



the parties had difficulty in communicating effectively, largely due to father's accusatory and critical tone towards mother. It found that mother had shown concern for the children and had followed the recommendations of medical and educational providers. She sought and obtained father's input in medical decisions such as COVID vaccinations and made accommodations to facilitate his contact with the children. The court found that father's concerns about the children's attendance at school and sports practice and other issues and the fact that he had a new child with his fiancée did not constitute real, unanticipated, and substantial changes in circumstances. It further held that even if there had been a change in circumstances, it was in the children's best interests to continue the existing custody arrangement. In so holding, it emphasized the children's relationship with mother as the primary caregiver, their strong bonds with their maternal grandmother and friends in mother's community, and their progress in school. The court also found that father's home had limited outdoor play space and potential safety hazards. It therefore denied father's request to modify parental rights and responsibilities or parent-child contact.

On appeal, father states that he would like to make medical, educational, and other day-to-day decisions for the children, and wants increased contact with them. He argues that the court erred in finding that the children have limited space to play outside at his home. He also appears to claim that the court made other unspecified errors in its findings.

We are unable to review father's claims that the court erred in its findings because he did not order a transcript of the hearing below. "By failing to order a transcript, the appellant waives the right to raise any issue for which a transcript is necessary for informed appellate review." V.R.A.P. 10(b)(1). Without the transcript, we are "unable to review the evidence to determine if it supports the trial court's factual findings." Airi v. Nagra, 2017 VT 42, ¶ 5, 205 Vt. 40. Accordingly, we assume that the family division's findings are supported by evidence. See Evans v. Cote, 2014 VT 104, ¶ 7, 197 Vt. 523. Furthermore, it was exclusively the family division's role as the trier of fact to determine the credibility of evidence and how much weight to give to it. Cabot v. Cabot, 166 Vt. 485, 497 (1997). Father does not identify any other errors in the court's ruling, other than disagreeing with the outcome. We therefore see no basis to disturb the decision below.

Affirmed.

BY THE COURT:

---

Paul L. Reiber, Chief Justice

---

Harold E. Eaton, Jr., Associate Justice

---

Karen R. Carroll, Associate Justice