independent tabulation of voting results and to vote “against” proposals to repeal such provisions.

Rationale: Confidential voting protects the privacy rights of all shareholders. This is particularly important for employee-shareholders or shareholders with business or other affiliations with the company, who may be vulnerable to coercion or retaliation when opposing management. Confidential voting does not interfere with the ability of corporations to communicate with all shareholders, nor does it prohibit shareholders from making their views known directly to management.

#### B. Cumulative Voting (For U.S. Securities)

AM policy is to vote “against” shareholder proposals requesting cumulative voting and “for” management proposals to eliminate it. The protections afforded shareholders by cumulative voting are not necessary when a company has a history of good performance and does not have a concentrated ownership interest. Accordingly, a vote is cast “against” cumulative voting and “for” proposals to eliminate it if:

- a) The company has a five year return on investment greater than the relevant industry index,
- b) All directors and executive officers as a group beneficially own less than 10% of the outstanding stock, and
- c) No shareholder (or voting block) beneficially owns 15% or more of the company.

Thus, failure of any one of the three criteria results in a vote for cumulative voting in accordance with the general policy.

Rationale: Cumulative voting is a tool that should be used to ensure that holders of a significant number of shares may have board representation; however, the presence of other safeguards may make their use unnecessary.

#### C. Supermajority Voting Requirements

AM policy is to vote “against” management proposals to require a supermajority vote to amend the charter or bylaws and to vote “for” shareholder proposals to modify or rescind existing supermajority requirements.



\*Exception made when company holds a controlling position and seeks to lower threshold to maintain control and/or make changes to corporate by-laws.

Rationale: Supermajority voting provisions violate the democratic principle that a simple majority should carry the vote. Setting supermajority requirements may make it difficult or impossible for shareholders to remove egregious by-law or charter provisions. Occasionally, a company with a significant insider held position might attempt to lower a supermajority threshold to make it easier for management to approve provisions that may be detrimental to shareholders. In that case, it may not be in the shareholders interests to lower the supermajority provision.

#### D. Shareholder Right to Vote

AM policy is to vote “against” proposals that restrict the right of shareholders to call special meetings, amend the bylaws, or act by written consent. Policy is to vote “for” proposals that remove such restrictions.

Rationale: Any reasonable means whereby shareholders can make their views known to management or effect the governance process should be supported.

#### IV. Compensation

Annual Incentive Plans or Bonus Plans are often submitted to shareholders for approval. These plans typically award cash to executives based on company performance. Deutsche Bank believes that the responsibility for executive compensation decisions rest with the board of directors and/or the compensation committee, and its policy is not to second-guess the board’s award of cash compensation amounts to executives unless a particular award or series of awards is deemed excessive. If stock options are awarded as part of these bonus or incentive plans, the provisions must meet Deutsche Bank’s criteria regarding stock option plans, or similar stock-based incentive compensation schemes, as set forth below.

##### A. Establishment of a Remuneration Committee (For FFT Securities)

AM policy is to vote “for” proposals that require the establishment of a remuneration committee.

Rationale: Corporations should disclose in each annual report or proxy statement their policies on remuneration. Essential details regarding executive remuneration including share options, long-term incentive plans and bonuses, should be disclosed in the annual report, so that investors can judge whether corporate pay policies and practices meet the standard.

The remuneration committee shall not comprise any board members and should be sensitive to the wider scene on executive pay. It should ensure that performance-based elements of executive pay are designed to align the interests of shareholders.

##### B. Executive and Director Stock Option Plans

AM policy is to vote “for” stock option plans that meet the following criteria:

- (1) The resulting dilution of existing shares is less than (a) 15 percent of outstanding shares for large capital corporations or (b) 20 percent of outstanding shares for small-mid capital companies (companies having a market capitalization under one billion U.S. dollars.)
- (2) The transfer of equity resulting from granting options at less than FMV is no greater than 3% of the over-all market capitalization of large capital corporations, or 5% of market cap for small-mid capital companies.

(3) The plan does not contain express repricing provisions and, in the absence of an express statement that options will not be repriced; the company does not have a history of repricing options.

(4) The plan does not grant options on super-voting stock.

AM will support performance-based option proposals as long as a) they do not mandate that all options granted by the company must be performance based, and b) only certain high-level executives are subject to receive the performance based options.

