

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

In re BRYCE A., et al., Persons Coming Under
the Juvenile Court Law.

STANISLAUS COUNTY COMMUNITY
SERVICES AGENCY,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

GARY A.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F065145

(Super. Ct. Nos. 516285 & 516286)

OPINION

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Stanislaus County. Ann Q.
Ameral, Judge.

Konrad S. Lee, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

John P. Doering, County Counsel, and Robin McIver, Deputy County Counsel, for
Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

Gary A. (father) appeals an order entered after a six-month review hearing
continuing placement of his sons, 13-year-old Bryce A. and 12-year-old Cannon A., out

of his care under Welfare and Institutions Code section 366.21.¹ He challenges the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the findings that (1) he was provided reasonable reunification services, and (2) his sons would be at substantial risk of detriment if returned to his care. We affirm.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

In February 2010, then 11-year-old Bryce and nine-year-old Cannon (collectively the boys) were living with their mother, Amber H., when they were detained from her due to her substance abuse and their unsafe and unsanitary living conditions.² Father was incarcerated at the state prison in Norco after being sentenced in March 2007 to a total prison term of six years, eight months; he had not had contact with the family for a significant period of time.

The Tuolumne County Department of Social Services (Department) initiated dependency proceedings. In March 2010, the Tuolumne County Superior Court took dependency jurisdiction over the boys under section 300, subdivisions (b) and (g), based on mother's history of substance abuse and neglect, and father's inability to care for the boys due to his incarceration. At disposition, the court removed the boys from their parents' custody, ordered reunification services for mother, and denied reunification services for father. The boys did not want any contact with father; mother had been their sole caretaker for the past six years and the boys had only minimal contact with father.

Father was released from prison in December 2010 and ordered to complete an inpatient drug and alcohol treatment program. He had not maintained contact with the boys during his incarceration. At the boys' request, father visited with them on

¹ Undesignated statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

² Father and mother also have a daughter, Layla, who was detained at the same time as the boys. Layla, who was 14 years old at the time, ran away from the placement. Her whereabouts remained unknown until October 18, 2011. Eventually Layla was returned to father's care. She is not a subject of this appeal.

December 12, 2010, while he was in treatment at Nirvana in Modesto. In the meantime, mother had made substantial progress on her reunification services. At the 12-month review hearing in February 2011, the boys, who had been in foster care, were returned to her custody and she was given family maintenance services. She was living with her boyfriend and his daughter in an apartment in Sonora.

An 18-month review hearing was held on July 26, 2011. The Department reported that since the prior review hearing, father had visited the boys several times, but the visits had not been consistent. Father had not contacted, or responded to correspondence from, child welfare services. He was last known to be in court-ordered inpatient substance abuse treatment; the social worker was unsuccessful in her attempts to contact him. Mother had ended her relationship with her boyfriend, who moved out of the home. Her housing situation was unstable as she needed to vacate her residence within the next few weeks and had limited income to find a new one. The boys were having trouble adjusting to being in mother's care; they both threatened to run away. Cannon upset easily, had tantrums, and threatened to hurt himself and others, while Bryce threw angry fits. Cannon had been hospitalized in April 2011 for suicidal ideation. The boys were both receiving counseling services. The Department recommended they remain in mother's care and she continue to receive family maintenance services. At the hearing, the juvenile court adopted the Department's recommendations and ordered six more months of family maintenance services.

Within the next month, the Department learned that mother had tested positive for Phenobarbital; she was dishonest when confronted about the positive test. The Department also learned mother had tested positive for opiates at a hospital emergency room and forged verification signatures for 12-step meetings she had been ordered to, but did not, attend. On September 2, 2011, the Department filed a section 387 petition to remove the boys from mother's custody and place them in foster care based on mother's behavior. The boys were detained and placed with the foster care family in Calaveras

County with whom they had been placed before being returned to mother's custody. When social workers told the boys they were going back into foster care, Bryce began crying hysterically and asked what his mother would do.

Father appeared at the September 27, 2011 jurisdictional hearing, submitted on the social worker's jurisdictional report, and requested reunification services. The juvenile court ordered the Department to prepare a case plan. Mother requested a contested jurisdictional hearing, which was held on October 5, 2011. After hearing mother's testimony, considering the Department's reports and hearing oral argument, the juvenile court found the section 387 petition's allegations true.

