



Recognizing the child's positive relationship with her grandparents, the court stated its willingness to order reasonable visitation between them. The present appeal followed the court's disposition order.

On appeal, father challenges the juvenile court's findings and its ultimate conclusion that C.C.'s best interests rest in remaining in DCF legal custody. We review the court's findings for clear error. Even if contradictory evidence exists, this Court will affirm the findings if they are supported by any credible evidence. In re A.F., 160 Vt. 175, 178 (1993). Evidentiary weight and credibility are, however, discretionary determinations for the juvenile court to make. Id. Finally, we will let legal conclusions stand on appeal if the findings support them. Id.

Section 5528 of Title 33 sets forth the disposition options for children adjudicated CHINS. The juvenile court may permit a child to remain with her parents, place the child in protective supervision, or transfer legal custody and guardianship of the child to DCF, a licensed foster or group home, or any other person deemed qualified by the court to assume responsibility for the child. 33 V.S.A. ' 5528(1)-(3); see also In re J.D., 165 Vt. 440, 443 (1996) (explaining that ' 5528(a)(3)(B) allows juvenile court to transfer custody of a CHINS child to an individual the court finds is qualified to provide care). The disposition ordered must be the most suited to the protection and physical, mental and moral welfare of the child. 33 V.S.A. ' 5528(a); In re J.D., 165 Vt. at 442. Disposition decisions are discretionary, and this Court requires the juvenile court to use its A[b]est judgment, rather than perfection, as the guiding standard. In re J.D., 165 Vt. at 444-45.

Father claims that the court ordered DCF custody for C.C. based on erroneous findings that: (1) DCF placed C.C. with her foster family to accommodate mother's wishes; (2) grandmother's mental health evaluation did not take place until after the first disposition hearing; and (3) grandparents did not follow through on obtaining a foster-care license while C.C. was in foster care. The record contains evidence on these points, and although the evidence may be conflicting, there is no basis to overturn the findings. Moreover, as this Court has stated repeatedly, erroneous factual findings do not compel reversal unless the remaining findings fail to support the juvenile court's conclusions. In re C.M., 157 Vt. 100, 103 (1991); In re A.F., 160 Vt. at 178-79. Thus, even if the findings father challenges lacked evidentiary support, the juvenile court's disposition order must be affirmed if the remaining findings support the court's decision. In re A.F., 160 Vt. at 178-79.

Here, the court found that grandmother and grandfather both have physical ailments and that grandmother has mental health issues that require significant medication. Grandmother's chronic pain sometimes limits her ability to even stand up. C.C. is a young child who, the court noted, has spent a substantial portion of her life with her current foster family. The court recognized that while C.C.'s best interests require that she maintain a relationship with her grandparents, DCF legal custody with placement in foster care was the disposition most suited to protect the child's physical and mental well being under the circumstances. Because the findings support the court's conclusion on C.C.'s best interests, no reversible error appears.

Affirmed.

BY THE COURT:

---

Paul L. Reiber, Chief Justice

---

John A. Dooley, Associate Justice

---

Marilyn S. Skoglund, Associate Justice

Note: Decisions of a three-justice panel are not to be considered as precedent before any tribunal