

Turnbridge / Turning Point Institutional Due-Diligence and Public Review Evidence Memo

Firsthand Accounts, Staff-Vetting Concerns, Public-Record Leads, Public Review Evidence, Client Culture Concerns, Client Property Concerns, and Records-Preservation Questions

I. Scope and Standard

This memorandum combines institutional due-diligence notes, firsthand recollections, direct disclosures, secondhand or relayed allegations, public-record leads, archived review screenshots, review-platform evidence, staff-conduct concerns, review-integrity concerns, and records-preservation questions. The purpose is not to ask readers to accept every account as proven fact. The purpose is to preserve source material, identify recurring categories of concern, distinguish evidence types, and frame due-diligence questions that Turnbridge / Turning Point should be able to answer through records. This memorandum distinguishes:

- firsthand observations;
- firsthand disclosures to staff;
- secondhand / overheard allegations;
- public-review allegations;
- public-record material;
- employee-review context;
- review-integrity concerns;
- observed institutional patterns;
- evidence and records requiring preservation.

Where evidence is not independently verified, this memo says so.

II. Methodological Note

This document uses the following reliability framework.

Class A - Public-source materials Publicly accessible materials, including public review pages, public police-log reporting, public licensing records, public news reporting, official Turnbridge materials, and employee-review pages. These sources may change over time and should be preserved through screenshots, PDFs, archive captures, or dated downloads. Class B - Archived review captures and screenshots Archived Google review captures and screenshots preserved as part of the Turnbridge institutional archive. Because Google reviews are dynamic and may change, these materials should be paired where possible with live review URLs, profile captures, screen recordings, or dated archive copies. Class C - Firsthand recollections and archive notes Firsthand recollections, direct disclosures, contemporaneous archive notes, and secondhand or relayed allegations preserved for due-diligence purposes. These materials should be treated as allegations or leads unless corroborated by records, witnesses, communications, or official documentation. Terminology rule For positive reviews, this memo uses language such as:

- review-integrity concern;
- low-probative review;
- relationship-based review;
- clustered positive-review pattern;
- suspicious review pattern warranting due-diligence review.

It avoids describing reviews as fake, fraudulent, or sham as a factual conclusion unless specific proof exists. "Sham" may appear only as quoted or paraphrased reviewer language or as informal shorthand outside formal public language.

III. Central Due-Diligence Questions

This archive raises recurring questions about Turnbridge / Turning Point's institutional systems:

- 1. How were client-on-client violence, threats, and coercion documented?**
- 2. What happened after sexual-boundary complaints?**
- 3. Were clients separated after violence, threats, unwanted sexual contact, harassment, outing threats, or coercion?**
- 4. Who reviewed CCTV footage after serious incidents?**
- 5. Could staff replay, discuss, or mock sensitive CCTV footage?**
- 6. Were families notified after safety incidents?**
- 7. What incident reports exist?**
- 8. What staff-vetting procedures were used before staff were placed around vulnerable clients?**
- 9. What public-record, licensing, social-media, employment, and conduct reviews were performed?**
- 10. What happened when staff were accused of violence, boundary problems, misconduct, unsafe judgment, unsafe transportation**
conduct, or sexual-boundary concerns?
- 11. Were staff ever disciplined, removed, rehired, or allowed back after client-safety concerns?**
- 12. How were public negative reviews, employee reviews, and review-integrity concerns handled?**
- 13. Can Turnbridge produce records that confirm, refute, or contextualize the accounts preserved here?**

IV. Firsthand Observations / Events Personally Witnessed or Experienced

1. Staff replaying CCTV footage of M.J. / C.S. incident while mocking a client

Approx. date: February 2022

Program/location: Phase 1 / Turnbridge

Staff involved: Drew Behr, Phase 1 case manager

Clients involved: M.J.; C.S.

Type: Staff conduct; client safety; misuse of surveillance footage; cruelty / humiliation

In or around February 2022, I personally witnessed Phase 1 case manager Drew Behr replay CCTV footage of a serious client-on-client incident involving M.J. and C.S. Drew showed the footage to me and numerous other clients while laughing and calling C.S. a "dumbass." This is included because the underlying incident involved serious client-on-client violence or threat, and because the alleged staff response raises separate questions about surveillance-footage access, evidence handling, client dignity, staff cruelty, and institutional oversight.

Potential corroboration:

- CCTV footage from the M.J. / C.S. incident
- Staff access logs / camera review logs

- Other clients who were shown the footage
- Incident reports, shift notes, or clinical notes
- House rosters or client records confirming M.J. and C.S. were present at the relevant time

Archive classification: Firsthand observation.