In a report prepared for the dispositional hearing, the Department recommended that reunification services not be offered to mother, but that father be given services. The social worker obtained a social history from father. He met mother when they were teenagers. After mother became pregnant with their daughter, Layla, they lived together, used drugs and moved every few months. He and mother often yelled and screamed at each other; sometimes the altercations became physical and mother called the police several times. His relationship with mother worsened. Layla and the boys were in his care "on and off" due to mother's unstable living situation. Father fell further into addiction, resulting in him going to prison, and the children went back into mother's care.

Father had a long history of substance abuse. He began using alcohol when he was 13 or 14 years old, and methamphetamine by the age of 16. After he and mother got together, they both used drugs and he got "dragged down" into the lifestyle. Father had bouts of sobriety and attempted treatment multiple times, but eventually he would relapse and end up in prison. He had lost touch with the children over the past four or five years due to being in and out of prison and treatment programs. Father admitted his substance abuse greatly affected the children, as it caused them to distrust him and caused distance in his relationships with them. Father felt his children did not believe in him anymore, due to his broken promises to them. He recognized that the domestic violence the

children witnessed opened them up to that lifestyle and likely caused their depression. He also recognized that the boys were particularly protective of mother and felt the need to take care of her. Father was willing to participate in any recommended services and eventually wanted to have the boys in his home. Father reported always having regular employment; he was working at a car wash approximately 35 hours per week.

The boys were adjusting well to being in foster care. The foster parents did not have any behavioral concerns regarding Bryce, although Bryce worried a great deal about mother's well-being. Cannon had not exhibited the behaviors he was having while living with mother; he appeared to be relieved he was back in foster care. The social worker commented that the boys were "very smart and outgoing," but the constant chaos and instability to which mother subjected them had a great impact on them.

The Department considered whether to place the boys with father, as he was the non-custodial parent. While father appeared to be following the conditions of his parole, and had secured housing and employment, the social worker did not believe it was appropriate to place the boys with him as his housing had minimal space and he had not had a consistent relationship with the boys for the last several years. Father had not yet received any visitation; the social worker was in the process of arranging visitation around father's "busy schedule." Father, who was attending junior college full time, told the social worker he was turning his life around for the better and could benefit from reunification services.

At the October 18, 2011 dispositional hearing, the parties submitted on the social worker's reports. The juvenile court ordered the boys remain dependents, removed them from their parents' custody, offered father reunification services and terminated mother's services. In father's case plan, which he signed on October 18, 2011, he was ordered to (1) participate in a mental health intake and any recommended treatment; (2) complete a parenting education program; (3) comply with random drug and alcohol testing at the social worker's discretion; and (4) attend three AA/NA meetings per week and provide

verification of meetings he attended to the case managing social worker at least once per week. Father was given once weekly supervised visitation, which could be changed at the social worker's discretion. A review hearing was set for April 10, 2012.

On March 14, 2012, the Department filed a request to transfer the case to Stanislaus County, where father lived, as the social worker was having difficulty managing the case and believed the Stanislaus County social services agency would be able to better manage the case and provide appropriate services. In a report submitted with the request, social worker Emily Amoruso stated that father was living in Modesto with his girlfriend, his daughter Layla and his youngest son, Noah. Father remained employed at the car wash and did not have reliable transportation. He had relapsed and voluntarily admitted himself into a 30-day residential treatment program at Nirvana Alcohol & Drug Treatment center, which he successfully completed on February 22, 2012. Amoruso reported that Cannon's mental and emotional states were stable at that time. Bryce also appeared to be coping well with the situation and was not displaying mental or emotional concerns. The boys had developed strong bonds with their care providers.

Amoruso reported that, as of March 2012, father had not complied with his case plan, as he failed to participate in a mental health intake, a parenting class, or provide verification of regular attendance at 12-step meetings. Amoruso had provided father with information about service providers in Stanislaus County to fulfill his case plan requirements, but father had not complied. Father had been cooperative with testing, however, and admitted relapsing on alcohol and methamphetamine in December 2011. He voluntarily entered the drug treatment center for 30 days, but failed to notify Amoruso of this, as he was embarrassed to do so.

