NUVEEN CALIFORNIA DIVIDEND ADVANTAGE MUNICIPAL FUND 2
Form N-CSR
May 06, 2015

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 811-10197

Nuveen California Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund 2
(Exact name of registrant as specified in charter)

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

Kevin J. McCarthy
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: February 28

Date of reporting period: February 28, 2015

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.

Life is Complex

Nuveen makes things e-simple.

It only takes a minute to sign up for e-Reports. Once enrolled, you'll receive an e-mail as soon as your Nuveen Investments Fund information is ready—no more waiting for delivery by regular mail. Just click on the link within the e-mail to see the report and save it on your computer if you wish.

Free e-Reports right to your e-mail!

www.investordelivery.com
If you receive your Nuveen Fund dividends and statements from your financial advisor or brokerage account.

or

www.nuveen.com/accountaccess
If you receive your Nuveen Fund dividends and statements directly from Nuveen.

Table of Contents

Chairman's Letter to Shareholders

Dear Shareholders,

A pattern of divergence has emerged in the past year. Steady and moderate growth in the U.S. economy helped sustain the stock market's bull run another year. U.S. bonds also performed well, amid subdued inflation, interest rates that remained unexpectedly low and concerns about the economic well-being of the rest of the world. The stronger domestic economy enabled the U.S. Federal Reserve (Fed) to gradually reduce its large scale bond purchases, known as quantitative easing (QE), without disruption to the markets, as well as begin to set expectations for a transition into tightening mode.

The economic story outside the U.S. continues to improve. Despite the drama over Greece's debt negotiations, the European economy appears to be stabilizing. Japan is on a moderate recovery path as it emerged from recession late last quarter. China's economy decelerated and, despite running well above the rate of other major global economies, investors feared it looked slow by China's standards. Some areas of concern were a surprisingly steep decline in oil prices, the U.S. dollar's rally and an increase in geopolitical tensions, including the Russia-Ukraine crisis and terrorist attacks across the Middle East and Africa, as well as more recently in Europe.

While a backdrop of healthy economic growth in the U.S. and the continuation of accommodative monetary policy (with the central banks of Japan and potentially Europe stepping in where the Fed has left off) bodes well for the markets, the global outlook has become more uncertain. Indeed, volatility is likely to feature more prominently in the investment landscape going forward. Such conditions underscore the importance of professional investment management. Experienced investment teams have weathered the market's ups and downs in the past and emerged with a better understanding of the sensitivities of their asset class and investment style, particularly in times of turbulence. We recognize the importance of maximizing gains, while striving to minimize volatility.

And, the same is true for investors like you. Maintaining an appropriate time horizon, diversification and relying on practiced investment teams are among your best strategies for achieving your long-term investment objectives. Additionally, I encourage you to communicate with your financial consultant if you have questions about your investment in a Nuveen Fund. 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.

William J. Schneider
Chairman of the Board
April 22, 2015

Portfolio Manager's Comments

Nuveen California Municipal Value Fund, Inc. (NCA)
Nuveen California Municipal Value Fund 2 (NCB)
Nuveen California AMT-Free Municipal Income Fund (NKX)
Nuveen California Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund (NAC)
Nuveen California Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund 2 (NVX)
Nuveen California Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund 3 (NZH)

These Funds feature portfolio management by Nuveen Asset Management, LLC, an affiliate of Nuveen Investments, Inc. Portfolio manager Scott R. Romans, PhD, reviews U.S. economic and municipal market conditions at the national and state levels, key investment strategies and the twelve-month performance of these Nuveen California Municipal Funds. Scott has managed NCA, NKX, NAC, NVX and NZH since 2003 and NCB since its inception in 2009.