2. Reported sexual-boundary incident involving L.M.; Mark David Grasso / Mark Grasso

overheard disclosure but no meaningful action followed

Approx. date: Late 2022

Location: 1212 Quinpiac Avenue, Turnbridge property

Staff involved: Mark David Grasso / Mark Grasso

Clients involved: E.O.; L.M.; myself

Type: Sexual-boundary violation; failure to act; client safety

In late 2022, I told E.O. that L.M. had gotten on top of me, grabbed my penis, and refused to get off during an incident at the Turnbridge property at 1212 Quinpiac Avenue.

Mark David Grasso / Mark Grasso overheard me relay this to E.O. He said words to the effect that it sounded crazy and that I should "feel free" to report it to higher-ups if I felt like it. To my knowledge, no meaningful protective action was taken. I do not recall being formally interviewed, separated from L.M., or given a clear protective plan. L.M. continued to harass me afterward. The staff identity is based on my memory of the staff member known as Mark, the screenshot display name "Mark David Grasso," and the public Instagram handle @markdgrasso22. Official employment records, staff rosters, or shift logs should confirm identity before stronger public claims are made.

Potential corroboration:

- Employment records confirming Mark David Grasso / Mark Grasso's role / assignment at the time
- House logs / shift notes from 1212 Quinpiac Avenue
- E.O. as witness to my disclosure
- Other clients aware of L.M.'s later harassment
- Any incident reports, if they exist
- Records showing Mark David Grasso / Mark Grasso was present or assigned to the house
- Clinical notes, staff notes, or communications following the disclosure

Archive classification: Firsthand disclosure + staff overhearing + alleged failure to respond.

3. Violent assault by C. using heavy wooden chair; footage later replayed by staff

mockingly

Approx. date: February 2022

Location: 90 Ford Street

Staff involved: Drew Behr

Client involved: C.

Type: Client-on-client violence; surveillance footage; staff cruelty / humiliation

In or around February 2022, at 90 Ford Street, I was violently assaulted by an older client, C., with a heavy wooden chair. The incident was on camera. Drew Behr later replayed the footage for me and mocked me for "flinching." This is included both as a client-safety incident and as a staff-conduct incident. The core institutional questions are whether the assault was properly documented, whether CCTV footage was preserved and reviewed appropriately, whether staff were permitted to replay it casually, and whether any meaningful protective action followed.

Potential corroboration:

- CCTV footage from 90 Ford Street
- Incident report / shift notes

- Other clients present at the house
- Medical records or injury documentation, if any
- Staff camera-access records
- House roster for the period
- Staff schedules for Drew Behr and others present
- Records identifying C. and his placement at 90 Ford Street

Archive classification: Firsthand victimization + firsthand staff conduct.

4. Alleged theft / mishandling of \$150 by Phase 1 director John Stewart

Approx. date: To be narrowed

Program/location: Phase 1

Staff involved: John Stewart, Phase 1 director

Type: Staff misconduct; alleged theft / mishandling of client money

I personally experienced John Stewart taking \$150 from my hands in three \$50 bills. This is included as an allegation involving client money and staff authority. It should be corroborated through date reconstruction, witness accounts, contemporaneous texts, family disclosures, or records showing staff contact around the time.

Potential corroboration:

- Date/time reconstruction
- Contemporaneous texts to family, therapist, sponsor, or clients
- House/staff logs showing staff contact around the time
- Witnesses, if any
- Internal complaint or note, if one exists

Archive classification: Firsthand allegation against staff.

4A. Client property / PS4 stolen after being left at 1212 Quinpiac; no meaningful response by case manager

Approx. date property left: January 2023

Approx. date discovered missing: May 2023

Location: 1212 Quinpiac Avenue

Staff involved: Eric Regensburg, case manager

Property involved: PlayStation 4, estimated value approximately \$400

Type: Client property; alleged theft / missing property; failure to document; failure to investigate; staff-response concern

In approximately January 2023, I left a PlayStation 4 at the Turnbridge property at 1212 Quinpiac Avenue. When I returned in May 2023, the PS4 was missing and appeared to have been stolen.

I raised the missing PS4 with case manager Eric Regensburg. My recollection is that no meaningful effort was made to retrieve it, locate it, document its disappearance, or create a report. Every conversation I remember having with Eric Regensburg about the missing PS4 ended up turning into him talking about taking a new job in Florida.

The PS4 was never returned. To my knowledge, no report was ever made.

This is included as a client-property and staff-response concern. In a residential-treatment setting, client belongings should be documented, protected, and investigated when missing. The institutional question is whether Turnbridge had a property-inventory process, missing-property reporting process, staff accountability process, or reimbursement procedure when client property disappeared from a Turnbridge residence.