Father had once weekly two-hour visits with the boys at the paternal grandmother's house in Turlock. Visitation was going well and father interacted appropriately with the boys. Noah and Layla were often present for visits and enjoyed

spending time with the boys. Father, however, did not consistently attend visits. He cancelled visits at least five times, citing transportation issues. He also missed visits while in residential treatment.

At the March 27, 2012 transfer-out hearing, the juvenile court ordered the case transferred to Stanislaus County. Stanislaus County juvenile court accepted the transfer-in at a hearing held on April 24, 2012, ordered the Stanislaus County Community Services Agency (Agency) to prepare and file a transfer-in and section 366.21, subdivision (e), report, and set a date for a review hearing.

In its report prepared for the hearing, the Agency recommended that father continue to receive services and the social worker be given discretion to allow overnight visits. The boys were doing well in foster care. They were not participating in counseling and did not wish to have counseling services. They liked the foster home and considered themselves part of the family, but did not want to be adopted as they wanted to live with father. The foster parents supported the boys' relationship with father and enjoyed a friendly relationship with father, which led to the boys being happy and well-adjusted.

Agency social worker Nichole Cunningham reviewed father's case plan. She stated that father had not been provided any referrals for a mental health intake. Cunningham provided father with referrals for (1) a drug and alcohol assessment, which father completed on May 3, 2012, (2) a domestic violence assessment, which was scheduled for June 7, 2012, and (3) a 12-week parenting class, which he was participating in with Sierra Vista Resource Center. Father had completed two of the 12 weeks of classes. At the alcohol and drug assessment, father tested positive for THC. Father admitted to relapsing on methamphetamine and alcohol in April, explaining that he lost his job after Easter and "partied" as a way to cope. It was recommended that father attend outpatient treatment at the Stanislaus Recovery Center. Father reported attending AA/NA meetings before the transfer, but he did not have a signed card to verify his

attendance. On April 25, 2012, Cunningham instructed father to attend one AA/NA meeting per day until his “AOD assessment.” Father provided verification of his attendance.

The boys visited father once per week for two hours. They enjoyed seeing him; Bryce counted down the days until each visit and considered it the best day of the week. Cannon wanted to see father more and really liked spending time with him. Father also wanted the visits increased.

Cunningham recommended that father receive an additional six months of reunification services. She stated it appeared that father “was not provided with appropriate referrals for services in Stanislaus County.” While father attempted to complete his case plan by locating available services, he was unable to address some of the concerns due to the lack of referrals. Since the case was transferred, Cunningham provided referrals, and father was cooperative and eager to work on his case plan. He promptly scheduled appointments with service providers and appeared dedicated to reunifying with the boys. The Agency was in the process of assessing father. He and his girlfriend had been fingerprinted and a home inspection completed on May 7, 2012. While the home appeared appropriate, the Agency was waiting for the fingerprint results and court approval before deciding whether to start overnight visits. Such visits appeared appropriate due to father’s cooperativeness, engagement in services and his bond with the boys.

The review hearing was continued twice, first to May 18, 2012, and again to June 8, 2012. At the May 18 hearing, the court issued an order giving the social worker discretion to allow overnight visits. The Agency filed an addendum report, in which the Agency social worker explained she had contacted Tuolumne County Department’s supervising social worker, Emily Amoruso, who had worked with the family. Amoruso reported father’s case plan included counseling (substance abuse/recovery services), parenting, 12-step meetings and drug testing. Amoruso said she provided father with

referrals for services in Stanislaus County, which included parenting at the Parent Resource Center or Sierra Vista, and recovery services at Behavioral Health and Recovery Services (BHRS). Amoruso wrote the places and numbers of the service providers on a paper for father. Father had gone into treatment at Nirvana without her knowledge, but she approved of the service provider. Amoruso said father drug tested several times and submitted one positive test for THC on September 30, 2011. Father did not provide Amoruso with verification of NA/AA meetings he attended.

From this information, the Agency social worker stated it appeared father had been provided referrals, including drug treatment, drug testing and parenting classes/program, and that father engaged in several services. Both Amoruso and father reported he attended Nirvana, which met the component of recovery services on his case plan. When the Agency social worker received the case, father already had begun participating in parenting classes at Sierra Vista, which indicated he was aware of the need for such a service. Based on this information, the Agency requested the court make a finding of reasonable services.

