EATON VANCE OHIO MUNICIPAL INCOME TRUST Form N-CSR January 25, 2016

UNITED STATES

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

Form N-CSR

CERTIFIED SHAREHOLDER REPORT OF REGISTERED

MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Investment Company Act File Number: 811-09149

Eaton Vance Ohio Municipal Income Trust

(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in Charter)

Two International Place, Boston, Massachusetts 02110

(Address of Principal Executive Offices)

Maureen A. Gemma

Two International Place, Boston, Massachusetts 02110

(Name and Address of Agent for Services)

(617) 482-8260

(Registrant s Telephone Number)

November 30

Date of Fiscal Year End

November 30, 2015

Date of Reporting Period

Item 1. Reports to Stockholders

Municipal Income Trusts

Annual Report

November 30, 2015

California (CEV) Massachusetts (MMV) Michigan (EMI) New Jersey (EVJ)

New York (EVY) Ohio (EVO) Pennsylvania (EVP)

Commodity Futures Trading Commission Registration. Effective December 31, 2012, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) adopted certain regulatory changes that subject registered investment companies and advisers to regulation by the CFTC if a fund invests more than a prescribed level of its assets in certain CFTC-regulated instruments (including futures, certain options and swap agreements) or markets itself as providing investment exposure to such instruments. Each Fund has claimed an exclusion from the definition of the term—commodity pool operator—under the Commodity Exchange Act. Accordingly, neither the Funds nor the adviser with respect to the operation of the Funds is subject to CFTC regulation. Because of its management of other strategies, each Fund—s adviser is registered with the CFTC as a commodity pool operator and a commodity trading advisor.

Fund shares are not insured by the FDIC and are not deposits or other obligations of, or guaranteed by, any depository institution. Shares are subject to investment risks, including possible loss of principal invested.

Annual Report November 30, 2015

Eaton Vance

Municipal Income Trusts

Table of Contents

Management s Discussion of Fund Performance		
Performance and Fund Profile		
California Municipal Income Trust	4	
Massachusetts Municipal Income Trust	5	
Michigan Municipal Income Trust	6	
New Jersey Municipal Income Trust	7	
New York Municipal Income Trust	8	
Ohio Municipal Income Trust	9	
Pennsylvania Municipal Income Trust	10	
Endnotes and Additional Disclosures	11	
Financial Statements	12	
Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm	69	
Federal Tax Information	70	
Dividend Reinvestment Plan	71	
Management and Organization	73	
Important Notices	76	

Municipal Income Trusts

November 30, 2015

Management s Discussion of Fund Performance

Economic and Market Conditions

As the fiscal year began on December 1, 2014, municipal bonds were at the tail end of a rally that continued into the first two months of the period ended November 30, 2015. U.S. 10-year Treasury and municipal rates hit their low for the period around the end of January 2015.

From February through June, municipal returns turned negative as a flood of new issuance, along with modest outflows from municipal mutual funds, put downward pressure on bond prices. Beginning in July 2015, however, municipal returns turned positive again and remained positive through the end of the fiscal year. For the period as a whole, municipal bond prices generally ended close to where they began, with total return derived primarily from interest income.

Going into the period, investors anticipated rising interest rates, driven by what was expected to be the Federal Reserve Board s (the Fed s) first rate hike since 2006. But strong worldwide demand for U.S. Treasuries, fueled by concern about declining growth in the Eurozone, Japan and China, pushed Treasury rates down in the early months of the period, with municipal rates following.

Beginning in February 2015, however, rates in the short end of the yield curve began to creep upward, as investors believed the Fed was getting closer to a rate hike. Then in August 2015, China surprised the markets by devaluing its currency. Commodity prices continued to fall, as they had for most of the period, and the Fed decided not to take action at its September meeting. Against this backdrop, many asset classes experienced dramatic volatility in the closing months of the period. But the municipal market, which had low exposure to emerging markets and commodities, remained stable, continuing its steady rally. Even in the last month of the period, as expectations increased for a Fed rate hike in December, the municipal market overall delivered positive returns.

For the one-year period as a whole, the municipal yield curve flattened. For AAA-rated⁷ issues, interest rates rose modestly in the one- to six-year part of the curve, while rates were unchanged or declined slightly across the seven- to 30-year part of the curve.

Fund Performance

For the fiscal year ended November 30, 2015, the California, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania Funds shares at net asset value (NAV) outperformed the 4.44% return of the Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index (the Index), while the New Jersey Fund at NAV underperformed the Index.