Potential corroboration:

- Texts, emails, or messages about leaving the PS4 at 1212 Quinpiac
- Texts, emails, or messages about the PS4 being missing in May 2023
- Eric Regensburg's case-management notes

- 1212 Quinnipiac house logs
- Property inventory records, if any
- Client property policies
- Staff schedules for 1212 Quinnipiac during the relevant period
- Other clients who saw the PS4 at 1212 Quinnipiac
- Other clients who knew it was missing
- Communications with family about the missing PS4
- Records of Eric Regensburg leaving or planning to leave for a Florida job
- Missing-property report, if one exists
- Reimbursement / restitution policy

Archive classification: Firsthand client-property loss allegation + staff-response concern.

5. Failure to discipline A.S. after threats of bodily assault

Approx. date: To be narrowed

Clients involved: A.S.; myself; C.

Type: Threats; client safety; failure to discipline / failure to protect

I recall Turnbridge failing to meaningfully discipline or protect after A.S. threatened bodily assault against me and also against C. This is included because threats between clients in residential treatment are not merely interpersonal conflict. Clients often cannot easily choose where they sleep, who they live with, or whether they can avoid threatening peers. Threats in that setting raise housing, supervision, documentation, and safety-plan questions.

Potential corroboration:

- Witnesses to the threats
- Incident reports / shift notes
- Messages or contemporaneous disclosures
- C.'s account, if available
- House rosters and staff schedules
- Safety plans or clinical notes

Archive classification: Firsthand observation / firsthand safety concern.

6. Chris Meyer car / transportation story

Approx. date: Late 2022

Staff involved: Chris Meyer / Chris Myer

Type: Staff conduct; transportation; judgment / supervision concern; professional-boundary concern; confidentiality concern;

local-crime-story boundary concern Separate from the public police-log material concerning Chris Meyer, I personally remember Chris Meyer being hired to drive me into New York City for a film-related obligation. During that car ride, I remember Meyer:

- running red lights;
- speaking on the phone with multiple women about ways he was lying to them;
- telling me how much my parents were paying him;
- recounting a story from Fairhaven involving buying drugs with his girlfriend, a large Black man in the car, and a dog;
- telling me about the Fair Haven / "Fast Eddie" murder story;
- saying, as I remember it, that he was the person who was supposed to be killed by the person later charged in the "Fast Eddie" killing.

This is included as a personal recollection relevant to judgment, transportation safety, staff boundaries, confidentiality around family payment arrangements, and the appropriateness of placing staff in transportation or authority roles around young clients. This should not be treated as a criminal allegation against Meyer. The concern is not that Meyer was

involved in the "Fast Eddie" killing. The concern is that a staff member transporting a vulnerable client allegedly drove recklessly, disclosed family payment information, discussed chaotic relationship dynamics, and brought up local drug-world / murder material during a paid client transport. Public reporting separately anchors the existence of the Fair Haven / "Fast Eddie" murder case. Public reporting identified Edward Andrew "Fast Eddie" Thompson as having been killed in Fair Haven in 2011, reported that Larry Johnson was arrested on a warrant for murder in the case, and reported that police said Thompson was not the intended target. Later public reporting stated that Johnson was found not guilty. This public reporting is included only to anchor the apparent real-world event Meyer was discussing and to show why Meyer's alleged statement - that he had been the intended target - may be a relevant staff-boundary / judgment detail. It does not verify Meyer's statement, and no claim is made here that Meyer was involved in the killing.

Potential corroboration:

- Family records or memory of who hired Chris Meyer for transportation
- Texts, calendars, emails, or payment records around the ride
- My parents' recollection of the arrangement
- Employment or transportation records involving Chris Meyer
- Turnbridge transportation policies
- Communications showing Meyer's client-transport duties
- Contemporaneous therapist, family, or client disclosures about the ride
- Public reporting on the Fair Haven / "Fast Eddie" case
- Witness, text, or prior disclosure confirming Meyer discussed being the alleged intended target

Archive classification: Firsthand recollection / staff-conduct concern, not a criminal-record item.

7. Peter McConnell political / ideological boundary concerns with clients

Approx. date: Early-to-mid 2022

Program/location: Phase II, 520 Whitney Avenue / Whitney-Canner Turnbridge property, New Haven

Staff involved: Peter McConnell

Clients involved: Myself and other queer-presenting / left-wing clients

Type: Staff boundary issue; ideological / political pressure; inappropriate use of authority

In early-to-mid 2022, while I was in Phase II at the 520 Whitney Avenue / Whitney-Canner Turnbridge property, Peter McConnell repeatedly brought up conservatism and told clients that leftist politics were irresponsible. This often occurred in the context of waking us up at around 8 a.m., with the implication that we were leftist and lazy. In private meetings with queer-presenting clients, McConnell would also redirect conversation toward politics, leftists being personally irresponsible, and conservatism being the answer. This is included as a staff-boundary concern because he was speaking from a position of authority in a treatment setting, and because the political framing appeared to pathologize or moralize clients' identities, values, and perceived laziness rather than focusing on treatment, safety, or care. The property context is relevant because public reporting identifies 520 Whitney Avenue as a Whitney/Canner-area sober-house property bought by CT Clinical Services, Inc., also known as Turning Point. This helps anchor the location of the Phase II experience described above.