At the June 8, 2012 contested review hearing on the issue of reasonable services, the Agency submitted on the reports. Father testified that his October 18, 2011 case plan ordered him to receive counseling for substance abuse, domestic violence and parenting; to attend NA/AA meetings; and to complete a parenting course. About a week before Christmas, Amoruso gave him two telephone numbers, which were written on a piece of paper, and told father to contact them; one was for Behavioral Health Center and the other for Parent Resource Center. Father could not reach anyone at these numbers until January. When he did reach someone, both places told him he needed medical insurance to use their services; when he told them he had an open case in Tuolumne County, he was told to have his social worker contact them.

On January 14, 2012, father sought substance abuse treatment on his own by turning himself into Nirvana; he was aware of Nirvana because he had gone through them

before. His first week there was a blackout period in which he could not contact the social worker. Within a week and a half of being at Nirvana, Amoruso learned he was there and had contacted him; Amoruso approved of him being there, but did not provide him with any referral or contact information regarding a parenting class or domestic violence.

Once father left Nirvana on February 14 after completing the program, he again contacted Behavioral Health and was told they required insurance. Father was able to schedule an appointment for an evaluation at the Parent Resource Center and within a month of his release from Nirvana he began a program there. He started attending the parenting class the first week of April and had attended six or seven sessions.

Father said he attended AA or NA meetings, he kept attendance slips for February, as well as for April and May, but he did not have any slips for March. Father did not know why he did not get signed slips for March. Father admitted Amoruso told him he was required to attend NA/AA meetings and she asked him to get signatures verifying his attendance. Between October 2011 and March 2012, Amoruso never asked him to provide her with the signatures.

Initially father testified he had telephone contact with Amoruso once or twice between October and December, and he had no contact with her from her contact with him while in treatment until the review hearing in Tuolumne County at the end of March. He testified on cross-examination, however, that he had contact with Amoruso, whether by seeing her in court, talking to her face-to-face or by telephone, or by letter, about 20 times between October 18, 2011 and May 2012, during both the boys' and Layla's dependency cases. Father further testified that between October 18, 2011 and December 2012, when he received the telephone numbers, he asked his social worker for referral information more than once. Amoruso responded by saying "next week, not right now, no funds," and once said she was not familiar with what Stanislaus County provided.

After hearing oral argument on the issue of reasonable services, the juvenile court found from father's testimony that he was provided access to and visits with his children, and the Tuolumne County social worker had numerous contacts with him on at least a monthly basis. The court was concerned because it did not think services that were provided were perfect, but it recognized that some of the services ordered were offered. The court thought it was slow for the social worker to take two months to provide referrals, and it took longer than it should have, but it also did not think this was an extraordinarily long time. The court noted that father had only been drug tested once in Tuolumne County, but stated this could have been because father had not given the social worker any reason to require drug testing. The court was concerned about the failure to give a mental health assessment, which could have led to counseling as recommended by the assessment. The court recognized the case plan did not say that there was to be a specific domestic violence program; instead, it said that substance abuse, domestic violence, parenting and other issues would be determined by the clinician, but father was not provided the referrals he needed for that to occur.

The court found that, under the totality of the circumstances and based upon clear and convincing evidence, father was provided reasonable services based on the fact that the components of the case plan were basically, but not entirely, met. The court explained that if father is doing well but needs additional time to complete his case plan when the case reaches the 12-month review hearing, it would remember there were some issues in Tuolumne County and that Tuolumne County did not provide the services it believed he would have received in Stanislaus County, and consider giving him additional time if needed. The court found that returning the boys to father's custody would create a substantial risk of detriment to their safety, protection or physical or emotional wellbeing, found the extent of father's progress was good, ordered father's services continue and set a 12-month review hearing for September 20, 2012. The court

further ordered that the social worker would have discretion to begin a trial visit in father's home when deemed appropriate.

DISCUSSION

Reasonable Services

Father contends the juvenile court erred in finding he was provided reasonable services, claiming the Tuolumne County social worker did not make reasonable efforts to assist him in accessing services. Specifically, father contends reasonable efforts were not made because the social worker only gave him two referrals two months after services were ordered, and while she had ongoing contact with him, did nothing else to assist him with accessing services, such as contact Behavioral Health to authorize a mental health evaluation. He reasons it was impossible for the trial court to find services were reasonable when the case was transferred to Stanislaus County precisely because the Tuolumne County social worker was having difficulty managing his case plan.