FUND REORGANIZATIONS

Effective before the opening of business on June 9, 2014, certain California Funds (the Target Funds) were reorganized into larger California Funds included in this report (the Acquiring Funds) as follows:

The approved reorganizations are as follows:

Target Funds	Acquiring Funds
Nuveen California Performance Plus Municipal Fund, Inc. (NCP)	Nuveen California Dividend Advantage Municipal Fund (NAC)
Nuveen California Municipal Market Opportunity Fund, Inc. (NCO)	
Nuveen California Investment Quality Municipal Fund, Inc. (NQC)	
Nuveen California Select Quality Municipal Fund, Inc. (NVC)	
Nuveen California Quality Income Municipal Fund, Inc. (NUC)	
Nuveen California Premium Income Municipal Fund (NCU)	Nuveen California AMT-Free Municipal Income Fund (NKX)

See Notes to Financial Statements, Note 1 – General Information and Significant Accounting Policies, Fund Reorganizations for further information.

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.

Ratings shown 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). Credit ratings are subject to change. AAA, AA, A and BBB are investment grade ratings; 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.

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)

What factors affected the U.S. economy and the national municipal bond market during the twelve-month reporting period ended February 28, 2015?

During this reporting period, the U.S. economy continued to expand at a moderate pace. The Federal Reserve (Fed) maintained efforts to bolster growth and promote progress toward its mandates of maximum employment and price stability by holding the benchmark fed funds rate at the record low level of zero to 0.25% that it established in December 2008. At its October 2014 meeting, the Fed announced that it would end its bond-buying stimulus program as of November 1, 2014, after tapering its monthly asset purchases of mortgage-backed and longer-term Treasury securities from the original $85 billion per month to $15 billion per month over the course of seven consecutive meetings (December 2013 through September 2014). In making the announcement, the Fed cited substantial improvement in the outlook for the labor market since the inception of the current asset purchase program as well as sufficient underlying strength in the broader economy to support ongoing progress toward maximum employment in a context of price stability. The Fed also reiterated that it would continue to look at a wide range of factors, including labor market conditions, indicators of inflationary pressures and readings on financial developments, in determining future actions. Additionally, the Fed stated that it would likely maintain the current target range for the fed funds rate for a considerable time after the end of the asset purchase program, especially if projected inflation continues to run below the Fed's 2% longer run goal. However, if economic data shows faster progress, the Fed indicated it could raise the fed funds rate sooner than expected.

The Fed changed its language slightly in December, indicating it would be "patient" in normalizing monetary policy. This shift helped ease investors' worries that the Fed might raise rates too soon. As the reporting period drew to a close, expectations were that the Fed would drop the word patient from its March post-meeting statement, in an effort to telegraph that a rate hike was likely in June. The March statement (issued after the close of this reporting period) did indeed remove the word patient but also highlighted the Fed's less optimistic view of the economy's overall health as well as downgraded its inflation projections.

In the fourth quarter of 2014, the U.S. economy, as measured by the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP), grew at a 2.2% annual rate, compared with 4.6% in the second quarter and 5.0% in the third quarter of 2014. The decline in real GDP growth rate from the third quarter to the fourth quarter primarily reflects an upturn in imports, a downturn in federal government spending and a decline in exports. These were partly offset by an upturn in consumer spending. The Consumer Price Index (CPI) fell 0.1% year-over-year as of January 2015 (most recent data available at the time this report was prepared), the first negative twelve-month change since October 2009. The core CPI (which excludes food and energy) increased 1.6% during the same period, below the Fed's unofficial longer term inflation objective of 2.0%. As of February 28, 2015, the national unemployment rate was 5.5%, the lowest level since May 2008 and the level considered "full employment" by some Fed officials, down from the 6.7% reported in February 2014. The housing market continued to post gains, although price growth has shown signs of deceleration in recent months. The average home price in the S&P/Case-Shiller Index of 20 major metropolitan areas rose 4.6% for the twelve months ended January 2015 (most recent data available at the time this report was prepared).