AM will support proposals to eliminate the payment of outside director pensions.

Rationale: Determining the cost to the company and to shareholders of stock-based incentive plans raises significant issues not encountered with cash-based compensation plans. These include the potential dilution of existing shareholders' voting power, the transfer of equity out of the company resulting from the grant and execution of options at less than FMV and the authority to reprice or replace underwater options. Our stock option plan analysis model seeks to allow reasonable levels of flexibility for a company yet still protect shareholders from the negative impact of excessive stock compensation. Acknowledging that small mid-capital corporations often rely more heavily on stock option plans as their main source of executive compensation and may not be able to compete with their large capital competitors with cash compensation, we provide slightly more flexibility for those companies.

#### C. Employee Stock Option/Purchase Plans

AM policy is to vote for employee stock purchase plans (ESPP's) when the plan complies with Internal Revenue Code 423, allowing non-management employees to purchase stock at 85% of FMV.

AM policy is to vote "for" employee stock option plans (ESOPs) provided they meet the standards for stock option plans in general. However, when computing dilution and transfer of equity, ESOPs are considered independently from executive and director option plans.

Rationale: ESOPs and ESPP's encourage rank-and-file employees to acquire an ownership stake in the companies they work for and have been shown to promote employee loyalty and improve productivity.

#### D. Golden Parachutes

AM policy is to vote "for" proposals to require shareholder approval of golden parachutes and for proposals that would limit golden parachutes to no more than three times base compensation. Policy is to vote "against" more restrictive shareholder proposals to limit golden parachutes.

Rationale: In setting a reasonable limitation, AM considers that an effective parachute should be less attractive than continued employment and that the IRS has opined that amounts greater than three times annual salary, are excessive.

#### E. Proposals to Limit Benefits or Executive Compensation

AM policy is to vote "against"

1. Proposals to limit benefits, pensions or compensation and

2. Proposals that request or require disclosure of executive compensation greater than the disclosure required by Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) regulations.

Rationale: Levels of compensation and benefits are generally considered to be day-to-day operations of the company, and are best left unrestricted by arbitrary limitations proposed by shareholders.

F. Option Expensing

AM policy is to support proposals requesting companies to expense stock options.

Rationale: Although companies can choose to expense options voluntarily, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) does not yet require it, instead allowing companies to disclose the theoretical value of options as a footnote. Because the expensing of stock options lowers earnings, most companies elect not to do so. Given the fact that options have become an integral component of compensation and their exercise results in a transfer of shareholder value, AM agrees that their value should not be ignored and treated as “no cost” compensation. The expensing of stock options would promote more modest and appropriate use of stock options in executive compensation plans and present a more accurate picture of company operational earnings.

G. Management board election and motion (For FFT Securities)

AM policy is to vote “against”:

- the election of board members with positions on either remuneration or audit committees;
- the election of supervisory board members with too many supervisory board mandates;
  - “automatic” election of former board members into the supervisory board.

Rationale: Management as an entity, and each of its members, are responsible for all actions of the company, and are - subject to applicable laws and regulations - accountable to the shareholders as a whole for their actions.

Sufficient information should be disclosed in the annual company report and account to allow shareholders to judge the success of the company.

H. Remuneration (variable pay): (For FFT Securities)

Executive remuneration for Management Board

AM policy is to vote “for” remuneration for Management Board that is transparent and linked to results.

Rationale: Executive compensation should motivate management and align the interests of management with the shareholders. The focus should be on criteria that prevent excessive remuneration; but enable the company to hire and retain first-class professionals.

Shareholder interests are normally best served when management is remunerated to optimize long-term returns. Criteria should include suitable measurements like return on capital employed or economic value added.

Interests should generally also be correctly aligned when management own shares in the company – even more so if these shares represent a substantial portion of their own wealth.

Its disclosure shall differentiate between fixed pay, variable (performance related) pay and long-term incentives, including stock option plans with valuation ranges as well as pension and any other significant arrangements.

Executive remuneration for Supervisory Board

AM policy is to vote “for” remuneration for Supervisory Board that is at least 50% in fixed form.

Rationale: It would normally be preferable if performance linked compensation were not based on dividend payments, but linked to suitable result based parameters. Consulting and procurement services should also be published in the company report.

