STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of WILLIAM GEORGE REESE, JR., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JUDI SCHULZ,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

WILLIAM GEORGE REESE,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED
July 10, 2001

No. 230667
Bay Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 98-006382-NA

In the Matter of WILLIAM GEORGE REESE, JR., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WILLIAM GEORGE REESE,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JUDI SCHULTZ,

No. 230775
Bay Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 98-006382-NA

Respondent.

Before: Saad, P.J., and Holbrook, Jr., and Murphy, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents appeal as of right from the trial court's order terminating their parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g). We affirm.

Once a trial court determines that one or more grounds for termination has been established by clear and convincing evidence, the trial court must terminate parental rights unless "there exists clear evidence, on the whole record, that termination is not in the child's best interests." *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). We review the trial court's findings under the clearly erroneous standard. *Id.* at 358. "A finding is clearly erroneous where the reviewing court is left with a firm and definite conviction that a mistake has been made." *In re Jackson*, 199 Mich App 22, 25; 501 NW2d 182 (1993).

After carefully reviewing the record, we conclude that the trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination had been established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to both respondents. The record establishes that despite their efforts, both respondent's made only modest progress, failing to master even basic parenting skills. For example, respondents evidenced an inability to comprehend the correct way to mix the child's formula even after repeated instruction. Further, the record shows that respondents rely heavily on third-party caretakers for helping them meet their own basic needs. Respondents' psychological evaluations indicate that it is "unrealistic" that either respondent "will attain the skills necessary to adequately care for" themselves, and that it is "equally unlikely" that either "will attain the skills necessary to adequately manage" custody of their minor son.

Additionally, considered in its entirety, the evidence did not show that termination of respondents' parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. Finally, we find no merit to respondents' claims that petitioner failed to modify its services to accommodate respondents' mental retardation, contrary to the Americans with Disabilities Act.[1] *In re Terry*, 240 Mich App 14, 27-28; 610 NW2d 563 (2000).

Affirmed.

/s/ Henry William Saad
/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.
/s/ William B. Murphy

---

[1] 42 USC 12101 *et seq.*