Municipal bonds enjoyed strong performance during the twelve-month reporting period, buoyed by a backdrop of low interest rates, improving investor sentiment and favorable supply-demand dynamics. Interest rates were widely expected to rise in 2014, as the economy improved and the Fed wound down its asset purchases. However, the 10-year Treasury yield ended the year even lower than where it began. As a result, fixed income asset classes performed surprisingly well (as yields fall, prices rise and vice versa). At the same time, investors grew more confident that the Fed's tapering would proceed at a measured pace and that the credit woes of Detroit and Puerto Rico would be contained. In addition, credit fundamentals for state and local governments were generally stabilizing, although pockets of trouble remained. California and New York showed marked improvements during 2014, whereas Illinois, New Jersey and Puerto Rico, for example, still face considerable challenges.

Investors' declining risk aversion bolstered demand for higher yielding assets, including municipal bonds, which reversed the tide of outflows municipal bond funds suffered in 2013. While demand and inflows rose, supply continued to be subdued. More municipal bonds left the market than were added in 2014, a condition known as net negative issuance. Part of the reason for net negative issuance was that a significant portion of issuer activity focused on current refundings, in which a new bond is issued to replace the called bond (in contrast to an advanced refunding, where the called bond remains in the market as a pre-refunded bond).

These factors helped drive municipal bond yields lower and tightened yield spreads relative to Treasuries in 2014 overall. However, as the new year began, market conditions turned more volatile. A series of disappointing economic data underscored the fragility of the U.S. recovery, as well as cast further uncertainty on the timing of the Fed's first rate hike. A change in the supply-demand balance also hampered the municipal bond sector. Issuance was unusually strong in the first two months of 2015, up 72.5% compared to the same two-month period in 2014. Over the twelve months ended February 28, 2015, municipal bond issuance nationwide totaled $358.8 billion, an increase of 13% from the issuance for the twelve-month period ended February 28, 2014. Finally, divergence in economic growth and foreign central bank policies have reinforced an interest rate differential that favors demand for U.S. Treasuries, maintaining downward pressure on yields.

How were the economic and market environments in California during the twelve-month reporting period ended February 28, 2015?

California's economy is the largest in the United States and ranks 8th in the world according to the International Monetary Fund and continues to strengthen with employment growth driven by high technology, international trade and tourism but also supplemented by better residential construction and real estate conditions. The state's labor force participation rate saw a large rebound reducing the risk to recovery. As of February 2015, California's preliminary unemployment rate was 6.7%, down from 8% as of February 2014. According to the S&P/Case-Shiller Index, home prices in San Diego, Los Angeles and San Francisco rose 5.1%, 5.7% and 7.9%, respectively, over the twelve months ended January 2015 (most recent data available at the time this report was prepared) compared with an average increase of 4.6% nationally. California entered its fourth straight year of drought conditions resulting in the Governor issuing mandatory water cuts. In looking at the impact of the drought more broadly, the non-partisan Legislative Analyst Office says the drought is not likely to have a significant effect on California's economy or state government revenues in the short term. Agriculture is exempt from the mandate though farms consume 80% of California's water but only generate 2% of the state's economic activity. The most significant economic risk would be a slowdown in California's home building industry, which is a major part of the state's economy. On the fiscal front, the Fiscal 2014 general fund budget totaled $97.1 billion and did not require major expenditure cuts and revenue raising. Fiscal Year 2015 is projected to transfer excess revenue to the rainy day fund for the first time since Fiscal Year 2008. The enacted Fiscal 2015 budget continues to pay down budgetary deferrals; implements a funding plan for California State Teachers Retirement System (teachers' pension system); transfers funds to the rainy day fund; and provides funds for deferred maintenance and infrastructure projects. Strong revenue growth due to a recovering economy and the passage of Proposition 30 (increases state sales and personal income taxes temporarily) have aided in the State's fiscal recovery. For Fiscal 2015-2016, the proposed General Fund Governor's Budget totals $113.3 billion (up 1.4% over the forecast in the 2014 Budget Act). The proposed budget is expected to be again balanced, add to reserves, continue to pay down the "Wall of Debt" (education funding deferrals and budgetary obligations) and proposes to address the state's retiree health liabilities over the next few decades. In November 2014, S&P upgraded its rating on California general obligation (GO) debt to A+ from A and revised the outlook to stable from positive. Moody's upgraded the State GO to Aa3 with stable outlook from A1 in June 2014. During the twelve months ended February 28, 2015, municipal issuance in California totaled $48.7 billion, an increase of 6.8% for the twelve months ended February 28, 2014. For this reporting period, California was the largest state issuer in the nation, representing approximately 13.9% of total issuance nationwide.