I. Long-term incentive plans (For FFT Securities)

AM policy is to vote “for” long-term incentive plans for members of a management board that reward for above average company performance.

Rationale: Incentive plans will normally be supported if they:

- directly align the interests of members of management boards with those of shareholders;
- establish challenging performance criteria to reward only above average performance;
- measure performance by total shareholder return in relation to the market or a range of comparable companies;
- are long-term in nature and encourage long-term ownership of the shares once exercised through minimum holding periods;
  - do not allow a repricing of the exercise price in stock option plans.

J. Shareholder Proposals Concerning “Pay for Superior Performance”

AM policy is to address pay for superior performance proposals on a case-by-case basis, incorporating the recommendation of an independent third party proxy research firm (currently ISS) subject to review by the GPVSC as set forth in AM’s Proxy Policies and Procedures.

Rationale: While AM agrees that compensation issues are better left to the discretion of management, they appreciate the need to monitor for excessive compensation practices on a case by case basis. If, after a review of the ISS metrics, AM is comfortable with ISS’s applying this calculation and will vote according to their recommendation.

K. Executive Compensation Advisory

AM policy is to follow management’s recommended vote on shareholder proposals to propose an advisory resolution seeking to ratify the compensation of the company’s named executive officers (NEOs) on an annual basis.

Rationale: AM believes that controls exist within senior management and corporate compensation committees, ensuring fair compensation to executives. This might allow shareholders to require approval for all levels of management’s compensation.

V. Anti-Takeover Related Issues

A. Shareholder Rights Plans (“Poison Pills”)

AM policy is to vote “for” proposals to require shareholder ratification of poison pills or that request boards to redeem poison pills, and to vote “against” the adoption of poison pills if they are submitted for shareholder ratification.

Rationale: Poison pills are the most prevalent form of corporate takeover defenses and can be (and usually are) adopted without shareholder review or consent. The potential cost of poison pills to shareholders during an attempted takeover outweighs the benefits.

B. Reincorporation

AM policy is to examine reincorporation proposals on a case-by-case basis. The voting decision is based on: (1) differences in state law between the existing state of incorporation and the proposed state of incorporation; and (2) differences between the existing and the proposed charter/bylaws/articles of incorporation and their effect on shareholder rights. If changes resulting from the proposed reincorporation violate the corporate governance principles set forth in these guidelines, the reincorporation will be deemed contrary to shareholder's interests and a vote cast "against."

Rationale: Reincorporations can be properly analyzed only by looking at the advantages and disadvantages to their shareholders. Care must be taken that anti-takeover protection is not the sole or primary result of a proposed change.

#### C. Fair-Price Proposals

AM policy is to vote "for" management fair-price proposals, provided that: (1) the proposal applies only to two-tier offers; (2) the proposal sets an objective fair-price test based on the highest price that the acquirer has paid for a company's shares; (3) the supermajority requirement for bids that fail the fair-price test is no higher than two-thirds of the outstanding shares; (4) the proposal contains no other anti-takeover provisions or provisions that restrict shareholders rights.

A vote is cast for shareholder proposals that would modify or repeal existing fair-price requirements that do not meet these standards.

Rationale: While fair price provisions may be used as anti-takeover devices, if adequate provisions are included, they provide some protection to shareholders who have some say in their application and the ability to reject those protections if desired.

#### D. Exemption from state takeover laws

AM policy is to vote "for" shareholder proposals to opt out of state takeover laws and to vote "against" management proposals requesting to opt out of state takeover laws.

Rationale: Control share statutes, enacted at the state level, may harm long-term share value by entrenching management. They also unfairly deny certain shares their inherent voting rights.

#### E. Non-financial Effects of Takeover Bids

Policy is to vote "against" shareholder proposals to require consideration of non-financial effects of merger or acquisition proposals.

Rationale: Non-financial effects may often be subjective and are secondary to AM's stated purpose of acting in its client's best economic interest.

#### VI. Mergers & Acquisitions

Evaluation of mergers, acquisitions and other special corporate transactions (i.e., takeovers, spin-offs, sales of assets, reorganizations, restructurings and recapitalizations) are performed on a case-by-case basis incorporating information from an independent proxy research source (currently ISS.) Additional resources including portfolio management and research analysts may be considered as set forth in AM's Policies and Procedures.