We review the juvenile court's reasonable services finding for substantial evidence (*In re Alvin R.* (2003) 108 Cal.App.4th 962, 971), bearing in mind that in "almost all cases it will be true that more services could have been provided more frequently and that the services provided were imperfect." (*In re Misako R.* (1991) 2 Cal.App.4th 538, 547.) "The standard is not whether the services provided were the best that might be provided in an ideal world, but whether the services were reasonable under the circumstances." (*Ibid.*)

The Department has a duty to devise and implement a services plan based on a goal of reunification. (*In re Mario C.* (1990) 226 Cal.App.3d 599, 603-604.) To that end, the Department is required to make a good faith effort to help the parent access services. (*In re Riva M.* (1991) 235 Cal.App.3d 403, 414.) However, reunification services are voluntary and the Department cannot force an unwilling parent to participate in the case plan. (*In re Ronell A.* (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 1352, 1365.) The Department is not required to "take the parent by the hand and escort him or her to and through classes

or counseling sessions.” (*In re Michael S.* (1987) 188 Cal.App.3d 1448, fn. 5.)

Therefore, in assessing the reasonableness of reunification services, the juvenile court evaluates not only the Department’s efforts to assist the parent in accessing the services, but also the parent’s efforts to avail him or herself of those services. On appeal, father bears the burden of demonstrating error. (*Winograd v. American Broadcasting Co.* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 624, 632.)

In this case, we conclude substantial evidence supports the juvenile court’s reasonable services finding. Father’s case plan consisted of (1) completion of a mental health evaluation and participation in any recommended treatment, (2) a parenting class, (3) random drug and alcohol testing at the social worker’s discretion, and (4) attending three AA/NA meetings per week. Father admitted being aware of these requirements. Tuolumne County social worker Amoruso provided father with referrals to both a mental health evaluation and a parenting class. While it took her two months to do so, given that Amoruso needed to locate services in another county with which she presumably was not familiar, the delay was not unreasonable. Father did not require a referral for AA/NA meetings, as he was able to, and did, attend such meetings on his own. While father only recalled being drug tested once, Amoruso reported that he drug tested several times and was cooperative with testing.

Father asserts he should have received more assistance with accessing the mental health evaluation and parenting class. He testified he contacted both programs in January, before his admission to inpatient treatment, and was told he needed medical insurance to participate in them and the social worker should contact each program. While this may have been true regarding the mental health evaluation, the evidence shows that father could access the parenting class without social worker help or medical insurance, as he was able to do so by entering the parenting class after he was released from inpatient treatment.

Around this time, father relapsed. To his credit, he voluntarily admitted himself into a 30-day treatment program at Nirvana, where he had received inpatient treatment after his release from prison. But father neglected to tell Amoruso of his plan to enter treatment, which prevented her from tailoring father's case plan to his circumstances. Once she learned that he had entered treatment, Amoruso approved the provider. Inpatient treatment, however, delayed his ability to attend a parenting class or complete a mental health evaluation.

On his release from the treatment program, father was able to sign up for parenting and began attending classes. He again contacted the mental health provider and was told he needed medical insurance. While the record shows that Amoruso knew father had not completed a mental health intake, the record is silent on whether father ever told her why he was unable to do so. It reasonably could be inferred from Amoruso's report that father did not, as father had numerous opportunities to tell Amoruso she needed to contact the program, yet Amoruso did not report any problems with access.

Father argues the mere fact that Amoruso requested transfer of the case to Stanislaus County because she was having difficulty managing the case shows that the Department's efforts were unreasonable. That Amoruso found it difficult to manage from Tuolumne County services provided in Stanislaus County, however, does not necessarily mean that she did not attempt to locate services, inform father of them, and then follow up with father on his progress. She did all of these things. This is not a situation where the social worker was unavailable to father or refused to assist him. Instead, the evidence shows the opposite.

In sum, father was aware of his case plan components, Amoruso provided referrals to services in Stanislaus County, and she remained in contact with father so he could report any difficulties he had in obtaining services. Once Stanislaus County accepted the case, father was referred to a drug and alcohol assessment and a domestic violence assessment. We conclude that, viewing the record in the light most favorable to the

juvenile court's order, there was substantial evidence to show that both Tuolumne and Stanislaus Counties offered reasonable services to father.

