NUVEEN NEW YORK AMT-FREE MUNICIPAL INCOME FUND
Form N-CSR
December 08, 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 811-21211

Nuveen New York AMT-Free Municipal Income Fund
(Exact name of registrant as specified in charter)

Nuveen Investments
333 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
(Address of principal executive offices) (Zip code)

Gifford R. Zimmerman
Nuveen Investments
333 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
(Name and address of agent for service)

Registrant’s telephone number, including area code: (312) 917-7700

Date of fiscal year end: September 30

Date of reporting period: September 30, 2016

Form N-CSR is to be used by management investment companies to file reports with the Commission not later than 10 days after the transmission to stockholders of any report that is required to be transmitted to stockholders under Rule 30e-1 under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (17 CFR 270.30e-1). The Commission may use the information provided on Form N-CSR in its regulatory, disclosure review, inspection, and policymaking roles.

A registrant is required to disclose the information specified by Form N-CSR, and the Commission will make this information public. A registrant is not required to respond to the collection of information contained in Form N-CSR unless the Form displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) control number. Please direct comments concerning the accuracy of the information collection burden estimate and any suggestions for reducing the burden to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20549-0609. The OMB has reviewed this collection of information under the clearance requirements of 44 U.S.C. ss. 3507.

ITEM 1. REPORTS TO STOCKHOLDERS.

Table of Contents

Chairman's Letter to Shareholders	4
Portfolio Manager's Comments	5
Fund Leverage	10
Common Share Information	12
Risk Considerations	14
Performance Overview and Holding Summaries	15
Shareholder Meeting Report	19
Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm	20
Portfolios of Investments	21
Statement of Assets and Liabilities	51
Statement of Operations	52
Statement of Changes in Net Assets	53
Statement of Cash Flows	55
Financial Highlights	56
Notes to Financial Statements	61
Additional Fund Information	75
Glossary of Terms Used in this Report	76
Reinvest Automatically, Easily and Conveniently	78
Annual Investment Management Agreement Approval Process	79
Board Members and Officers	87

Chairman's Letter to Shareholders

Dear Shareholders,

After a sluggish first half of 2016, the U.S. economy gained some momentum in the third quarter. In fact, it was the economy's strongest quarterly acceleration in two years, propelled by healthy consumer spending, a temporary surge in exports and a turnaround in inventories. As the year winds down, 2016 looks on track to deliver the same steady-but-slow growth that has characterized the seven-year recovery.

A year ago, the U.S. Federal Reserve (Fed) took the first step toward policy "normalization" by raising its benchmark interest rate at its December 2015 meeting. Speculation about the Fed's intentions since then has been a strong influence on the markets. Currently, with the economy modestly growing, the return to "full" employment and a recent uptick in inflation, the Fed may be encouraged to again raise its target rate at the December 2016 meeting, after remaining on hold for nearly a year.

Global conditions continue to look subdued by comparison. Investors continue to adjust to the idea of a slower Chinese economy, which has helped commodity prices stabilize and lift global inflation expectations. The U.K.'s June 23rd "Brexit" vote to leave the European Union introduced a new set of economic and political uncertainties to the already fragile conditions across Europe. Moreover, there are growing concerns that global central banks' unprecedented efforts to revive growth may be showing signs of fatigue. Interest rates are currently negative in Europe and Japan and near or at zero in the U.S., U.K. and elsewhere; nonetheless, growth has remained subdued.

Given muted global growth, the risk of policy errors by central banks around the world, the unfolding Brexit process and an uncertain political outlook with the U.S. transitioning to a new presidential administration followed by key elections across Europe in 2017, we anticipate that turbulence remains on the horizon for the time being. In this environment, Nuveen remains committed to both managing downside risks and seeking upside potential. If you're concerned about how resilient your investment portfolio might be, we encourage you to talk to your financial advisor.

On behalf of the other members of the Nuveen Fund Board, we look forward to continuing to earn your trust in the months and years ahead.

Sincerely,

William J. Schneider

Chairman of the Board

November 22, 2016

Portfolio Manager's Comments
Nuveen New York Municipal Value Fund, Inc. (NNY)
Nuveen New York Municipal Value Fund 2 (NYV)
Nuveen New York Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund (NAN)
Nuveen New York AMT-Free Municipal Income Fund (NRK)

These Funds feature portfolio management by Nuveen Asset Management, LLC, an affiliate of Nuveen Investments, Inc. Portfolio manager Scott R. Romans, PhD, discusses economic and municipal market conditions at the national and state levels, key investment strategies and the twelve-month performance of the Nuveen New York Funds. Scott assumed portfolio management responsibility for these four Funds in 2011.