What key strategies were used to manage these California Funds during the twelve-month reporting period ended February 28, 2015?

A backdrop of supportive technical and fundamental factors helped the municipal market rally for most of the reporting period. For the reporting period as a whole, municipal bond prices generally rose, while interest rates declined. California municipal paper as a whole outperformed the national market, due in part to increased demand triggered by recent changes in the state tax code as well as improving economic conditions in the state. During this time, we continued to take a bottom-up approach to discovering sectors that appeared undervalued as well as individual credits that we believed had the potential to perform well over the long term.

Portfolio Manager's Comments (continued)

We continued to find opportunities to purchase bonds in both the primary and secondary markets that helped us keep the Funds fully invested. As the municipal market improved over the course of the reporting period, we increasingly positioned our portfolios more defensively by focusing on higher grade bonds that offered good liquidity and that were positioned in the longer intermediate part of the yield curve, (i.e. 18 to 22 years, rather than 25 to 30 years). At the same time, we became more selective within the lower credit quality segments of the market, as yield spreads on lower rated bonds began to tighten. One exception to our longer duration focus was our trading in tobacco bonds, which moved toward the shorter end of the yield curve during the reporting period.

Overall, our emphasis in purchase activity was on relative value and credit quality, rather than sector. That is, when considering the purchase of a lower rated bond or a slightly less liquid issue, we looked carefully at the compensation offered by the bond in question relative to its credit quality and to other opportunities available in the market. During this reporting period, our purchases of high grade, liquid bonds included California general obligation (GO) bonds as well as California State Public Works credits, which were upgraded during the reporting period. As spreads on these bonds tightened following the upgrade, we shifted our focus to other bonds in the high-grade end of the spectrum. In the second half of the reporting period, notable additions included school district GOs, community college GOs, local sales tax bonds, health care credits, and water and electric utilities credits, all of which were from the higher rated segments of the market.

In June 2014, Moody's upgraded its credit rating on California GO debt to Aa3 from A1, the highest level since 2001, citing California's rapidly improving financial position, high but declining debt metrics, adjusted net pension liability ratios and robust employment growth. S&P had revised its outlook for the state to positive from stable, while affirming an A rating. Fitch continued to rate the state at A with a stable outlook. Also during this reporting period, S&P upgraded its credit rating on National Public Finance Guarantee Corp. (NPFG), the insurance subsidiary of MBIA, to AA- rated from A rated, citing NPFG's strong operating performance and competitive position in the financial guarantee market. As a result, the ratings on the Funds' holdings of bonds backed by insurance from NPFG were similarly upgraded to AA- as of mid-March 2014. This action produced an increase in the percentage of our portfolios held in the AA- rated credit quality category (and a corresponding decrease in the A-rated category), improving the overall credit quality of the Funds. During this reporting period, S&P also upgraded its rating on Assured Guaranty Municipal (AGM) as well as AGM's municipal-only insurer Municipal Assurance Corp. to AA from AA-.

Cash for purchases was generated primarily by proceeds from called and matured bonds, which we worked to redeploy to keep the Funds fully invested and support their income streams. The decline in municipal yields and the flattening of the municipal yield curve relative to the Treasury curve helped to make refunding deals more attractive and we saw an increase in this activity during the reporting period, as bond issuers sought to lower costs through refinancings. This provided ample cash for purchases and drove most of our trading activity for the reporting period.

As of February 28, 2015, all six 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 Funds perform during the twelve-month reporting period ended February 28, 2015?

