BLACKROCK MUNIYIELD PENNSYLVANIA QUALITY FUND

Form N-CSRS April 01, 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 811-07136

Name of Fund: BlackRock MuniYield Pennsylvania Quality Fund (MPA)

Fund Address: 100 Bellevue Parkway, Wilmington, DE 19809

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

Pennsylvania

Quality Fund, 55 East 52nd Street, New York, NY 10055

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

Date of fiscal year end: 07/31/2016

Date of reporting period: 01/31/2016

Item 1 Report to Stockholders

JANUARY 31, 2016

SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT (UNAUDITED)

BlackRock MuniHoldings California Quality Fund, Inc. (MUC)

BlackRock MuniHoldings New Jersey Quality Fund, Inc. (MUJ)

BlackRock MuniYield Investment Quality Fund (MFT)

BlackRock MuniYield Michigan Quality Fund, Inc. (MIY)

BlackRock MuniYield Pennsylvania Quality Fund (MPA)

Not FDIC Insured May Lose Value No Bank Guarantee

Table of Contents

	Page
The Markets in Review	<u>3</u>
Semi-Annual Report:	
Municipal Market Overview	4
The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging	5
<u>Derivative Financial Instruments</u>	5
Fund Summaries	6
Financial Statements:	
Schedules of Investments	16
Statements of Assets and Liabilities	41
Statements of Operations	42
Statements of Changes in Net Assets	43
Statements of Cash Flows	45
Financial Highlights	46
Notes to Financial Statements	51
Officers and Directors	64
Additional Information	65

2 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT JANUARY 31, 2016

The Markets in Review

Dear Shareholder.

Diverging monetary policies and shifting economic outlooks across regions have been the overarching themes driving financial markets over the past couple of years. With U.S. growth outpacing the global economic recovery while inflationary pressures remained low, investors spent most of 2015 anticipating a short-term rate hike from the Federal Reserve (Fed), which ultimately came to fruition in December. In contrast, the European Central Bank and the Bank of Japan moved to a more accommodative stance over the year. In this environment, the U.S. dollar strengthened considerably, causing profit challenges for U.S. exporters and high levels of volatility in emerging market currencies and commodities.

Market volatility broadly increased in the latter part of 2015 and continued into 2016 given a collapse in oil prices and decelerating growth in China, while global growth and inflation failed to pick up. Oil prices were driven lower due to excess supply while the world's largest oil producers had yet to negotiate a deal that would stabilize oil prices. In China, slower economic growth combined with a depreciating yuan and declining confidence in the country's policymakers stoked worries about the potential impact to the broader global economy. After a long period in which global central bank policies had significant influence on investor sentiment and hence the direction of financial markets, in recent months, the underperformance of markets in Europe and Japan where central banks had taken aggressive measures to stimulate growth and stabilize their currencies highlighted the possibility that central banks could be losing their effectiveness.

In this environment, higher quality assets such as municipal bonds, U.S. Treasuries and investment grade corporate bonds outperformed risk assets including equities and high yield bonds. Large cap U.S. equities fared better than international developed and emerging markets.

At BlackRock, we believe investors need to think globally, extend their scope across a broad array of asset classes and be prepared to move freely as market conditions change over time. We encourage you to talk with your financial advisor and visit blackrock.com for further insight about investing in today s markets.

Sincerely,

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

Rob Kapito

President, BlackRock Advisors, LLC

Total Returns as of January 31, 2016

	6-month	12-month
U.S. large cap equities (S&P 500® Index)	(6.77)%	(0.67)%
U.S. small cap equities (Russell 2000® Index)	(15.80)	(9.92)
International equities (MSCI Europe, Australasia, Far East Index)	(14.58)	(8.43)
Emerging market equities (MSCI Emerging Markets Index)	(16.96)	(20.91)
3-month Treasury bills (BofA Merrill Lynch 3-Month U.S. Treasury	0.05	0.05

Bill Index)		
U.S. Treasury securities	3.36	(0.41)
(BofA Merrill Lynch		
10-Year U.S. Treasury Index)		
U.S. investment-grade bonds	1.33	(0.16)
(Barclays U.S.		
Aggregate Bond Index)		
Tax-exempt municipal	3.67	2.66
bonds (S&P Municipal		
Bond Index)		
U.S. high yield bonds	(7.75)	(6.58)
(Barclays U.S. Corporate		
High Yield 2% Issuer		
Capped Index)		