#### VII. Social, Environmental & Political Issues

Social and environmental issues are becoming increasingly important to corporate success. We incorporate social and environmental considerations into both our investment decisions and our proxy voting decisions – particularly if the financial performance of the company could be impacted. In addition, AM has incorporated the Principles for Responsible Investment (PRI) in these Proxy Voting Guidelines.

A. Labor & Human Rights

AM policy is to vote “against” adopting global codes of conduct or workplace standards exceeding those mandated by law.

Rationale: Additional requirements beyond those mandated by law are deemed unnecessary and potentially burdensome to companies

B. Diversity & Equality

1. AM policy is to vote “against” shareholder proposals to force equal employment opportunity, affirmative action or board diversity.

Rationale: Compliance with State and Federal legislation along with information made available through filings with the EEOC provides sufficient assurance that companies act responsibly and make information public.

2. AM policy is also to vote “against” proposals to adopt the Mac Bride Principles. The Mac Bride Principles promote fair employment, specifically regarding religious discrimination.

Rationale: Compliance with the Fair Employment Act of 1989 makes adoption of the Mac Bride Principles redundant. Their adoption could potentially lead to charges of reverse discrimination.

C. Health & Safety

1. AM policy is to vote “against” adopting a pharmaceutical price restraint policy or reporting pricing policy changes.

Rationale: Pricing is an integral part of business for pharmaceutical companies and should not be dictated by shareholders (particularly pursuant to an arbitrary formula.) Disclosing pricing policies may also jeopardize a company’s competitive position in the marketplace.

2. AM policy is to vote “against” shareholder proposals to control the use or labeling of and reporting on genetically engineered products.

Rationale: Additional requirements beyond those mandated by law are deemed unnecessary and potentially burdensome to companies.

D. Government/Military

1. AM policy is to vote against shareholder proposals regarding the production or sale of military arms or nuclear or space-based weapons, including proposals seeking to dictate a company's interaction with a particular foreign country or agency.

Rationale: Generally, management is in a better position to determine what products or industries a company can and should participate in. Regulation of the production or distribution of military supplies is, or should be, a matter of government policy.

2. AM policy is to vote “against” shareholder proposals regarding political contributions and donations.

Rationale: The Board of Directors and Management, not shareholders, should evaluate and determine the recipients of any contributions made by the company.

3. AM policy is to vote “against” shareholder proposals regarding charitable contributions and donations.

Rationale: The Board of Directors and Management, not shareholders, should evaluate and determine the recipients of any contributions made by the company.

#### E. Tobacco

1. AM policy is to vote “against” shareholder proposals requesting additional standards or reporting requirements for tobacco companies as well as “against” requesting companies to report on the intentional manipulation of nicotine content.

Rationale: Where a tobacco company’s actions meet the requirements of legal and industry standards, imposing additional burdens may detrimentally effect a company’s ability to compete. The disclosure of nicotine content information could affect the company’s rights in any pending or future litigation.

2. Shareholder requests to spin-off or restructure tobacco businesses will be opposed.

Rationale: These decisions are more appropriately left to the Board and management, and not to shareholder mandate.

#### F. Principles for Responsible Investment

AM policy is to engage actively with companies on ESG issues and participate in collaborative engagement initiatives. In this context, AM is willing to participate in the development of policy, regulation and standard setting (such as promoting and protecting shareholder rights). AM could support shareholder initiatives and also file shareholder resolutions with long term ESG considerations and improved ESG disclosure, when applicable. In addition, AM could ask for standardized ESG reporting and issues to be integrated within annual financial reports.

#### G. Environmental Issues

AM policy is to vote “for” increased disclosure on CERES Principles, ESG issues or other similar environmental mandates (e.g., those relating to Greenhouse gas emissions or the use of nuclear power) and to follow management’s recommended vote on all other matters related to the above issues.

Rationale: Environmental issues are extensively regulated by outside agencies and compliance with additional requirements often involves significant cost to companies.

#### VIII. Miscellaneous Items

##### A. Ratification of Auditors

AM policy is to vote “for” a) the management recommended selection of auditors and b) proposals to require shareholder approval of auditors.

Rationale: Absent evidence that auditors have not performed their duties adequately, support for management’s nomination is warranted.

B. Limitation of non-audit services provided by independent auditor

AM policy is to support proposals limiting non-audit fees to 50% of the aggregate annual fees earned by the firm retained as a company's independent auditor.

