

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 8-168 / 07-2167
Filed March 14, 2008

**IN THE INTEREST OF J.B., B.B., A.B., and K.B.,
Minor Children,**

**M.K.H., Mother,
Appellant.**

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Linn County, Barbara H. Liesveld,
District Associate Judge.

A mother appeals the termination of her parental rights to her children.

AFFIRMED.

Sara L. Smith of Nidey, Peterson, Erdahl & Tindahl, P.L.C., Cedar Rapids,
for appellant.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, Kathrine S. Miller-Todd, Assistant
Attorney General, Harold Denton, County Attorney, and Rebecca Belcher,
Assistant County Attorney, for appellee.

Collin Olander, Hiawatha, for father.

Thomas Viner, Cedar Rapids, guardian ad litem for minor children.

Considered by Mahan, P.J., and Eisenhauer and Baker, JJ.

EISENHAUER, J.

A mother appeals the termination of her parental rights pursuant to Iowa Code sections 232.116(1)(f) and (h) (2007). She does not dispute the State proved the grounds for termination by clear and convincing evidence. Instead, she contends termination was not in the children's best interest and requests additional time to allow her to resume care of the children. We review her claim de novo. *In re C.H.*, 652 N.W.2d 144, 147 (Iowa 2002).

The children were adjudicated in need of assistance as a result of the parents' failure to supervise the children properly and concerns about the conditions of the home. They were originally removed and placed in foster care in May 2006 and returned to their parents' home within a week. In July 2006 they were removed again and have remained in foster care. Despite receiving services to correct the problems that led to the CINA, the mother has not been able to demonstrate stability in regard to her employment or housing. Concerns about the quality of her parenting continue to exist. Although she requests an additional six months to obtain stable housing, the crucial days of childhood cannot be suspended while the mother experiments with ways to face up to her own problems. See *In re C.K.*, 558 N.W.2d 170, 175 (Iowa 1997). The children simply cannot wait for responsible parenting. *Id.* The children have been in foster care since July 2006. While the law requires a "full measure of patience with troubled parents who attempt to remedy a lack of parenting skills," this patience has been built into the statutory scheme of chapter 232. *In re C.B.*, 611 N.W.2d 489, 494 (Iowa 2000).

The mother claims termination is not in the children's best interest. In seeking out those best interests, we look to the children's long-range as well as immediate interests. *In re L.L.*, 459 N.W.2d 489, 493 (Iowa 1990). This requires considering what the future holds for a child if returned to the parents. *Id.* at 493-94. When making this decision, we look to the parents' past performance because it may indicate the quality of care the parent is capable of providing in the future. *Id.* at 494.

The mother cites the closeness of the parent-child relationship as a reason termination is not in the children's best interest. As the district court noted, "[a]ny bond between the children and their mother is outweighed by the children's need for stability." We concur. The mother also argues against termination because the children were residing in three separate foster homes and it would be difficult for all four children to be placed in one adoptive home given their behavioral issues. However, the mother is unable to resume parenting responsibilities for the children now or in the foreseeable future. It is simply not in the best interests of children to continue to keep them in temporary foster homes while a natural parent gets her life together. *In re J.L.P.*, 449 N.W.2d 349, 353 (Iowa 1989).

Because the grounds for termination have been proved and termination is in the children's best interest, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.