Each Fund s overall strategy is to invest primarily in investment grade bonds of the Fund s particular state. Management may hedge to various degrees against the greater potential risk of volatility caused by the use of leverage and by investing in bonds at the long end of the yield curve by using Treasury futures. As a risk management tactic within the Funds overall strategy, interest rate hedging is intended to moderate performance on both the upside and the downside of the market.

In managing the Funds, management employs leverage through Residual Interest Bond (RIB) financing and Auction Preferred Shares (APS)⁶ to seek to enhance the Funds tax-exempt income. The use of leverage has the effect of achieving additional exposure to the municipal market, and thus magnifying a Fund s exposure to its underlying investments in both up and down market environments. During this period of positive performance by municipal bonds, the additional income derived from the use of leverage was the single largest contributor to performance versus the Index which does not employ leverage for all seven Funds.

In contrast, an overweight in bonds priced to a short call date detracted from performance versus the Index for all Funds. While these bonds generally had maturities of 10 years or longer, they were callable within the next 2 3 years. This increased the Funds exposure to the short end of the yield curve, where bond prices declined slightly during the period.

State-specific Results

Eaton Vance California Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 5.28%, outperforming the 4.44% return of the Index. As noted earlier, leverage was the most significant contributor to Fund performance versus the Index. An overweight and security selection in local general obligation bonds those issued by cities and towns and an overweight and security selection in the housing sector helped performance relative to the Index as well.

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

Municipal Income Trusts

November 30, 2015

Management s Discussion of Fund Performance continued

An overweight in bonds priced to a short call date detracted from results versus the Index, as mentioned above. Additional detractors from results relative to the Index included an overweight in prerefunded, or escrowed, bonds; security selection and an underweight in the transportation sector, which was the best-performing sector in the Index during the period; and security selection in zero coupon bonds, which were the strongest-performing coupon structure in the Index during the one-year period.

Eaton Vance Massachusetts Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 5.21%, outperforming the 4.44% return of the Index. Contributors to performance versus the Index included leverage and security selection in the hospitals and health care sector. An overweight in bonds priced to a short call date detracted from results relative to the Index, as did an underweight in the transportation sector and an overweight in prerefunded bonds.

Eaton Vance Michigan Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 6.44%, outperforming the 4.44% return of the Index. Leverage, security selection in the electric power sector, and security selection in water and sewer bonds all helped performance relative to the Index during the period. In contrast, an overweight in bonds priced to a short call date, an underweight and security selection in the transportation sector, and an underweight in bonds rated BBB and below detracted from results versus the Index.

Eaton Vance New Jersey Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 4.08%, underperforming the 4.44% return of the Index. During the period, New Jersey was the worst-performing state in the Index, due to continuing investor concerns about the state s finances. Detractors from the Fund s performance relative to the Index included an overweight in bonds priced to a short call date, security selection in the transportation sector, and security selection in Puerto Rico bonds.

Leverage, an overweight and security selection in industrial development revenue (IDR) bonds, and an overweight in zero coupon bonds all contributed to Fund performance versus the Index.

Eaton Vance New York Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 5.63%, outperforming the 4.44% return of the Index. Leverage aided performance relative to the Index, as did an overweight in zero coupon bonds and an overweight and security selection in IDR bonds. Detractors from performance versus the Index included an overweight in bonds priced to a short call date, an underweight and security selection in the transportation sector, and an underweight in the hospitals and health care sector.

Eaton Vance Ohio Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 5.91%, outperforming the 4.44% return of the Index. Contributors to results versus the Index included leverage, an overweight in zero coupon bonds, and security selection in the electric power sector. Performance versus the Index was hurt by an overweight in bonds priced to a short call date, an underweight in bonds rated BBB and below, and an overweight in prerefunded bonds.

Eaton Vance Pennsylvania Municipal Income Trust shares at NAV returned 6.02%, outperforming the 4.44% return of the Index. Leverage, an overweight in the education sector, and security selection in IDR bonds all contributed to the Fund s performance versus the Index. Detractors from performance relative to the Index included an overweight in bonds priced to a short call date, security selection in zero coupon bonds, and security selection in the hospitals and health care sector.

California Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2015

Performance^{2,3}

Portfolio Manager Craig R. Brandon, CFA

% Average Annual Total Returns	Inception Date	One Year	Five Years	Ten Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	5.28%	9.19%	5.28%
Fund at Market Price		7.65	7.37	5.69
Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		4.44%	6.70%	5.19%
% Premium/Discount to NAV ⁴				
				7.99%
D. D. J. 5				
Distributions ⁵				

Total Distributions per share for the period	\$ 0.731
Distribution Rate at NAV	5.04%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV	10.27%
Distribution Rate at Market Price	5.47%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price	11.15%

% Total Leverage ^o	
Auction Preferred Shares (APS)	30.43%
Residual Interest Bond (RIB) Financing	7.62
Fund Profile	

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

Massachusetts Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2015

Performance^{2,3}

Portfolio Manager Craig R. Brandon, CFA

% Average Annual Total Returns	Inception Date	One Year	Five Years	Ten	Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	5.21%	7.79%		5.64%
Fund at Market Price		10.75	5.84		5.15
Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		4.44%	6.70%		5.19%
% Premium/Discount to NAV ⁴					
					7.46%
Distributions ⁵					
Total Distributions per share for the period				\$	0.686
Distribution Rate at NAV					4.53%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV					8.44%
Distribution Rate at Market Price					4.89%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price					9.11%
% Total Leverage ⁶					
APS					31.60%
RIB Financing					3.02
Fund Profile					

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

Michigan Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2015

Performance^{2,3}

Portfolio Manager Cynthia J. Clemson

% Average Annual Total Returns	Inception Date	One Year	Five Years	Tei	n Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	6.44%	9.10%		6.04%
Fund at Market Price		7.19	7.27		5.47
Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		4.44%	6.70%		5.19%
% Premium/Discount to NAV ⁴					
					13.67%
Distributions ⁵					
Total Distributions per share for the period				\$	0.709
Distribution Rate at NAV					4.81%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV					8.88%
Distribution Rate at Market Price					5.57%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price					10.28%

Fund Profile

% Total Leverage⁶

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

Past performance is no guarantee of future results. Returns are historical and are calculated by determining the percentage change in net asset value (NAV) or market price (as applicable) with all distributions reinvested and includes management fees and other expenses. Fund performance at market price will differ from its results at NAV due to factors such as changing perceptions about the Fund, market conditions, fluctuations in supply and demand for Fund shares, or changes in Fund distributions. Investment return and principal value will fluctuate so that shares, when sold, may be worth more or less than their original cost. Performance less than one year is cumulative. Performance is for the

37.09%

^{*} Amount is less than 0.05%.

stated time period only; due to market volatility, current Fund performance may be lower or higher than the quoted return. For performance as of the most recent month-end, please refer to eatonvance.com.

New Jersey Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2015

Performance^{2,3}

Portfolio Manager Adam A. Weigold, CFA

% Average Annual Total Returns	Inception Date	One Year	Five Years	Ter	ı Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	4.08%	7.20%		5.27%
Fund at Market Price		6.21	4.39		4.79
Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		4.44%	6.70%		5.19%
% Premium/Discount to NAV ⁴					
					10.72%
Distributions ⁵					
Total Distributions per share for the period				\$	0.728
Distribution Rate at NAV				Ψ	5.28%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV					10.25%
Distribution Rate at Market Price					5.91%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price					11.47%
% Total Leverage ⁶					
APS					33.35%
RIB Financing Fund Profile					3.35

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

New York Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2015

Performance^{2,3}

Portfolio Manager Craig R. Brandon, CFA

% Average Annual Total Returns	Inception Date	One Year	Five Years	Tei	ı Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	5.63%	8.85%		5.60%
Fund at Market Price		6.13	7.24		5.47
Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		4.44%	6.70%		5.19%
% Premium/Discount to NAV ⁴					
					5.45%
Distributions ⁵					
Total Distributions per share for the period				\$	0.813
Distribution Rate at NAV					5.51%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV					10.68%
Distribution Rate at Market Price					5.83%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price					11.30%
% Total Leverage ⁶					
APS					25.72%
RIB Financing					13.64
Fund Profile					

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

Ohio Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2015

Performance^{2,3}

Portfolio Manager Cynthia J. Clemson

% Average Annual Total Returns	Inception Date	One Year	Five Years	Te	n Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	5.91%	8.99%		6.05%
Fund at Market Price		6.11	6.33		5.49
Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		4.44%	6.70%		5.19%
% Premium/Discount to NAV ⁴					
					9.93%
Distributions ⁵					
Total Distributions per share for the period				\$	0.731
Distribution Rate at NAV					4.81%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV					8.95%
Distribution Rate at Market Price					5.34%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price					9.93%
% Total Leverage ⁶					
APS					33.60%
RIB Financing					2.15
Fund Profile					