Detriment if Returned to Father's Care

Father challenges the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the finding that the boys would be at risk of detriment if returned to his care. Once a child has been removed from his or her parents' custody under section 361, the juvenile court is required to review the child's status every six months. (*In re Joseph B.* (1996) 42 Cal.App.4th 890, 897 (*Joseph B.*)) At the first review hearing held six months after the initial dispositional hearing, "the court shall order the return of the child to the physical custody of his or her parent or legal guardian unless the court finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the return of the child to his or her parent or legal guardian would create a substantial risk of detriment to the safety, protection, or physical or emotional well-being of the child." (§ 366.21, subd. (e).) We review the court's finding to see if substantial evidence supports it. (*Angela S. v. Superior Court* (1995) 36 Cal.App.4th 758, 763.)

As a preliminary matter, we consider the Agency's argument that father forfeited his appellate challenge to the juvenile court's detriment finding. While generally issues not raised in the trial court cannot be raised on appeal, "[t]he contention that a judgment is not supported by substantial evidence, however, is an obvious exception to the rule." (*Tahoe National Bank v. Phillips* (1971) 4 Cal.3d 11, 23, fn. 17.) "In other words, when the merits of a case are contested, a parent is not required to object to the agency's failure to carry its burden of proof." (*In re Javier G.* (2006) 137 Cal.App.4th 453, 464.)

Here, father contested the evidence presented at trial, as he did not submit on the Agency's recommendations. Therefore, the juvenile court was required to "weigh evidence, make appropriate evidentiary findings and apply relevant law to determine whether the case has been proved." (*In re Richard K.* (1994) 25 Cal.App.4th 580, 589.) Unless a parent submits on the Agency's recommendation, the parent preserves the right to challenge the sufficiency of the evidence to support a particular legal conclusion.

(*Ibid.*) Father's challenge to the juvenile court's reasonable services finding is not forfeited on appeal. (*In re Brian P.* (2002) 99 Cal.App.4th 616, 622-623.)

Father asserts there is insufficient evidence to support the detriment finding because he had completed most of his services, he had stable housing, he was extremely bonded with the boys and the boys wanted to live with him. He reasons that because he substantially complied with services, he posed little risk of harm to the boys, and while he admittedly relapsed in May 2012, there was no evidence his drug use would harm the boys.

While the court must consider the extent to which the parent has cooperated with the services provided and the efforts he or she has made to correct the problems that gave rise to the dependency, the decision to return the child depends on the effect that action would have on the child's well-being. (*Joseph B.*, *supra*, 42 Cal.App.4th at p. 899.) Here, the record shows that the boys had been in and out of foster care over the past two years. They were emotionally stable during their first year of foster care, but after they were returned to mother's custody, they had trouble adjusting to living with her. They threatened to run away and Cannon threatened to hurt himself. Both were angry – Cannon had tantrums and Bryce threw angry fits. Bryce was protective of mother and feared for her when they were removed again. When the boys returned to their former foster care family, they stabilized. Although the social worker described the boys as smart and outgoing, she noted the constant chaos and instability mother had subjected them to impacted them greatly.

At that point, the boys' contact with father had been minimal. Father had a long history of substance abuse and had attempted treatment multiple times, only to relapse. This pattern continued during the dependency, as he relapsed twice during the first six months of services – first in December 2011 and, despite inpatient treatment, again in May 2012, when he used methamphetamine and alcohol to cope with losing his job. Father also had a history of domestic violence with mother. Father's visits with the boys

had been going well and the boys enjoyed seeing father, but father's attendance was inconsistent. While the boys wanted to live with father, their relationship with him had not been firmly established.

Given the boys' experience of being moved in and out of foster care, their volatile and self-destructive behavior while living with mother in chaotic circumstances, and the improvement of that behavior while living in a stable foster care situation, the juvenile court reasonably could conclude that it would be detrimental to the boys' emotional well-being to return them to father until father could establish stability in his own life. Otherwise, the boys could be placed with father only to require removal once again should father relapse and require further inpatient services. Under the circumstances, the juvenile court reasonably concluded, albeit impliedly, it would not be safe to return the boys until father further benefited from intensive services, and the boys developed a stronger relationship with father through the overnight and trial visits the court authorized.

DISPOSITION

The six-month review orders are affirmed.

Gomes, J.

WE CONCUR:

Levy, Acting P.J.

Franson, J.