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 February 28, 2015. Each Fund's returns on common share net asset value (NAV) are compared with the performance of corresponding market indexes and Lipper classification average.

For the twelve months ended February 28, 2015, the total returns at common share NAV for all six of these Funds exceeded the return for the S&P Municipal Bond California Index as well as that for the national S&P Municipal Bond Index. For this same period, NKX, NAC, NVX and NZH outperformed the average return for the Lipper California Municipal Debt Funds Classification Average, while NCA and NCB trailed this Lipper California average.

Key management factors that influenced the Funds' returns during this reporting period included duration and yield curve positioning and credit exposure. Sector allocation had a relatively negligible impact on returns. In addition, the use of leverage was an important factor in performance. Among the primary reasons that the returns of NCA and NCB lagged those of the other Funds for this reporting period was that these two Funds do not use regulatory leverage. Leverage is discussed in more detail later in this report.

Given the combination of declining interest rates and a flattening yield curve during this reporting period, municipal bonds with longer maturities generally outperformed those with shorter maturities. Overall, credits with maturities of 15 years or more, especially those at the longest end of the municipal yield curve, outperformed the general municipal market, while bonds at the shortest end of the curve produced the weakest results. In general, the Funds' durations and yield curve positioning were positive for their performance. Consistent with our long-term strategy, all of these Funds tended to be overweighted in the longer parts of the yield curve that performed best and underweighted in the underperforming shorter end of the curve.

During this reporting period, lower rated bonds generally outperformed higher quality bonds, as the municipal market rally continued and investors became more willing to accept risk. The B-rated category was an outlier from the overall trend, however, as the predominance of Puerto Rico bonds in this segment contributed to weaker performance. Improving credit fundamentals also supported investor demand for lower rated bonds in California. In addition to the upgrade in state GOs (described earlier in the key strategies section), evidence of a turnaround in other sectors further contributed to the stronger relative performance of the lower rated segments. For example, health care bonds benefited from an increase in health care utilization, driven by the improving jobs market. Improvements in the assessed value of California real estate along with an easing of uncertainty about the state's tax allocation sector boosted trading volumes for real estate-related bonds, notably special tax districts, community facilities districts and incremental tax districts. In general, the Funds tended to have overweights in the lower quality categories and underweights in the AAA-rated and AA-rated categories, which helped their performance.

An Update Involving Puerto Rico

We also continue to monitor ongoing economic developments in Puerto Rico for any impact on the Funds' holdings and performance. Shareholders should note that NCB had no exposure to Puerto Rico bonds during this reporting period. NVX had less than 2% and the other four Funds had allocations of less than 1% at the end of the reporting period. The Puerto Rico credits offered higher yields, added diversification and triple exemption (i.e., exemption from most federal, state and local taxes). However, 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. Following the latest rating reduction by Moody's in July 2014, Puerto Rico general obligation debt was rated B2/BB+/BB (below investment grade) by Moody's, S&P and Fitch, respectively, with negative outlooks.

On February 6, 2015, a federal court found Puerto Rico's Recovery Act to be unconstitutional. Though the Commonwealth is pursuing an appeal of the ruling, the outcome is uncertain. Puerto Rico's non-voting Representative in Congress recently introduced legislation that would make chapter 9 bankruptcy available to the Commonwealth's public corporations. A congressional committee hearing was held on February 26, 2015, but the bill has not advanced out of committee.

In light of the evolving economic situation in Puerto Rico, Nuveen's credit analysis of the Commonwealth had previously considered the possibility of a default and restructuring of public corporations and we adjusted our portfolios to prepare for such an outcome, although no such default or restructuring has occurred to date. The Nuveen complex's entire exposure to obligations of the government of Puerto Rico and other Puerto Rico issuers totaled 0.36% of assets under management as of February 28, 2015. As of February 28, 2015, the Funds' limited exposure to Puerto Rico generally was invested in bonds that were insured (which we believe adds value), pre-refunded (and therefore backed by securities such as U.S. Treasuries), or tobacco settlement bonds. Overall, the small size of our exposures meant that our Puerto Rico holdings had a negligible impact on performance.