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

Pennsylvania Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2015

Performance^{2,3}

Portfolio Manager Adam A. Weigold, CFA

% Average Annual Total Returns	Inception Date	One Year	Five Years	Tei	ı Years
Fund at NAV	01/29/1999	6.02%	7.33%		5.44%
Fund at Market Price		6.08	4.94		4.10
Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index		4.44%	6.70%		5.19%
% Premium/Discount to NAV ⁴					
					13.32%
Distributions ⁵					
Total Distributions per share for the period				\$	0.727
Distribution Rate at NAV				-	5.23%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at NAV					9.53%
Distribution Rate at Market Price					6.04%
Taxable-Equivalent Distribution Rate at Market Price					11.01%
% Total Leverage ⁶					
APS					36.48%
RIB Financing Fund Profile					1.29

See Endnotes and Additional Disclosures in this report.

Municipal Income Trusts

November 30, 2015

Endnotes and Additional Disclosures

- The views expressed in this report are those of the portfolio manager(s) and are current only through the date stated at the top of this page. These views are subject to change at any time based upon market or other conditions, and Eaton Vance and the Fund(s) disclaim any responsibility to update such views. These views may not be relied upon as investment advice and, because investment decisions are based on many factors, may not be relied upon as an indication of trading intent on behalf of any Eaton Vance fund. This commentary may contain statements that are not historical facts, referred to as forward looking statements. The Fund s actual future results may differ significantly from those stated in any forward looking statement, depending on factors such as changes in securities or financial markets or general economic conditions, the volume of sales and purchases of Fund shares, the continuation of investment advisory, administrative and service contracts, and other risks discussed from time to time in the Fund s filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission.
- ² Barclays Long (22+) Year Municipal Bond Index is an unmanaged index of municipal bonds traded in the U.S. with maturities of 22 years or more. Unless otherwise stated, index returns do not reflect the effect of any applicable sales charges, commissions, expenses, taxes or leverage, as applicable. It is not possible to invest directly in an index.
- ³ Performance results reflect the effects of leverage. Performance since inception for an index, if presented, is the performance since the Fund s or oldest share class inception, as applicable.
- ⁴ The shares of the Fund often trade at a discount or premium from their net asset value. The discount or premium of the Fund may vary over time and may be higher or lower than what is quoted in this report. For up-to-date premium/discount information, please refer to http://eatonvance.com/closedend.
- The Distribution Rate is based on the Fund s last regular distribution per share in the period (annualized) divided by the Fund s NAV or market price at the end of the period. The Fund s distributions may be comprised of amounts characterized for federal income tax purposes as tax-exempt income, qualified and non-qualified ordinary dividends, capital gains and nondividend distributions, also known as return of capital. The Fund will determine the federal income tax character of distributions paid to a shareholder after the end of the calendar year. This is reported on the IRS form 1099-DIV and provided to the shareholder shortly after each year-end. For information about the tax character of distributions made in prior calendar years, please refer to Performance-Tax Character of Distributions on the Fund s webpage available at eatonvance.com. The Fund s distributions are determined by the investment adviser based on its current assessment of the Fund s long-term return potential. As portfolio and market conditions change, the rate of distributions paid by the Fund could change. Taxable-equivalent performance is based on the highest combined federal and state income tax rates, where applicable. Lower tax rates would result in lower tax-equivalent performance. Actual tax rates will vary depending on your income, exemptions and deductions. Rates do not include local taxes. Subsequent distributions declared, but not reflected in Fund Performance, reflect a reduction of the monthly distribution for New York Municipal Income Trust.
- ⁶ Fund employs RIB financing and/or APS leverage. The leverage created by RIB investments and APS provides an opportunity for increased income but, at the same time, creates special risks (including the likelihood of greater price volatility). The cost of leverage rises and falls with changes in short-term interest rates. See Floating Rate Notes Issued in Conjunction with Securities Held in the notes to the financial statements for more information about RIB financing. RIB leverage represents the amount of Floating Rate Notes outstanding at period end as a percentage of Fund net assets applicable to common shares plus APS and Floating Rate Notes. APS leverage represents the liquidation value of the Fund s APS outstanding at period end as a percentage of Fund net assets applicable to common shares plus APS and Floating Rate Notes. The Fund may be required to maintain prescribed asset coverage for its leverage and may be required to reduce its leverage at an inopportune time. Floating Rate Notes in both calculations reflect the effect of RIBs purchased in secondary market transactions, if applicable.