Potential corroboration:

- Other Phase II clients present during early-to-mid 2022
- Queer-presenting clients who had private meetings with McConnell
- Phase II house schedules / wake-up routines
- Staff assignments for the 520 Whitney Avenue / Whitney-Canner property
- Contemporaneous texts, journal entries, or client accounts
- Public property / article records identifying 520 Whitney Avenue as a Turning Point / CT Clinical Services sober-house property

Archive classification: Firsthand staff-boundary / ideological-pressure concern + publicly anchored property context.

8. Dave Murphy Phase 3 East Haven lecture about clients being lazy / burdens on parents

Approx. date: March or April 2022

Program/location: Phase 3 transitional house in East Haven, a few blocks from Hobby Lobby [exact address unknown; public records

not yet located]

Staff involved: Dave Murphy

Clients involved: Myself and other Phase 3 clients

Type: Staff conduct; humiliation / shaming; inappropriate use of authority; family-pressure rhetoric

Sometime in March or April 2022, while I was at a Phase 3 transitional house in East Haven a few blocks from Hobby Lobby, Dave Murphy woke us up and lectured us about how we were lazy, how our parents could not take care of us, how our parents had dropped us off at Turnbridge, and how we needed to grow up and stop being a burden on our parents. I remember the tone as harsh and screaming. The content of the lecture framed clients as burdens whose parents could not handle them, rather than as vulnerable people in treatment. I am including this because it is relevant to staff conduct, emotional safety,

family-pressure rhetoric, and the way authority was used in transitional housing. I do not currently remember the exact East Haven address, and public records have not yet surfaced a confirmed property match. My memory is that the house was a few blocks from Hobby Lobby.

Potential corroboration:

- Other Phase 3 clients present during the lecture
- Phase 3 East Haven house rosters from March / April 2022
- Staff schedules showing Dave Murphy assigned to the East Haven transitional house
- Contemporaneous texts, journal entries, or family disclosures after the lecture
- Client accounts of similar "lazy / burden on parents" lectures
- Property records, staff schedules, mail records, or house lists identifying the East Haven transitional house near Hobby Lobby

Archive classification: Firsthand staff-conduct / humiliation concern; exact property address to confirm.

9. Sexual-boundary incident during Phase II movie trip; alleged extortion / outing threat

afterward; no meaningful action after disclosure to case manager

Approx. date: Around November 2022

Program/location: Phase II; weekly Tuesday movie trip; later 520 Whitney Avenue / Whitney-Canner Turnbridge property

Staff involved: Douglas Roberto; another case manager present [name to confirm]

Clients involved: E.; M.S.; myself

Type: Sexual-boundary incident; alleged coercion / extortion; outing threat; harassment; failure to respond; client safety

Around November 2022, while I was in Phase II, Turnbridge had weekly Tuesday movie trips. On one of these trips, we went to see Nope, the Jordan Peele movie. During the movie, E. and I grabbed each other's penises. When we returned to 520 Whitney Avenue and were back in our rooms, exhausted, I told M.S. what had happened. M.S. flew into a rage and told me to Venmo him \$50 or he would tell everyone I was gay. I felt physically imposed on and threatened, and I Venmoed him \$50. I later explained this to Douglas Roberto. Another case manager was also in the room. Douglas responded, "Why would you send him \$50?" The other case manager looked at me like I was an idiot. To my knowledge, no meaningful action was taken. M.S. continued harassing me afterward and texting me threats through social media.

Potential corroboration:

- Venmo record showing \$50 payment to M.S.
- Movie-trip schedule / Phase II Tuesday outing records
- Records showing Phase II clients attended Nope around November 2022
- Other clients present on the movie trip
- 520 Whitney Avenue house roster from that period
- Douglas Roberto's case-management records / notes
- Identity of the second case manager present

- Social-media messages / threat texts from M.S.
- Contemporaneous texts, journal entries, therapist disclosures, family disclosures, or client conversations
- Other clients aware of M.S.'s later harassment

Archive classification: Firsthand sexual-boundary / coercion allegation + firsthand disclosure to case manager + alleged failure to respond.