What factors affected the U.S. economy and the national municipal market during the twelve-month reporting period ended September 30, 2016?

Over the twelve-month reporting period, U.S. economic data continued to point to subdued growth, rising employment and tame inflation. Economic activity has continued to hover around a 2% annualized growth rate since the end of the Great Recession in 2009, as measured by real gross domestic product (GDP), which is the value of the goods and services produced by the nation's economy less the value of the goods and services used up in production, adjusted for price changes. For the third quarter of 2016, real GDP increased at an annual rate of 2.9%, as reported by the "advance" estimate of the Bureau of Economic Analysis, up from 1.4% in the second quarter of 2016.

The labor and housing markets improved over the reporting period, although the momentum appeared to slow toward the end of the reporting period. As reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the unemployment rate was little changed at 5.0% in September 2016 from 5.1% in September 2015, and job gains averaged slightly above 200,000 per month for the past twelve months. The S&P CoreLogic Case-Shiller U.S. National Home Price Index, which covers all nine U.S. census divisions, recorded a 5.3% annual gain in August 2016 (most recent data available at the time this report was prepared) (effective July 26, 2016, the S&P/Case-Shiller U.S. National Home Price Index was renamed the S&P CoreLogic Case-Shiller U.S. National Home Price Index). The 10-City and 20-City Composites reported year-over-year increases of 4.3% and 5.1%, respectively.

Consumers, whose purchases comprise the largest component of the U.S. economy, benefited from employment growth and firming wages over the twelve-month reporting period. Although consumer spending gains were rather muted in the latter half of 2015, a spending surge in the second quarter of 2016 helped offset weaker business investment. A backdrop of low inflation also contributed to consumers' willingness to buy. The Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose 1.5% over the twelve-month reporting period

Certain statements in this report are forward-looking statements. Discussions of specific investments are for illustration only and are not intended as recommendations of individual investments. The forward-looking statements and other views expressed herein are those of the portfolio manager as of the date of this report. Actual future results or occurrences may differ significantly from those anticipated in any forward-looking statements, and the views expressed herein are subject to change at any time, due to numerous market and other factors. The Funds disclaim any obligation to update publicly or revise any forward-looking statements or views expressed herein.

For financial reporting purposes, the ratings disclosed are the highest rating given by one of the following national rating agencies: Standard & Poor's (S&P), Moody's Investors Service, Inc. (Moody's) or Fitch, Inc. (Fitch). This treatment of split-rated securities may differ from that used for other purposes, such as for Fund investment policies. Credit ratings are subject to change. AAA, AA, A and BBB are investment grade ratings, while BB, B, CCC, CC, C and D are below investment grade ratings. Certain bonds backed by U.S. Government or agency securities are regarded as having an implied rating equal to the rating of such securities. Holdings designated N/R are not rated by these national rating agencies. Ratings are not covered by the report of independent registered public accounting firm. Bond insurance guarantees only the payment of principal and interest on the bond when due, and not the value of the bonds themselves, which will fluctuate with the bond market and the financial success of the issuer and the insurer. Insurance relates specifically to the bonds in the portfolio and not to the share prices of a Fund. No representation is made as to the insurers' ability to meet their commitments.

Refer to the Glossary of Terms Used in this Report for further definition of the terms used within this section.

Portfolio Manager's Comments (continued)
ended September 2016 on a seasonally adjusted basis, as reported by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The core CPI (which excludes food and energy) increased 2.2% during the same period, slightly above the Fed's unofficial longer term inflation objective of 2.0%.

Business investment remained weak over the reporting period. Corporate earnings growth slowed during 2015, reflecting an array of factors ranging from weakening demand amid sluggish U.S. and global growth to the impact of falling commodity prices and a strong U.S. dollar. Although energy prices rebounded off their lows and the dollar pared some of its gains in the first half of 2016, caution prevailed. Financial market turbulence in early 2016 and political uncertainties surrounding the U.K.'s "Brexit" vote to leave the European Union (EU) and the upcoming U.S. presidential election dampened capital spending.