Rationale: In the wake of financial reporting problems and alleged audit failures at a number of companies, AM supports the general principle that companies should retain separate firms for audit and consulting services to avoid potential conflicts of interest. However, given the protections afforded by the recently enacted Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (which requires Audit Committee pre-approval for non-audit services and prohibits auditors from providing specific types of services), and the fact that some non-audit services are legitimate audit-related services, complete separation of audit and consulting fees may not be warranted. A reasonable limitation is appropriate to help ensure auditor independence and it is reasonable to expect that audit fees exceed non-audit fees.

C. Audit firm rotation

AM policy is to support proposals seeking audit firm rotation unless the rotation period sought is less than five years.

Rationale: While the Sarbanes-Oxley Act mandates that the lead audit partner be switched every five years, AM believes that rotation of the actual audit firm would provide an even stronger system of checks and balances on the audit function.

D. Transaction of Other Business

AM policy is to vote against "transaction of other business" proposals.

Rationale: This is a routine item to allow shareholders to raise other issues and discuss them at the meeting. As the nature of these issues may not be disclosed prior to the meeting, we recommend a vote against these proposals. This protects shareholders voting by proxy (and not physically present at a meeting) from having action taken at the meeting that they did not receive proper notification of or sufficient opportunity to consider.

E. Motions to Adjourn the Meeting

AM Policy is to vote against proposals to adjourn the meeting.

Rationale: Management may seek authority to adjourn the meeting if a favorable outcome is not secured. Shareholders should already have had enough information to make a decision. Once votes have been cast, there is no justification for management to continue spending time and money to press shareholders for support.

F. Bundled Proposals

AM policy is to vote against bundled proposals if any bundled issue would require a vote against it if proposed individually.

Rationale: Shareholders should not be forced to "take the good with the bad" in cases where the proposals could reasonably have been submitted separately.

G. Change of Company Name

AM policy is to support management on proposals to change the company name.

Rationale: This is generally considered a business decision for a company.



H. Proposals Related to the Annual Meeting

AM Policy is to vote in favor of management for proposals related to the conduct of the annual meeting (meeting time, place, etc.)

Rationale: These are considered routine administrative proposals.

I. Reimbursement of Expenses Incurred from Candidate Nomination

AM policy is to follow management's recommended vote on shareholder proposals related to the amending of company bylaws to provide for the reimbursement of reasonable expenses incurred in connection with nominating one or more candidates in a contested election of directors to the corporation's board of directors.

Rationale: Corporations should not be liable for costs associated with shareholder proposals for directors.

J. Investment Company Proxies

Proxies solicited by investment companies are voted in accordance with the recommendations of an independent third party, currently ISS. However, regarding investment companies for which AM or an affiliate serves as investment adviser or principal underwriter, such proxies are voted in the same proportion as the vote of all other shareholders. Proxies solicited by master funds from feeder funds will be voted in accordance with applicable provisions of Section 12 of the Investment Company Act of 1940.

Investment companies, particularly closed-end investment companies, are different from traditional operating companies. These differences may call for differences in voting positions on the same matter. For example, AM could vote "for" staggered boards of closed-end investment companies, although AM generally votes "against" staggered boards for operating companies. Further, the manner in which AM votes investment company proxies may differ from proposals for which a AM-advised investment company solicits proxies from its shareholders. As reflected in the Guidelines, proxies solicited by closed-end (and open-end) investment companies are voted in accordance with the pre-determined guidelines of an independent third-party.

Subject to participation agreements with certain Exchange Traded Funds ("ETF") issuers that have received exemptive orders from the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission allowing investing DWS funds to exceed the limits set forth in Section 12(d)(1)(A) and (B) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, DeAM will echo vote proxies for ETFs in which Deutsche Bank holds more than 25% of outstanding voting shares globally when required to do so by participation agreements and SEC orders.

Note: With respect to the Central Cash Management Fund (registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940), the Fund is not required to engage in echo voting and the investment adviser will use these Guidelines, and may determine, with respect to the Central Cash Management Fund, to vote contrary to the positions in the Guidelines, consistent with the Fund's best interest.

K. International Proxy Voting

The above guidelines pertain to issuers organized in the United States, Canada and Germany. Proxies solicited by other issuers are voted in accordance with international guidelines or the recommendation of ISS and in accordance with applicable law and regulation.