Fund Leverage

IMPACT OF THE FUNDS' LEVERAGE STRATEGY 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. As mentioned previously, NCA and NCB 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. For NCA, the impact was minimal due to the low level of leverage used in the Fund.

As of February 28, 2015, the Funds' percentages of leverage are as shown in the accompanying table.

	NCA	NCB	NKX	NAC	NVX	NZH
Effective Leverage*	1.65%	9.43%	34.43%	35.66%	31.64%	37.68%
Regulatory Leverage*	0.00%	0.00%	30.10%	28.99%	29.57%	31.07%

* 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 February 28, 2015, the following Funds have issued and outstanding Institutional MuniFund Term Preferred (iMTP) Shares and Variable Rate Demand Preferred (VRDP) Shares as shown in the accompanying table. As mentioned previously, NCA and NCB do not use regulatory leverage.

	iMTP Shares		VRDP Shares		
	Series	Shares Issued at Liquidation Value	Series	Shares Issued at Liquidation Value	Total
NKX	2018	$ 36,000,000	2	$ 35,500,000	
			3	$ 42,700,000	
			4	$ 109,000,000	
			5	$ 104,400,000	
		$ 36,000,000		$ 291,600,000	$ 327,600,000
NAC	—	—	1	$ 136,200,000	
			2*	$ 91,000,000	
			3*	$ 49,800,000	
			4*	$ 105,600,000	
			5*	$ 158,900,000	
			6*	$ 158,100,000	
				$ 699,600,000	$ 699,600,000
NVX	—	—	1	$ 98,000,000	$ 98,000,000
NZH	—	—	1	$ 160,000,000	$ 160,000,000

* VRDP Shares issued in connection with the reorganization.

During the current reporting period, NKX issued MuniFund Term Preferred (MTP) Shares in connection with its reorganization. These MTP Shares were refinanced with the issuance of iMTP Shares prior to the end of the reporting period. Refer to Notes to Financial Statements, Note 1 — General Information and Significant Accounting Policies for further details on iMTP, MTP and VRDP Shares and each Fund's respective transactions.

Common Share Information

COMMON SHARE DISTRIBUTION INFORMATION

The following information regarding the Funds' distributions is current as of February 28, 2015. Each Fund's distribution levels may vary over time based on each Fund's investment activity and portfolio investment 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					
Ex-Dividend Date	NCA	NCB	NKX	NAC	NVX	NZH
March 2014	$ 0.0390	$ 0.0650	$ 0.0700	$ 0.0740	$ 0.0750	$ 0.0670
April	0.0390	0.0650	0.0700	0.0740	0.0750	0.0670
May	0.0390	0.0650	0.0700	0.0740	0.0750	0.0670
June*	0.0390	0.0650	0.1400	0.1480	0.0700	0.0670
July	0.0390	0.0650	0.0000	0.0000	0.0700	0.0670
August	0.0390	0.0650	0.0700	0.0800	0.0700	0.0670
September	0.0390	0.0650	0.0700	0.0800	0.0700	0.0670
October	0.0390	0.0650	0.0700	0.0800	0.0700	0.0670
November	0.0390	0.0650	0.0700	0.0800	0.0700	0.0670
December	0.0390	0.0650	0.0720	0.0800	0.0700	0.0670
January	0.0390	0.0650	0.0720	0.0800	0.0700	0.0670
February 2015	0.0390	0.0650	0.0720	0.0800	0.0700	0.0670
Long-Term Capital Gain**	$ —	$ 0.1119	$ —	$ —	$ —	$ —
Ordinary Income Distribution**	$ —	$ 0.0057	$ —	$ —	$ —	$ —
Market Yield***	4.40%	4.68%	5.89%	6.26%	5.76%	5.90%
Taxable-Equivalent Yield***	6.74%	7.17%	9.02%	9.59%	8.82%	9.04%