With the current expansion considered to be on solid footing, the U.S. Federal Reserve (Fed) prepared to raise one of its main interest rates, which had been held near zero since December 2008 to help stimulate the economy. After delaying the rate change for most of 2015 because of a weak global economic growth outlook, the Fed announced in December 2015 that it would raise the fed funds target rate by 0.25%. The news was widely expected and therefore had a relatively muted impact on the financial markets.

Although the Fed continued to emphasize future rate increases would be gradual, investors worried about the pace. This, along with uncertainties about the global macroeconomic backdrop, another downdraft in oil prices and a spike in stock market volatility triggered significant losses across assets that carry more risk and fueled demand for "safe haven" assets such as Treasury bonds and gold from January through mid-February. However, fear began to subside in March 2016, supporting assets that carry more risk. The Fed held the rate steady at both the January and March policy meetings, as well as lowered its expectations to two rate increases in 2016 from four. Also boosting investor confidence were reassuring statements from the European Central Bank, some positive economic data in the U.S. and abroad, a retreat in the U.S. dollar and an oil price rally. At its April 2016 meeting, the Fed indicated its readiness to raise its benchmark rate at the next policy meeting in June. However, a very disappointing jobs growth report in May and the significant uncertainty surrounding the U.K.'s Brexit vote led the Fed to again hold rates steady at its June and July meetings. At the September meeting, the Fed indicated the case for increasing rates had strengthened but left the rate unchanged in anticipation of further progress toward its objectives. The Fed's policy making committee has one more meeting in 2016, with expectations favoring a rate hike potentially in December.

The U.K.'s vote on June 23, 2016 to leave the EU caught investors off guard. In response, U.K. sterling fell precipitously, global equities were turbulent and safe-haven assets such as gold, the U.S. dollar and U.S. Treasuries saw notable inflows. However, the markets stabilized fairly quickly, buoyed by reassurances from global central banks and a perception that the temporary price rout presented an attractive buying opportunity. July and August were relatively calm in the markets, then some headwinds resumed in September. Concerns about central bank actions, in the U.S., Europe and Japan, as well as an escalation of European banking sector woes and uncertainty about the U.S. presidential election triggered elevated volatility in the markets during the final month of the reporting period. After the close of the reporting period, similar to the Brexit response, the unexpected result of the U.S. election contributed to choppy trading across global markets.

The broad municipal bond market performed well during the twelve-month reporting period, supported by falling interest rates, a favorable supply-demand balance and generally improving credit fundamentals. The Fed's continued delays in raising short-term interest rates drove bond yields to lower levels over the reporting period. The largest declines were in longer-dated bond yields, while yields on the short end (zero to three years) of the yield curve increased, driven by anticipation of new money market fund regulations that triggered volatility in short-term rates. This caused the municipal yield curve to flatten over the reporting period.

The demand for municipal bonds continued to outpace supply. During the reporting period, municipal bond gross issuance nationwide totaled $412.3 billion, a 3.6% drop from the issuance for the twelve-month period ended September 30, 2015. Gross issuance remains robust as issuers continue to actively and aggressively refund their outstanding debt given the very low interest rate environment. In these transactions the issuers are issuing new bonds and taking the bond proceeds and redeeming (calling) old bonds. These refunding transactions have ranged from 40%-60% of total issuance over the past few years. Thus, the net issuance (all bonds issued less bonds redeemed) is actually much lower than the gross issuance. In fact, the total municipal bonds

outstanding has actually declined in each of the past four calendar years. So, the gross is surging, but the net is not and this has been an overall positive technical factor on municipal bond investment performance.

While supply has tightened, investor demand for municipal bonds has risen. Municipal bond mutual funds reported net inflows in 2015, and the inflows for the first four months of 2016 had already exceeded 2015's total volume for the year. The bouts of heightened volatility across other risky assets, uncertainty about the Fed's rate increases and the low to negative yields of European and Asian bonds have bolstered the appeal of municipal bonds' risk-adjusted returns and tax-equivalent yields. The municipal bond market is less directly influenced by the Fed's rate adjustments and its demand base is largely comprised of U.S. investors, factors which have helped municipal bonds deliver relatively attractive returns with less volatility than other market segments.