ITEM 8.

PORTFOLIO MANAGERS OF CLOSED-END MANAGEMENT  
INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Portfolio Manager Disclosure

The Fund is managed by a Team of investment professionals who collaborate to develop and implement the Fund's investment strategy. Each Portfolio Manager on the Team has authority over all aspects of the Fund's investment portfolio, including but not limited to, purchases and sales of individual securities, portfolio construction techniques, portfolio risk assessment, and the management of daily cash flows in accordance with portfolio holdings.

The following individuals handle the day-to-day management of the Fund.

Philip G. Condon, Managing Director of Deutsche Asset Management and Co-Lead Portfolio Manager of the Fund.

- Head of US Retail Fixed Income Funds.
- Joined Deutsche Asset Management in 1983 and the Fund in 1998.
- Over 35 years of investment industry experience.
  - BA and MBA, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Michael J. Generazo, Director of Deutsche Asset Management and Co-Lead Portfolio Manager of the Fund.

- Joined Deutsche Asset Management in 1999 and the Fund in 2010.
- Over 18 years of investment industry experience.
- BS, Bryant College; MBA, Suffolk University.

Compensation of Portfolio Managers

Portfolio managers are paid on a Total Compensation basis, which includes: (i) fixed pay (base salary), which is linked to job function, responsibilities and internal and external peer comparison, and (ii) variable pay, which is linked to investment performance, individual contributions to the team, and the overall financial results of both Deutsche Asset Management and Deutsche Bank AG. Variable pay can be delivered via a short-term and/or long-term vehicle, namely cash, restricted equity awards, and/or restricted incentive awards. Variable pay comprises a greater proportion of total compensation as the portfolio manager's seniority and total compensation level increase. The proportion of variable pay delivered via a long-term incentive award, which is subject to clawback, will increase significantly as the amount of variable pay increases. All variable pay delivered via a long-term incentive award is subject to clawback.

To evaluate its investment professionals, Deutsche Asset Management reviews investment performance for all accounts managed in relation to both account peer group and benchmark related data (i.e., appropriate Morningstar peer group universes and/or benchmark index(es) with respect to each account). The ultimate goal of this process is to evaluate the degree to which investment professionals deliver investment performance that meets or exceeds their clients' risk and return objectives. When determining Total Compensation, Deutsche Asset Management considers a number of quantitative and qualitative factors:

- Quantitative measures (e.g. one-, three- and five-year pre-tax returns versus the benchmark and appropriate peer group, taking risk targets into account) are utilized to measure performance.
- Qualitative measures (e.g. adherence to, as well as contributions to, the enhancement of the investment process) are included in the performance review.

- Other factors (e.g. teamwork, adherence to compliance rules, risk management and "living the values" of Deutsche Asset Management) are included as part of a discretionary component of the review process, giving management the ability to consider additional markers of performance on a subjective basis.

#### Fund Ownership of Portfolio Managers

The following table shows the dollar range of shares owned beneficially and of record by each member of the Fund's portfolio management team in the Fund as well as in all DWS Funds as a group (i.e. those funds advised by Deutsche Asset Management or its affiliates), including investments by their immediate family members sharing the same household and amounts invested through retirement and deferred compensation plans. This information is provided as of the Fund's most recent fiscal year end.

Name of Portfolio Manager	Dollar Range of Fund Shares Owned	Dollar Range of All DWS Fund Shares Owned
Philip G. Condon	-	Over \$1,000,000
Michael J. Generazo	-	\$100,001 - \$500,000

#### Conflicts of Interest

In addition to managing the assets of the Fund, the Fund's portfolio managers may have responsibility for managing other client accounts of the Advisor or its affiliates. The tables below show, for each portfolio manager, the number and asset size of (1) SEC registered investment companies (or series thereof) other than the Fund, (2) pooled investment vehicles that are not registered investment companies and (3) other accounts (e.g., accounts managed for individuals or organizations) managed by each portfolio manager. Total assets attributed to each portfolio manager in the tables below include total assets of each account managed by them, although the manager may only manage a portion of such account's assets. For Funds subadvised by subadvisors unaffiliated with DIMA, total assets of Funds managed may only include assets allocated to the portfolio manager and not the total assets of each Fund managed. The tables also show the number of performance based fee accounts, as well as the total assets of the accounts for which the advisory fee is based on the performance of the account. This information is provided as of the Fund's most recent fiscal year end.