* In connection with NKX's reorganization, the Fund declared a dividend of $0.0700 per common share with an ex-dividend date of June 4, 2014, payable on July 1, 2014 and a dividend of $0.0700 per common share with an ex-dividend date of June 4, 2014, payable on August 1, 2014. In connection with NAC's reorganization, the Fund declared a dividend of $0.0740 per common share with an ex-dividend date of June 4, 2014, payable on July 1, 2014, a dividend of $0.0686 per common share with an ex-dividend date of June 4, 2014, payable on August 1, 2014 and a dividend of $0.0054 per common share with an ex-dividend date of June 17, 2014, payable on August 1, 2014.

** Distribution paid in December 2014.

*** Market Yield is based on the Fund's current annualized monthly distribution divided by the Fund's market price as of the end of the reporting period. Taxable-Equivalent Yield represents the yield that must be earned on a fully taxable investment in order to equal the yield of the Fund on an after-tax basis. It is based on a combined federal and state income tax rate of 34.7%. When comparing a Fund to investments that generate qualified dividend income, the Taxable-Equivalent Yield is lower.

Each Fund in this report seeks to pay regular monthly dividends out of its net investment income at a rate that reflects its past and projected net income performance. To permit each Fund to maintain a more stable monthly dividend, the Fund may pay dividends at a rate that may be more or less than the amount of net income actually earned by the Fund during the period. If a Fund has cumulatively earned more than it has paid in dividends, it will hold the excess in reserve as undistributed net investment income (UNII) as part of the Fund's net asset value. Conversely, if a Fund has cumulatively paid in dividends more than it has earned, the excess will constitute a negative UNII that will likewise be reflected in the Fund's net asset value. Each Fund will, over time, pay all its net investment income as dividends to shareholders.

As of February 28, 2015, the Funds had positive UNII balances for tax purposes and positive UNII balances for financial reporting purposes.

All monthly dividends paid by each Fund during the current reporting period, were paid from net investment income. If a portion of the Fund's monthly distributions was sourced from or comprised of elements other than net investment income, including capital gains and/or a return of capital, shareholders would have received a notice to that effect. For financial reporting purposes, the composition and per share amounts of each Fund's dividends for the reporting period are presented in this report's Statement of Changes in Net Assets and Financial Highlights, respectively. For income tax purposes, distribution information for each Fund as of its most recent tax year end is presented in Note 6 – Income Tax Information within the Notes to Financial Statements of this report.

COMMON SHARE REPURCHASES

During August 2014, the Funds' Board of Directors/Trustees reauthorized an open-market share repurchase program allowing each Fund to repurchase an aggregate of up to approximately 10% of its outstanding shares.

As of February 28, 2015, and since the inception of the Funds' repurchase programs, the Funds have cumulatively repurchased and retired common shares as shown in the accompanying table.

	NCA	NCB	NKX	NAC	NVX	NZH
Common Shares Cumulatively Repurchased and Retired	0	0	0	0	50,700	12,900
Common Shares Authorized for Repurchase	2,530,000	330,000	4,770,000	10,740,000	1,475,000	2,415,000

During the current reporting period, the Funds did not repurchase any of their outstanding common shares.

COMMON SHARE EQUITY SHELF PROGRAMS

During the reporting period, the following Funds were authorized to issue additional common shares through their ongoing equity shelf programs. Under these programs, each Fund, subject to market conditions, may raise additional capital from time to time in varying amounts and offering methods at a net price at or above the Fund's NAV per common share. Under the equity shelf programs, the Funds are authorized to issue the following number of additional common shares.

	NCA	NKX	NAC
Additional Common Shares Authorized	2,500,000	4,100,000	2,300,000

During the current reporting period, NCA sold common shares through its equity shelf program at a weighted average premium to its NAV per common share as shown in the accompanying table.

	NCA
Common Shares Sold through Equity Shelf Program	124,572
Weighted Average Premium to NAV per Common Share Sold	