10. Staff refusal to provide inhaler during asthma attack; staff-boundary / judgment

concerns involving Will

Approx. date: Summer 2022

Program/location: Turnbridge house a few blocks from Foxon Boulevard / Hobby Lobby [exact address to confirm]

Staff involved: Will [last name to confirm]

Clients involved: Myself; other clients present [names to confirm]

Type: Medical safety; medication access; staff judgment; alleged failure to respond to asthma symptoms; staff-boundary concern

In summer 2022, while I was at a Turnbridge house a few blocks from Foxon Boulevard / Hobby Lobby, I was having an asthma attack. I asked a staff member named Will to provide me with my inhaler. Will refused to provide the inhaler. My memory is that he said I was "faking it" and that other clients had said I was "getting high" off the albuterol. I am including this as a medical-safety and medication-access concern because asthma symptoms can require urgent access to prescribed medication, and because a staff member in a residential treatment setting should not dismiss a client's request for an inhaler based on peer commentary or an assumption that the client is faking symptoms. This same staff member also raised broader staff-boundary and judgment concerns. My memory is that Will had black hair, a mustache and beard, and an overweight build. I remember him having a habit of restraining and tickling clients, and telling clients stories about robbing gas stations in ski masks with toy guns and not getting caught. These details are included not as separate proven criminal allegations, but because they may be relevant to identifying the staff member and evaluating his judgment, boundaries, and appropriateness for direct-care work with vulnerable clients.

Potential corroboration:

- Will's full name and employment records
- Staff schedules for the Foxon Boulevard / Hobby Lobby-area house in summer 2022
- Medication logs showing inhaler access / denial / request timing
- House logs or shift notes from the day of the asthma attack
- Other clients present when I asked for the inhaler
- Other clients who heard Will say I was "faking it" or "getting high" off albuterol
- Other clients who witnessed Will restraining or tickling clients
- Other clients who heard Will tell stories about gas-station robberies with ski masks and toy guns
- Contemporaneous texts, journal entries, therapist disclosures, family disclosures, or medical records
- Records showing the exact house address near Foxon Boulevard / Hobby Lobby

Archive classification: Firsthand medical-safety / medication-access allegation + firsthand staff-boundary / staff-judgment concern.

V. Secondhand / Overheard Allegations

A. Client Autonomy / Attempted Departure / Outside-Contact Interference

1. J. airport story: alleged client brought to Turnbridge against his wishes; later allegation that

Turnbridge contacted girlfriend's father during attempted departure

Approx. date: Late 2021

Program/location: Turnbridge / Turning Point

Client involved: J.

Other people involved: J.'s girlfriend; girlfriend's father

Type: Client autonomy; consent / placement concern; alleged interference with client departure; alleged family-contact boundary issue;

secondhand allegation requiring corroboration In late 2021, I remember a fellow client, J., being at Turnbridge after, according to him, being brought there against his wishes. J. repeatedly told people around him that he felt "conned." My memory is that he spent much of his time in his room watching *The Wire* and did not attend groups. I am certain that J. called a girlfriend to get him a plane ticket. I do not remember the final destination, but my memory is that it was somewhere below the Mason-Dixon line. J. later alleged that after he got off a connecting flight in Florida, his girlfriend called him and told him that Turnbridge had contacted her father to say that J. needed to stay at Turnbridge for his own sake. I did not personally witness any call between Turnbridge and the girlfriend's father. This item is included because I directly remember J. repeatedly expressing that he felt conned, directly remember his disengagement from programming, and directly remember him arranging a plane ticket through his girlfriend. The allegation about Turnbridge contacting the girlfriend's father should be treated as J.'s allegation unless corroborated.

Potential corroboration:

- J.'s direct account
- J.'s girlfriend's account
- Girlfriend's father's account
- Flight / airline records, if J. preserved them
- Texts or call logs between J. and his girlfriend
- Turnbridge records concerning J.'s intake, consent status, discharge attempt, departure, or return
- Staff notes or communications around J. leaving / attempting to leave
- Other clients who heard J. say he felt "conned"
- Other clients who knew J. was watching *The Wire* and not attending groups
- Contemporaneous texts, journal entries, or family disclosures from the time

Archive classification: Firsthand memory of J.'s statements, behavior, and plane-ticket arrangement + secondhand allegation from J.

regarding Turnbridge contacting girlfriend's father.

2. H. denied-access story: alleged girlfriend / girlfriend's father contact after client tried to leave

Turnbridge

Approx. date: Early 2022

Program/location: Turnbridge / Turning Point

Client involved: H.