#### Other SEC Registered Investment Companies Managed:

Name of Portfolio Manager	Number of Registered Investment Companies	Total Assets of Registered Investment Companies	Number of Investment Company Accounts with Performance Based Fee	Total Assets of Performance-Based Fee Accounts
Philip G. Condon	10	\$10,632,985,610	-	-
Michael J. Generazo	2	\$5,532,912,302	-	-

#### Other Pooled Investment Vehicles Managed:

Name of Portfolio Manager	Number of Pooled Investment	Total Assets of Pooled	Number of Pooled Investment Vehicle Accounts	Total Assets of Performance-
---------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	--	------------------------------

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

	Vehicles	Investment Vehicles	with Performance-Based Fee	Based Fee Accounts
Philip G. Condon	-	-	-	-
Michael J. Generazo	-	-	-	-

Other Accounts Managed:

Name of Portfolio Manager	Number of Other Accounts	Total Assets of Other Accounts	Number of Other Accounts with Performance-Based Fee	Total Assets of Performance-Based Fee Accounts
Philip G. Condon	-	-	-	-
Michael J. Generazo	-	-	-	-

In addition to the accounts above, an investment professional may manage accounts in a personal capacity that may include holdings that are similar to, or the same as, those of the Funds. The Advisor has in place a Code of Ethics that is designed to address conflicts of interest and that, among other things, imposes restrictions on the ability of portfolio managers and other “access persons” to invest in securities that may be recommended or traded in the Funds and other client accounts.

Real, potential or apparent conflicts of interest may arise when a portfolio manager has day-to-day portfolio management responsibilities with respect to more than one fund or account, including the following:

- Certain investments may be appropriate for the Fund and also for other clients advised by the Advisor, including other client accounts managed by the Fund’s portfolio management team. Investment decisions for the Fund and other clients are made with a view to achieving their respective investment objectives and after consideration of such factors as their current holdings, availability of cash for investment and the size of their investments generally. A particular security may be bought or sold for only one client or in different amounts and at different times for more than one but less than all clients. Likewise, because clients of the Advisor may have differing investment strategies, a particular security may be bought for one or more clients when one or more other clients are selling the security. The investment results achieved for the Fund may differ from the results achieved for other clients of the Advisor. In addition, purchases or sales of the same security may be made for two or more clients on the same day. In such event, such transactions will be allocated among the clients in a manner believed by the Advisor to be most equitable to each client, generally utilizing a pro rata allocation methodology. In some cases, the allocation procedure could potentially have an adverse effect or positive effect on the price or amount of the securities purchased or sold by the Fund. Purchase and sale orders for the Fund may be combined with those of other clients of the Advisor in the interest of achieving the most favorable net results to the Fund and the other clients.
- To the extent that a portfolio manager has responsibilities for managing multiple client accounts, a portfolio manager will need to divide time and attention among relevant accounts. The Advisor attempts to minimize these conflicts by aligning its portfolio management teams by investment strategy and by employing similar investment models across multiple client accounts.
- In some cases, an apparent conflict may arise where the Advisor has an incentive, such as a performance-based fee, in managing one account and not with respect to other accounts it manages. The Advisor will not determine allocations based on whether it receives a performance-based fee from the client. Additionally, the Advisor has in place supervisory oversight processes to periodically monitor performance deviations for accounts with like strategies.

- The Advisor and its affiliates and the investment team of each Fund may manage other mutual funds and separate accounts on a long only or a long-short basis. The simultaneous management of long and short portfolios creates potential conflicts of interest including the risk that short sale activity could adversely affect the market value of the long positions (and vice versa), the risk arising from sequential orders in long and short positions, and the risks associated with receiving opposing orders at the same time. The Advisor has adopted procedures that it believes are reasonably designed to mitigate these and other potential conflicts of interest. Included in these procedures are specific guidelines developed to provide fair and equitable treatment for all clients whose accounts are managed by each Fund’s portfolio management team. The Advisor and the portfolio management team have established monitoring procedures, a protocol for supervisory reviews, as well as compliance oversight to ensure that potential conflicts of interest relating to this type of activity are properly addressed.