The fundamental backdrop also remained favorable for municipal bonds. Despite the U.S. economy's rather sluggish recovery, improving state and local balance sheets have contributed to generally good credit fundamentals. Higher tax revenue growth, better expense management and a more cautious approach to new debt issuance have led to credit upgrades and stable credit outlooks for many state and local issuers. While some pockets of weakness continued to grab headlines, including Illinois, New Jersey and Puerto Rico, their problems were largely contained, with minimal spillover into the broader municipal market.

How were economic and market conditions in New York during the twelve-month reporting period ended September 30, 2016?

New York State's $1.4 trillion economy represents 8.1% of U.S. GDP and, according to the International Monetary Fund, would be the 11th largest economy in the world on a standalone basis. As of September 2016, the state's unemployment rate registered 5.0%, matching the national average of 5.0%. According to the S&P CoreLogic Case-Shiller U.S. National Home Price Index of 20 major metropolitan areas, housing prices in New York City rose 1.7% over the twelve months ended August 2016 (most recent data available at the time this report was prepared), compared with an average increase of 5.3% nationally. The state's budget picture has improved considerably over the past few years, though Fiscal Year 2016 did show a small General Fund deficit. Revenues have been increased through tax hikes and expenditures have been more tightly controlled. On a significant positive note, New York State has collected approximately $8.7 billion in various settlements and assessments from the financial industry over the past two years. Proceeds from those settlements have been used to bolster reserves, foster economic development upstate, and provide funds for the replacement of the Tappan Zee Bridge. The adopted $156 billion budget for Fiscal Year 2017 is 9.9% higher than the adopted Fiscal Year 2016 budget, though State Operating Funds expenditures increased only 3.3% in Fiscal Year 2017. The Fiscal Year 2017 budget contains no new taxes. The budget includes a $1.5 billion increase in education spending. New York is a high income state, with per-capita income at 121% of the U.S. average, fourth-highest among the 50 states. New York is a heavily indebted state. The state's pensions have traditionally been well funded, though they did decline with the stock market financial crisis. As of September 2016, Moody's rates New York "Aa1" with a stable outlook. Moody's upgraded New York State from Aa2 to Aa1 on June 16, 2014 citing the State's sustained improvements in fiscal governance. S&P rates the state "AA+" with a stable outlook. S&P upgraded New York State from AA to AA+ on July 23, 2014, citing the State's improved budget framework. New York municipal bond supply totaled $46 billion for the twelve-month period ended September 30, 2016, a 4.1 % gross issuance increase from the same period ended September 30, 2015. This ranked New York third among state issuers behind California and Texas.

What key strategies were used to manage the New York Funds during the twelve-month reporting period ended September 30, 2016?

Despite the volatility during this reporting period, the low interest rate environment continued to attract investors to spread products, including municipal bonds. Credit spreads relative to Treasuries continued to tighten, helping the broad municipal market to appreciate during the twelve-month reporting period. The New York municipal market slightly underperformed the national market.

Our trading activity continued to focus on pursuing the Funds' investment objectives. Our approach focused on two areas of the New York municipal market. First, we looked for high quality bonds issued by large issuers that would likely maintain their liquidity, even if market conditions turned more volatile. Our second emphasis was on selectively buying bonds offering compelling yields in

