STATE OF MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of TLC and MJC, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

 \mathbf{v}

WRENETHA CALHOUN,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JAMES ROOSEVELT,

Respondent.

Before: Sawyer, P.J., and O'Connell and Zahra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (j). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(g) and (j) were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I), *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Petitioner-appellee's evidence established that respondent-appellant failed to address her substance abuse and mental health problems. We find no merit to respondent-appellant's argument that petitioner failed to provide her with the services she needed to reunify her family. Respondent-appellant had two opportunities to benefit from treatment programs arranged through her probation, but she did not properly avail herself of these opportunities. There is no reason to believe that respondent-appellant would have performed better had the services been arranged through petitioner-appellee rather than through the probation officer. We also find no merit to any of respondent-appellant's arguments that the trial court improperly considered federal funding or adoption subsidy issues when it ordered termination of her parental rights.

UNPUBLISHED January 25, 2002

No. 234605 Ingham Circuit Court Family Division LC No. 00-030304-NA Because the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests, the trial court did not err in terminating her parental rights. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Affirmed.

/s/ David H. Sawyer /s/ Peter D. O'Connell

/s/ Brian K. Zahra