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

THIS PAGE NOT PART OF YOUR FUND REPORT

6

Municipal Market Overview

For the Reporting Period Ended January 31, 2016 Municipal Market Conditions

Municipal bonds generated positive performance for the period, due to a favorable supply-and-demand environment. Interest rates were volatile in 2015 (bond prices rise as rates fall) leading up to a long-awaited rate hike from the U.S. Federal Reserve (the Fed) that ultimately came in December. However, ongoing reassurance from the Fed that rates would be increased gradually and would likely remain low overall resulted in strong demand for fixed income investments, with municipal bonds being one of the strongest-performing sectors. Investors favored the relative stability of municipal bonds amid bouts of volatility resulting from uneven U.S. economic data, falling oil prices, global growth concerns, geopolitical risks, and widening central bank divergence i.e., policy easing outside the United States while the Fed was posturing to commence policy tightening. During the 12 months ended January 31, 2016, municipal bond funds garnered net inflows of approximately \$16 billion (based on data from the Investment Company Institute).

For the same 12-month period, total new issuance remained relatively strong from a historical perspective at \$392 billion (considerably higher than the \$349 billion issued in the prior 12-month period). A noteworthy portion of new supply during this period was attributable to refinancing activity (roughly 60%) as issuers took advantage of low interest rates and a flatter yield curve to reduce their borrowing costs.

S&P Municipal Bond Index Total Returns as of January 31, 2016

6 months: 3.67% 12 months: 2.66%

A Closer Look at Yields

From January 31, 2015 to January 31, 2016, yields on AAA-rated 30-year municipal bonds increased by 25 basis points (bps) from 2.50% to 2.75%, while 10-year rates fell by 1 bp from 1.72% to 1.71% and 5-year rates increased 6 bps from 0.94% to 1.00% (as measured by Thomson Municipal Market Data). The slope of the municipal yield curve remained unchanged over the 12-month period with the spread between 2- and 30-year

maturities holding steady at 209 bps as the spread between 2- and 10-year maturities flattened by 26 bps and the spread between 10- and 30-year maturities steepened by 26 bps.

During the same time period, U.S. Treasury rates increased by 50 bps on 30-year bonds, 25 bps on 10-year bonds and 14 bps on 5-year bonds. Accordingly, tax-exempt municipal bonds outperformed Treasuries, most notably in the intermediate and long-end of the curve as a result of manageable supply and robust demand. In absolute terms, the positive performance of municipal bonds was driven largely by a supply/demand imbalance within the municipal market as investors sought income and incremental yield in an environment where opportunities had become scarce. More broadly, municipal bonds benefited from the greater appeal of tax-exempt investing in light of the higher tax rates implemented in 2014. The asset class is known for its lower relative volatility and preservation of principal with an emphasis on income as tax rates rise.

Financial Conditions of Municipal Issuers

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

The opinions expressed are those of BlackRock as of January 31, 2016, and are subject to change at any time due to changes in market or economic conditions. The comments should not be construed as a recommendation of any individual holdings or market sectors. Investing involves risk including loss of principal. Bond values fluctuate in price so the value of your investment can go down depending on market conditions. Fixed income risks include interest-rate and credit risk. Typically, when interest rates rise, there is a corresponding decline in bond values. Credit risk refers to the possibility that the bond issuer will not be able to make principal and interest payments. There may be less information on the financial condition of municipal issuers than for public corporations. The market for

municipal bonds may be less liquid than for taxable bonds. Some investors may be subject to Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT). Capital gains distributions, if any, are taxable.

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

4 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 31, 2016

The Benefits and Risks of Leveraging

The Funds may utilize leverage to seek to enhance the distribution rate on, and net asset value (NAV) of, their common shares (Common Shares). However, these objectives cannot be achieved in all interest rate environments.

In general, the concept of leveraging is based on the premise that the financing cost of leverage, which is based on short-term interest rates, is normally lower than the income earned b