Other people involved: H.'s girlfriend; girlfriend's father

Type: Client autonomy; consent / placement concern; alleged interference with client departure; alleged third-party family-contact

pressure; secondhand allegation requiring corroboration In early 2022, client H. allegedly called his girlfriend to help get him out of Turnbridge. H. recalled that Turnbridge spoke to his girlfriend's father. According to H., his girlfriend then called him in tears and said she could not help him. I did not personally witness the call between Turnbridge and the girlfriend's father. This item is included because it may be relevant to a broader pattern in which clients trying to leave Turnbridge through girlfriends or outside support allegedly encountered intervention through the girlfriend's parent or family authority figure. This should be treated as H.'s recollection / allegation unless corroborated.

Potential corroboration:

- H.'s direct account

- H.'s girlfriend's account
- Girlfriend's father's account
- Texts or call logs between H. and his girlfriend
- Turnbridge records concerning H.'s intake, consent status, attempted departure, discharge request, or outside contact
- Staff notes or communications around H. attempting to leave
- Other clients who heard H. describe the incident at the time
- Contemporaneous texts, journal entries, family disclosures, or therapist disclosures

Archive classification: Secondhand allegation / H.'s reported recollection regarding Turnbridge contacting girlfriend's father after H.

sought help leaving.

B. Staff Boundary / Substance / Safety Allegations

3. Allegation that staff member Liam tried to meet up with underage former adolescent-program client

Approx. date of allegation discussion: Late 2022 or 2023; later phone confirmation / report in 2023 or 2024

Staff involved: Liam [last name to be identified]

Sources: Z.T. discussion overheard / partially observed in program context; later W.H. phone account

Type: Staff boundary issue; adolescent-program concern; alleged misconduct; termination-context concern

In late 2022 or 2023, I remember Z.T. discussing the case of why Liam was fired with another client in a hushed voice. Z.T. became very hesitant to tell me the details when I became aware of the discussion. My memory is that the conversation clearly suggested a serious allegation or sensitive reason for Liam's departure, but I did not receive the full substance from Z.T. at that time. Later, in 2023 or 2024, W.H. informed me on the phone of the allegation concerning why Liam was fired. According to W.H., Liam allegedly tried to meet up with an underage former client of the adolescent program while Liam was an adult support staff member in the young-adults program. This item should be treated carefully. I did not personally witness Liam contact the former adolescent-program client. The allegation comes from W.H.'s later phone account, with earlier program-context support from my memory of Z.T. discussing Liam's firing in a hushed, hesitant way. The underlying allegation requires corroboration through direct witnesses, employment records, termination records, internal communications, or the former client's own account.

There was significant drama around Liam being "quietly" let go, which I experienced firsthand in the program environment, though the specific allegation was relayed to me secondhand.

Potential corroboration:

- W.H.'s direct account of the phone conversation and how W.H. learned the allegation
- Z.T.'s account of what he was discussing in late 2022 or 2023
- The other client who was speaking with Z.T. during the hushed discussion
- Employment records identifying Liam
- Liam's staff termination / separation timeline
- Internal Turnbridge communications concerning Liam's departure
- Any complaint, incident report, HR record, or mandated-reporting record concerning Liam
- Former adolescent-program client's direct account, if legally and ethically obtainable
- Other clients who heard the same allegation
- Contemporaneous texts, call records, notes, or disclosures from the 2023/2024 W.H. phone conversation

Archive classification: Secondhand allegation from W.H. + firsthand observation of earlier Z.T. hushed discussion / hesitation +

firsthand observation of surrounding institutional drama concerning Liam's departure. Requires corroboration before stronger use.

4. Allegation that Liam gave THC pen hits to H.V. and C. while they were sequestered after relapse

Approx. date: 2021-2023 window, exact date to be narrowed

Staff involved: Liam [last name to be identified]

Clients involved: H.V.; C.

Type: Substance-use misconduct; staff boundary violation; relapse-management failure

I heard that the same staff member, Liam, gave H.V. and C. hits from a THC pen for approximately two weeks while they were sequestered at a separate property after both had relapsed. This allegedly occurred after H.V. and C. threatened to retaliate against Liam for getting high on the job. This allegation is distinct from the underage-former-client allegation, but both belong in the Liam staff-boundary / staff-misconduct cluster because they concern alleged conduct by the same staff member, alleged surrounding institutional drama, and questions about why Liam was quietly let go.

Potential corroboration:

- H.V. and C. as direct witnesses
- W.H.'s account if W.H. heard related information
- Z.T.'s account if Z.T. heard related information
- Staff schedules showing Liam assigned to the separate property
- Drug-testing / relapse documentation
- House logs / shift notes
- Other clients aware of the sequestering arrangement
- Employment records surrounding Liam's departure
- Internal Turnbridge communications concerning Liam's termination or separation

Archive classification: Secondhand allegation; potentially corroborable through witnesses and staffing records.