Portfolio Manager's Comments (continued)
exchange for taking appropriate credit risk. These included purchases of tobacco securitization credits, charter school bonds and higher education issues.
To fund these purchases, we mostly used the proceeds from called and maturing bonds. Market conditions continued to be favorable for refunding activity, as issuers continued to refinance bonds to lower their debt costs. As such, call activity provided ample cash for our trading activities. In addition, the Funds occasionally sold bonds that were maturing in less than one year. For NAN and NRK, we also invested the proceeds from incremental preferred share offerings that were conducted as part of the overall management of the Fund's leverage.
As of September 30, 2016, all four of these Funds continued to use inverse floating rate securities. We employ inverse floaters for a variety of reasons, including duration management, income enhancement and total return enhancement.
How did the New York Funds perform during the twelve-month reporting period ended September 30, 2016?
The tables in each Fund's Performance Overview and Holding Summaries section of this report provide the Funds' total returns for the one-year, five-year, ten-year and/or since inception periods ended September 30, 2016. Each Fund's total returns on common share net asset value (NAV) are compared with the performance of corresponding market indexes and a Lipper classification average.
For the twelve months ended September 30, 2016, the total return at common share NAV for NNY, NAN and NRK exceeded the return for the S&P Municipal Bond New York Index and the national S&P Municipal Bond Index, while NYV performed in line with the state index and trailed the national index. For the same period, NRK exceeded, while the other three Funds lagged the average return for the Lipper New York Municipal Debt Funds Classification Average.
The main contributor to the Funds' relative performance during this reporting period was yield curve and duration positioning. We continued to overweight the longer parts of the yield curve with corresponding underweights to the shorter end of the curve, which resulted in longer durations than the benchmark. This positioning was advantageous in this reporting period as longer dated bonds generally outperformed shorter dated bonds as the yield curve flattened. We should note that the positive influence of yield curve and duration positioning was more muted in NYV than in the other three Funds, in part due to NYV's more recent inception date in 2009. As the bonds we bought at that time have drifted down the yield curve and approach their call dates, they have caused NYV's duration to shorten, lessening the performance advantage that duration positioning provided during this reporting period.
Credit ratings exposure was a secondary driver of the Funds' performance during this reporting period. Credit spread contraction and investor demand for higher-yielding securities continued to support the outperformance of lower-rated municipal bonds over this reporting period. The Funds were positioned with overweight allocations to the lower-quality categories (BBB rated and below investment grade) and underweight allocations to the highest-quality categories (AAA and AA rated), which was beneficial to performance.
Sector performance was mixed over this reporting period. Revenue sectors generally outperformed, driven by investors' reach for yield. Tobacco was the best performing sector during this reporting period, followed by the industrial development revenue/pollution control revenue (IDR/PCR) and health care sectors. On the opposite end, the pre-refunded and tax-supported sectors underperformed, generally due to their higher credit quality being out of favor with investors in this reporting period.
An Update Involving Puerto Rico
As noted in the Funds' previous shareholder reports, we continue to monitor situations in the broader municipal market for any impact on the Funds' holdings and performance: the ongoing economic problems of Puerto Rico is one such case. Puerto Rico's continued economic weakening, escalating debt service obligations, and long-standing inability to deliver a balanced budget led to multiple downgrades on its debt over the past two years. Puerto Rico has warned investors since 2014 that the island's debt burden may be unsustainable and the Commonwealth has been exploring various strategies to deal with this burden, including Chapter 9 bankruptcy, which is currently not available by law. On June 30, 2016, President Obama signed the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management and Economic Stability Act (PROMESA) into law. The legislation creates a path for Puerto Rico to establish an inde-

pendent oversight board responsible for managing the government's financial operations and restructure debt. Implementation is expected to take time, as the law focuses on developing a comprehensive five-year fiscal plan.

In terms of Puerto Rico holdings, shareholders should note that, as of the end of this reporting period, NYV had no exposure to Puerto Rico debt, NAN held 0.8%, NNY held 2.9% and NRK had an allocation of 3.1%, with all of the Funds' Puerto Rico holdings in insured bonds. The Puerto Rico credits offered higher yields, added diversification and triple exemption (i.e., exemption from most federal, state and local taxes). Puerto Rico general obligation debt is currently rated Caa2/CC/CC (below investment grade) by Moody's, S&P and Fitch, respectively, with negative outlooks.

A Note About Investment Valuations

The municipal securities held by the Funds are valued by the Funds' pricing service using a range of market-based inputs and assumptions. A different municipal pricing service might incorporate different assumptions and inputs into its valuation methodology, potentially resulting in different values for the same securities. These differences could be significant, both as to such individual securities, and as to the value of a given Fund's portfolio in its entirety. Thus, the current net asset value of a Fund's shares may be impacted, higher or lower, if the Fund were to change pricing service, or if its pricing service were to materially change its valuation methodology. On October 4, 2016 (subsequent to the close of this reporting period), the Funds' current municipal bond pricing service was acquired by the parent company of another pricing service. Thus there is an increased risk that each Fund's pricing service may change, or that the Funds' current pricing service may change its valuation methodology, either of which could have an impact on the net asset value of each Fund's shares.