7

Ratings are based on Moody s, S&P or Fitch, as applicable. If securities are rated differently by the ratings agencies, the higher rating is applied. Ratings, which are subject to change, apply to the creditworthiness of the issuers of the underlying securities and not to the Fund or its shares. Credit ratings measure the quality of a bond based on the issuer s creditworthiness, with ratings ranging from AAA, being the highest, to D, being the lowest based on S&P s measures. Ratings of BBB or higher by S&P or Fitch (Baa or higher by Moody s) are considered to be investment- grade quality. Credit ratings are based largely on the ratings agency s analysis at the time of rating. The rating assigned to any particular security is not necessarily a reflection of the issuer s current financial condition and does not necessarily reflect its assessment of the volatility of a security s market value or of the liquidity of an investment in the security. Holdings designated as Not Rated are not rated by the national ratings agencies stated above.

⁸ The chart includes the municipal bonds held by a trust that issues residual interest bonds, consistent with the Portfolio of Investments.

Fund profile subject to change due to active management.

Important Notice to Shareholders

Effective July 31, 2015, the Michigan Municipal Income Trust and the Ohio Municipal Income Trust are managed by Cynthia J. Clemson.

California Municipal Income Trust

November 30, 2015

Portfolio of Investments

Tax-Exempt Municipal Securities 157.3%

Security	Principal Amount (000 s omitted) Value
Education 15.5% California Educational Facilities Authority, (Claremont McKenna College), Prerefunded to 1/1/19, 5.00%, 1/1/39 California Educational Facilities Authority, (Harvey Mudd College), 5.25%, 12/1/31 California Educational Facilities Authority, (Harvey Mudd College), 5.25%, 12/1/36 California Educational Facilities Authority, (Loyola Marymount University), 5.00%, 10/1/30 California Educational Facilities Authority, (Santa Clara University), 5.00%, 9/1/23 California Educational Facilities Authority, (University of San Francisco), 6.125%, 10/1/36 California Educational Facilities Authority, (University of Southern California), 5.25%, 10/1/39 California Educational Facilities Authority, (University of the Pacific), 5.00%, 11/1/30 California Municipal Finance Authority, (University of San Diego), 5.00%, 10/1/31 California Municipal Finance Authority, (University of San Diego), 5.25%, 10/1/26 California Municipal Finance Authority, (University of San Diego), 5.25%, 10/1/27 California Municipal Finance Authority, (University of San Diego), 5.25%, 10/1/28 University of California, 5.25%, 5/15/39 University of California, Prerefunded to 5/15/19, 5.25%, 5/15/39	\$ 3,135 \$ 3,434,800 195 229,743 330 386,060 745 833,700 1,600 1,911,008 235 286,799 2,490 2,772,739 630 710,974 415 482,408 285 327,488 810 954,310 850 994,152 895 1,040,787 1,045 1,174,507 205 234,415
	\$ 15,773,890
Electric Utilities 13.6% Chula Vista, (San Diego Gas and Electric), 5.875%, 2/15/34 Chula Vista, (San Diego Gas and Electric), (AMT), 5.00%, 12/1/27 Colton Public Financing Authority, Electric System Revenue, 5.00%, 4/1/27 Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Electric System Revenue, 5.25%, 7/1/32 Northern California Power Agency, 5.25%, 8/1/24 Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 5.00%, 8/15/27 Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 5.00%, 8/15/28 Southern California Public Power Authority, (Tieton Hydropower), 5.00%, 7/1/35 Vernon, Electric System Revenue, 5.125%, 8/1/21	\$ 270 \$ 308,351 2,275 2,329,395 1,500 1,711,365 2,170 2,391,666 1,500 1,685,565 1,335 1,570,320 1,795 2,111,405 680 772,643 900 993,519
	\$ 13,874,229
Security	Principal Amount (000 s omitted) Value
Escrowed / Prerefunded 2.9% California Department of Water Resources, Prerefunded to 6/1/18, 5.00%, 12/1/29 California Health Facilities Financing Authority, (Providence Health System), Prerefunded to 10/1/18, 6.50%, 10/1/38 Vernon, Electric System Revenue, Prerefunded to 8/1/19, 5.125%, 8/1/21	\$ 715 \$ 787,980 1,475 1,705,307 400 441,300

\$ 2,934,587

General Obligations 25.9% California, 5.00%, 10/1/31

California, 5.00%, 10/1/31 California, 5.50%, 11/1/35 California, 6.00%, 4/1/38 \$ 1,885 \$2,212,406 1,600 1,905,744