5. Early-2023 concern about returning a client after alleged restraint / beating incident

Approx. date: Early 2023

Program/location: Phase 1

Clients involved: Names not remembered

Type: Client safety; alleged inadequate separation; uncorroborated concern

In early 2023, a skinny younger client whose name I cannot currently remember expressed concern to me and another client that a heavier client he was scared of had been returned to Phase 1 after being taken off site for a weekend following an incident in which the heavier client had allegedly restrained and beaten him. The younger client was concerned because they were again living together. I cannot currently remember the names of the clients involved, so this item should be treated as uncorroborated unless further witnesses, house logs, shift notes, incident reports, or client names can be identified.

Potential corroboration:

- Phase 1 house logs from early 2023
- Incident reports involving client restraint / assault
- Records of any client being taken off site for a weekend after violence
- The second client who heard the concern
- The younger client's account, if identified
- Staff communications regarding returning the heavier client to Phase 1

Archive classification: Firsthand memory of a client's expressed safety concern; underlying assault allegation uncorroborated at present.

6. Allegation that Douglas Roberto left a Phase 3 house open and involved a client in searching the

house after an intruder entered

Approx. date: To be narrowed

Program/location: Phase 3 house [exact property to confirm]

Staff involved: Douglas Roberto

Clients involved: Client asked to sweep the house [name to confirm]

Type: Secondhand allegation; house safety; intruder incident; staff judgment; failure to report / secrecy concern

I heard from multiple people that Douglas Roberto allegedly left a Phase 3 house open, and that a man in a ski mask came into the house. According to the allegation, once Douglas realized someone was in the house, he grabbed a knife and brought a client with him to sweep the house. He allegedly told the client not to tell anybody. I also heard that Douglas was fired shortly after this. I did not personally witness this incident. I am preserving it because I heard the rumor from multiple people, and because, if true, it would raise serious questions about house security, staff judgment, the use of clients in a potentially dangerous situation, incident reporting, and whether staff attempted to suppress reporting. This should not be stated as proven unless corroborated through witnesses, house logs, police reports, staff records, or internal communications.

Potential corroboration:

- Client who was allegedly asked to sweep the house
- Other clients who heard about the incident at the time
- House roster and address for the Phase 3 property
- Staff schedules showing Douglas Roberto assigned to the house
- Police report / 911 call / incident report concerning an intruder or suspicious person in a ski mask
- Internal Turnbridge communications about the incident
- HR / termination records showing whether Douglas Roberto was fired and when
- Contemporaneous texts, group chats, or client disclosures about the alleged intruder incident

Archive classification: Secondhand allegation heard from multiple people; serious safety / staff-judgment lead requiring corroboration.

7. Steve Tobey sexual-boundary / inappropriate self-disclosure concern involving C.R.

Approx. date: February 2022

Program/location: Phase I; Structured Group / Carriage House context [exact property / group location to confirm]

Staff involved: Steve Tobey, Phase I case manager

Clients involved: C.R.; myself

Type: Secondhand allegation; sexual-boundary concern; inappropriate staff self-disclosure; inappropriate sexualized pressure toward

client In February 2022, client C.R. told me that Phase I case manager Steve Tobey had told the Structured Group / Carriage House group that his marriage had recently fallen apart because of his sex addiction and cheating. C.R. further relayed to me that Tobey was frustrated that C.R. was masturbating and verbally pressured him to stop masturbating, after identifying C.R. as "another sex addict." I did not personally witness the group disclosure or the private interaction between Tobey and C.R. This item is included because it was relayed to me by C.R. and because, if accurate, it would raise staff-boundary concerns involving sexualized self-disclosure, staff projection onto a client, and inappropriate pressure around a client's sexual behavior in a treatment setting.

Potential corroboration:

- C.R.'s direct account
- Other Structured Group / Carriage House clients present for Tobey's alleged self-disclosure
- Phase I group schedules from February 2022
- Case-management records involving Tobey and C.R.

- Contemporaneous texts, journal entries, client conversations, therapist disclosures, or family disclosures
- Turnbridge employment / staff records confirming Tobey's Phase I case-manager role during that period

Archive classification: Secondhand allegation involving staff sexual-boundary / self-disclosure concerns; requires corroboration.

8. Allegation involving adolescent-program client J. and Matt Fields / Matthew Fields, LMFT during walk near 189 Orange

Approx. date: Late 2021 / early 2022

Program/location: Turnbridge clinical building at 189 Orange / surrounding area

Staff involved: Matt Fields / Matthew Fields, LMFT

Client involved: J., former adolescent-program client [identity to distinguish from other J. entries if needed]

Type: Secondhand allegation; therapist boundary concern; adolescent-program concern; cruelty / humiliation; inappropriate joke

involving client safety; alleged request not to disclose In late 2021 or early 2022, J., an old adolescent-program client, told me about an incident involving therapist Matt Fields / Matthew Fields, LMFT, whom J. described as a bald therapist and recovered Xanax addict. According to J., Matt Fields took him for a walk around the clinical building at 189 Orange. During that walk, Matt Fields allegedly saw a homeless man and joked that he should sell J. to the homeless man, and that he could buy a lot of crack with the money.

