IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF OREGON

In the Matter of K. L. H., a Child.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, Petitioner-Respondent,

υ.

R. A. H., Jr. and A. M., *Appellants*.

Washington County Circuit Court 17JU09088; A170200 (Control)

In the Matter of S. E. H., a Child.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, Petitioner-Respondent,

υ.

R. A. H., Jr. and A. M., *Appellants*.

Washington County Circuit Court 17JU09089: A170202

Erik M. Buchér, Judge.

Submitted August 1, 2019.

Shannon Storey, Chief Defender, Juvenile Appellate Section, and Shannon Flowers, Deputy Public Defender, Office of Public Defense Services, filed the brief for appellant R. A. H., Jr.

Ginger Fitch filed the brief for appellant A. M.

Ellen F. Rosenblum, Attorney General, Benjamin Gutman, Solicitor General, and Erin K. Galli, Assistant Attorney General, filed the brief for respondent.

Before Lagesen, Presiding Judge, and DeVore, Judge, and Powers, Judge.

PER CURIAM

Reversed and remanded.

PER CURIAM

Mother and father each appeal permanency judgments with respect to two of their children, K and S. The iudgments continue the children's permanency plans as reunification. Parents contend that the judgments do not satisfy the requirements of ORS 419B.476(5) in a number of ways, including by omitting "a brief description of the efforts the department has made with regard to the case plan in effect at the time of the permanency hearing," as ORS 419B.476(5)(a) mandates. The state concedes that the judgments lack the description of the department's efforts required by ORS 419B.476(5)(a), and, further, that the error requires us to reverse and remand under Dept. of Human Services v. T. H., 254 Or App 394, 401, 294 P3d 531 (2012), and State ex rel DHS v. M. A. (A139693), 227 Or App 172, 183-84, 205 P3d 36 (2009). In view of T. H. and M. A., we accept the state's concession and reverse and remand.

Reversed and remanded.

¹ The judgments refer to an "attached" Exhibit 1 as containing the description of the department's efforts, but no Exhibit 1 is attached to the judgments. The record contains three documents designated Exhibit 1 and it is unclear which of those, if any, the juvenile court intended to reference.