

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 8-380 / 08-0604

Filed May 29, 2008

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

G.B., Mother,
Appellant,

K.B., Father,
Appellant.

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Wapello County, William S. Owens,
Associate Juvenile Judge.

A mother and father appeal from the district court's order terminating their
parental rights to their sons. **AFFIRMED.**

Cynthia Hucks of Box and Box, Ottumwa, for appellant mother.

Mary Krafka of Krafka Law Office, Ottumwa, for appellant father.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, Kathrine Miller-Todd, Assistant
Attorney General, Mark Tremmel, County Attorney, and Seth Harrington,
Assistant County Attorney, for appellee State.

Samuel Erhardt of Erhardt & Erhardt, Ottumwa, for the minor children.

Considered by Huitink, P.J., and Vogel and Zimmer, JJ.

VOGEL, J.

A mother and father each appeal from the district court's order terminating their parental rights to K.B. (born in July 2004) and C.B. (born in December 2005) pursuant to Iowa Code section 232.116(1)(h) (2007). On appeal, both parents challenge the sufficiency of the evidence and the father challenges the services offered to achieve reunification.¹

Upon our de novo review, we conclude that the parents' arguments are without merit and termination is in the children's best interests. See *In re J.E.*, 723 N.W.2d 793, 798 (Iowa 2006). Over eighteen months, the parents were offered a multiplicity of services to assist them in working towards reunification. The district court noted that although the parents were able to make periodic progress, serious parenting deficiencies still existed. Due to safety risks left unaddressed in the parents' home, the children could not be returned to either parent's care either now or in the foreseeable future. Neither parent challenges the district court's detailed factual findings, and we find it unnecessary to repeat those here. Because we agree with the district court's careful findings and application of the law, we affirm pursuant to Iowa Court Rule 21.29(1)(a), (c), (d), (e).

AFFIRMED.

¹ The father raises a claim asserting that termination is not in the best interests of the children, but his argument is predominately that insufficient services were offered to achieve reunification.