The Advisor is owned by Deutsche Bank AG, a multi-national financial services company. Therefore, the Advisor is affiliated with a variety of entities that provide, and/or engage in commercial banking, insurance, brokerage, investment banking, financial advisory, broker-dealer activities (including sales and trading), hedge funds, real estate and private equity investing, in addition to the provision of investment management services to institutional and individual investors. Since Deutsche Bank AG, its affiliates, directors, officers and employees (the “Firm”) are engaged in businesses and have interests in addition to managing asset management accounts, such wide ranging activities involve real, potential or apparent conflicts of interest. These interests and activities include potential advisory, transactional and financial activities and other interests in securities and companies that may be directly or indirectly purchased or sold by the Firm for its clients’ advisory accounts. The Advisor may take investment positions in securities in which other clients or related persons within the Firm have different investment positions. There may be instances in which the Advisor is purchasing or selling for its client accounts, or pursuing an outcome in the context of a workout or restructuring with respect to, securities in which the Firm is undertaking the same or differing strategy in other businesses or other client accounts. These are considerations of which advisory clients should be aware and which may cause conflicts that could be to the disadvantage of the Advisor’s advisory clients, including the Fund. The Advisor has instituted business and compliance policies, procedures and disclosures that are designed to identify, monitor and mitigate conflicts of interest and, as appropriate, to report them to a Fund’s Board.

**ITEM 9. PURCHASES OF EQUITY SECURITIES BY CLOSED-END MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT COMPANY AND AFFILIATED PURCHASERS**

Period	(a) Total Number of Shares Purchased	(b) Average Price Paid per Share	(c) Total Number of Shares Purchased as Part of Publicly Announced Plans or Programs	(d) Maximum Number of Shares that May Yet Be Purchased Under the Plans or Programs
December 1 through December 31	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
January 1 through January 31	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
February 1 through February 28	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
March 1 through March 31	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
April 1 through April 30	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
May 1 through May 31	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
June 1 through June 30	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
July 1 through July 31	0	n/a	n/a	n/a

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

August 1 through August 31	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
September 1 through September 30	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
October 1 through October 31	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
November 1 through November 30	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	0	n/a	n/a	n/a

The Fund may from time to time repurchase shares in the open market.

ITEM 10. SUBMISSION OF MATTERS TO A VOTE OF SECURITY HOLDERS

There were no material changes to the procedures by which shareholders may recommend nominees to the Fund's Board. The primary function of the Nominating and Governance Committee is to identify and recommend individuals for membership on the Board and oversee the administration of the Board Governance Guidelines. Shareholders may recommend candidates for Board positions by forwarding their correspondence by U.S. mail or courier service to Paul K. Freeman, Independent Chairman, DWS Funds, P.O. Box 101833, Denver, CO 80250-1833.

ITEM 11. CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

- (a) The Chief Executive and Financial Officers concluded that the Registrant's Disclosure Controls and Procedures are effective based on the evaluation of the Disclosure Controls and Procedures as of a date within 90 days of the filing date of this report.
- (b) There have been no changes in the registrant's internal control over financial reporting that occurred during the second fiscal quarter of the period covered by this report that has materially affected, or is reasonably likely to materially affect, the registrant's internal controls over financial reporting.

ITEM 12. EXHIBITS

- (a)(1) Code of Ethics pursuant to Item 2 of Form N-CSR is filed and attached hereto as EX-99.CODE ETH.
- (a)(2) Certification pursuant to Rule 30a-2(a) under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (17 CFR 270.30a-2(a)) is filed and attached hereto as Exhibit 99.CERT.
- (b) Certification pursuant to Rule 30a-2(b) under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (17 CFR 270.30a-2(b)) is furnished and attached hereto as Exhibit 99.906CERT.

Form N-CSR Item F

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Investment Company Act of 1940, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

Edgar Filing: DWS MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST - Form N-CSR

Registrant: DWS Municipal Income Trust

By: /s/W. Douglas Beck  
W. Douglas Beck  
President

Date: January 30, 2012

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Investment Company Act of 1940, this report has been signed below by the following persons on behalf of the registrant and in the capacities and on the dates indicated.

By: /s/W. Douglas Beck  
W. Douglas Beck  
President

Date: January 30, 2012

By: /s/Paul Schubert  
Paul Schubert  
Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer

Date: January 30, 2012