Fund Leverage

IMPACT OF THE FUNDS' LEVERAGE STRATEGIES ON PERFORMANCE

One important factor impacting the returns of the Funds relative to their comparative benchmarks was the Funds' use of leverage through their issuance of preferred shares and/or investments in inverse floating rate securities, which represent leveraged investments in underlying bonds. NNY and NYV do not use regulatory leverage. The Funds use leverage because our research has shown that, over time, leveraging provides opportunities for additional income, particularly in the recent market environment where short-term market rates are at or near historical lows, meaning that the short-term rates the Fund has been paying on its leveraging instruments have been much lower than the interest the Fund has been earning on its portfolio of long-term bonds that it has bought with the proceeds of that leverage. However, use of leverage also can expose the Fund to additional price volatility. When a Fund uses leverage, the Fund will experience a greater increase in its net asset value if the municipal bonds acquired through the use of leverage increase in value, but it will also experience a correspondingly larger decline in its net asset value if the bonds acquired through leverage decline in value, which will make the Fund's net asset value more volatile, and its total return performance more variable over time. In addition, income in levered funds will typically decrease in comparison to unlevered funds when short-term interest rates increase and increase when short-term interest rates decrease. Leverage had a positive impact on the performance of the Funds over this reporting period.

As of September 30, 2016, the Funds' percentages of leverage are as shown in the accompanying table.

	NNY	NYV	NAN	NRK
Effective Leverage*	2.62%	5.01%	37.52%	37.27%
Regulatory Leverage*	0.00%	0.00%	32.45%	35.85%

* Effective leverage is a Fund's effective economic leverage, and includes both regulatory leverage and the leverage effects of certain derivative and other investments in a Fund's portfolio that increase the Fund's investment exposure. Currently, the leverage effects of Tender Option Bond (TOB) inverse floater holdings are included in effective leverage values, in addition to any regulatory leverage. Regulatory leverage consists of preferred shares issued or borrowings of a Fund. Both of these are part of a Fund's capital structure. Regulatory leverage is subject to asset coverage limits set forth in the Investment Company Act of 1940.

THE FUNDS' REGULATORY LEVERAGE

As of September 30, 2016, the following Funds have issued and outstanding Institutional MuniFund Term Preferred (iMTP) Shares, Variable Rate MuniFund Term Preferred (VMTP) Shares and/or Variable Rate Demand Preferred (VRDP) Shares as shown in the accompanying table. As mentioned previously, NNY and NYV do not use regulatory leverage.

	iMTP Shares		VMTP Shares		VRDP Shares		
	Series	Shares Issued at Liquidation Preference	Series	Shares Issued at Liquidation Preference	Series	Shares Issued at Liquidation Preference	Total
NAN	—	$—	2019	$147,000,000	1	$89,000,000	$236,000,000
NRK	2017	$79,000,000	—	$—	1	$112,300,000	
		—	—	—	2	164,800,000	
		—	—	—	3	161,700,000	
		—	—	—	4	50,000,000	
		—	—	—	5	175,000,000	
		$79,000,000		$—		$663,800,000	$742,800,000

During the current reporting period, NAN refinanced all of its outstanding Series 2017 VMTP Shares with the issuance of new Series 2019 VMTP Shares. In conjunction with this refinancing NAN issued an additional $53,000,000 Series 2019 VMTP Shares at liquidation preference, to be invested in accordance with the Fund's investment policies.

During the current reporting period, NRK issued $175,000,000 Series 5 VRDP Shares at liquidation preference, which will be used to invest in additional municipal securities in accordance with its investment objectives and policies and to pay costs associated with the transaction.

Refer to the Notes to Financial Statements, Note 4 – Fund Shares, Preferred Shares for further details on iMTP, VMTP and VRDP Shares and each Funds' respective transactions.

Common Share Information

COMMON SHARE DISTRIBUTION INFORMATION

The following information regarding the Funds' distributions is current as of September 30, 2016. Each Fund's distribution levels may vary over time based on each Fund's investment activity and portfolio investments value changes.

During the current reporting period, each Fund's distributions to common shareholders were as shown in the accompanying table.

	Per Common Share Amounts			
Monthly Distributions (Ex-Dividend Date)	NNY	NYV	NAN	NRK
October 2015	$0.0325	$0.0525	$0.0665	$0.0585
November	0.0325	0.0525	0.0665	0.0585
December	0.0325	0.0525	0.0665	0.0585
January	0.0325	0.0525	0.0665	0.0585
February	0.0325	0.0525	0.0665	0.0585
March	0.0325	0.0525	0.0665	0.0585
April	0.0325	0.0525	0.0665	0.0585
May	0.0325	0.0525	0.0665	0.0585
June	0.0325	0.0525	0.0650	0.0585
July	0.0325	0.0525	0.0650	0.0585
August	0.0325	0.0525	0.0650	0.0585