

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 8-742 / 08-1220
Filed September 17, 2008

**IN THE INTEREST OF Q.T.-R.D.,
Minor Child,**

**K.E., Mother,
Appellant.**

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Jones County, Angie Wilson,
District Associate Judge.

A mother appeals from the order terminating her parental rights.

AFFIRMED.

Craig Elliott of Elliott & McKean, Anamosa, for appellant mother.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, Kathrine Miller-Todd, Assistant
Attorney General, and Connie Ricklefs, County Attorney, for appellee State.

Jessica Wiebrand, Cedar Rapids, for minor child.

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

HUITINK, P.J.

K.E. appeals from the juvenile court's order terminating her parental rights concerning her child, Q.D. K.E. contends that the evidence does not support termination of her parental rights, the State failed to make reasonable efforts to reunify her with Q.D., and termination of her parental rights is not in Q.D.'s best interests. We review K.E.'s claims de novo. *In re C.B.*, 611 N.W.2d 489, 492 (Iowa 2000).

K.E.'s parental rights were terminated pursuant to Iowa Code sections 232.116(1)(d) and (h) (2007). When the trial court terminates on more than one statutory ground, we need only find termination is proper on one ground. *In re S.R.*, 600 N.W.2d 63, 64 (Iowa Ct. App. 1999).

The State is required to "make every reasonable effort to return the child to the child's home as quickly as possible consistent with the best interests of the child." Iowa Code § 232.102(7); *In re C.B.*, 611 N.W.2d at 493. This requirement involves providing "services to a parent before termination proceedings may be instituted." *In re C.H.*, 652 N.W.2d 144, 147 (Iowa 2002). "Reasonable efforts are aimed at both preventing and eliminating the need for removal." *Id.* "[W]hat constitutes reasonable services varies based upon the requirements of each individual case." *Id.* "Generally, in making reasonable efforts to provide services, the State's focus is on services to improve parenting." *Id.* "[I]t is the parent's responsibility to demand services if they are not offered prior to the termination hearing." *In re H.L.B.R.*, 567 N.W.2d 675, 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1997). "[V]oicing complaints regarding the adequacy of services to a social worker is not sufficient." *In re C.H.*, 652 N.W.2d at 148. "A parent must inform the juvenile

court of such challenge.” *Id.* When the parent alleging inadequate services fails to demand services other than those provided, the issue of whether services were adequate is not preserved for appellate review. *In re S.R.*, 600 N.W.2d at 65; *In re T.J.O.*, 527 N.W.2d 417, 420 (Iowa Ct. App. 1994). The record indicates K.E. failed to challenge the adequacy of the services provided or request additional services to facilitate reunification. This issue has not been preserved for appellate review, and we need not consider K.E.’s reasonable efforts argument.

Like the trial court, we find clear and convincing evidence supporting termination of K.E.’s parental rights under section 232.116(1)(h). Q.D. has been removed from K.E.’s home for six of the last twelve months. The unfortunate fact is that K.E. has failed to adequately address the parenting skills, domestic violence, mental health, and substance abuse issues necessitating Q.D.’s removal from her care and CINA adjudication. The record indicates K.E. is cohabiting with a man who has been convicted of assaulting two of his previous domestic partners. K.E. has also failed to comply with the court orders concerning substance abuse treatment and has since been charged with operating while intoxicated and tested positive for cocaine. K.E. has further failed to comply with recommended treatment or therapy following her mental health evaluations.

“A parent does not have an unlimited amount of time in which to correct his or her deficiencies.” *In re H.L.B.R.*, 567 N.W.2d at 677. Q.D. “should not be forced to endlessly await the maturity of [K.E.]” *In re C.L.H.*, 500 N.W.2d 449, 453 (Iowa 1993).

For the same reasons cited above, we reject K.E.'s argument that termination of her parental rights is not in Q.D.'s best interests. We accordingly affirm the juvenile court's order terminating her parental rights concerning Q.D.

AFFIRMED.