J. further said that Matt Fields panicked after making the comment and pleaded with J. not to disclose it to anyone.

I did not personally witness the walk or the alleged comment. This item is included because it was relayed to me by J., because it involved an adolescent-program client, and because, if accurate, it would raise concerns about therapist judgment, cruelty / humiliation, client safety, professional boundaries, and alleged discouragement of reporting.

Potential corroboration:

- J.'s direct account
- Other adolescent-program clients who may have heard J. describe the incident
- Employment records confirming Matt Fields / Matthew Fields, LMFT's adolescent-program role, dates, and assignment to 189 Orange
- Staff schedules showing Matt Fields assigned to 189 Orange during late 2021 / early 2022
- Clinical-building records or appointment schedules involving J. and Matt Fields
- Contemporaneous texts, journal entries, therapist disclosures, family disclosures, or client conversations
- Records showing walks or off-building movement around 189 Orange
- Prior complaints or reports involving Matt Fields' conduct with adolescent clients

Archive classification: Secondhand allegation from former adolescent-program client J. involving therapist-boundary / cruelty concern

and alleged request not to disclose.

C. Client Culture / Identity-Based Hostility / Peer Humiliation Concerns

Approx. date range: Late 2021-2024

Program/location: Phase I, Phase II, 520 Whitney Avenue, 1212 Quinpiac Avenue, 189 Orange Street clinical building, adolescent-program context, and broader Turnbridge / Turning Point client culture

Type: Client culture; identity-based harassment; sexual shaming; anti-gay slurs; racialized harassment; peer violence; peer humiliation; cyberbullying; staff-witnessed hostility; clinical-response concern

This section preserves incidents and relayed accounts involving client culture at Turnbridge / Turning Point, including anti-gay slurs, racialized harassment, sexual shaming, peer humiliation, mocking of criminal records, group-chat harassment, retaliation language around "snitching," and reported violence between clients.

These accounts are included not to claim that Turnbridge created every harmful statement made by a client. Residential treatment programs cannot control every word spoken by every client. The institutional question is whether Turnbridge

adequately supervised, interrupted, documented, and clinically addressed a client culture in which vulnerable clients could be sexually shamed, mocked, slurred, physically attacked, humiliated, or targeted in front of staff and peers.

1. Sexual shaming involving false claim about L.M.; witnessed by clinical staff and clients

Approx. date: Early 2023

Location/program: Turnbridge / Turning Point clinical or program setting [exact group/location to confirm]

People involved: D.; L.M.; myself; Chris Rush; other clinical staff and clients present

Type: Sexual shaming; false sexual allegation; same-sex sexual stigma; staff-witnessed peer humiliation

In early 2023, a client, D., told me in a condemnatory and mocking manner that it was shameful that L.M. and I had engaged "in oral sex." I had never engaged in sexual relations with L.M.

My recollection is that same-sex sexual contact was the focal point of the ridicule. D. laughed while making the comment. My memory is that the clinical staff present, including Chris Rush, and other clients witnessed this.

This is included because it raises questions about sexual shaming, peer humiliation, anti-gay stigma, false sexual allegations, and staff response when humiliating sexual claims were made in a clinical or treatment setting.

Potential corroboration:

- Chris Rush's account
- Clinical staff present at the time
- Other clients present
- Group schedule / clinical schedule for early 2023
- Clinical notes or incident notes, if they exist
- Contemporaneous disclosures to therapist, family, or peers

Archive classification: Firsthand experience of client sexual shaming / false sexual claim + staff-witnessed response concern.

2. H.V. allegedly called adolescent client J. an anti-gay slur after J. accused him of beating women

Approx. date: Late 2021

People involved: H.V.; J. [adolescent client]; other witnesses to confirm

Type: Anti-gay slur; peer hostility; gender / violence accusation context; adolescent-program concern

In late 2021, I remember H.V. calling adolescent client J. an anti-gay slur after J. accused H.V. of beating women.

This is included as part of the broader client-culture record involving anti-gay language, aggression, and hostile peer dynamics.

Potential corroboration:

- J.'s account
- H.V.'s account
- Other clients present
- Staff present, if any
- House logs or incident notes, if any exist
- Contemporaneous disclosures or messages

Archive classification: Firsthand or remembered client-culture concern; exact setting and witnesses to confirm.

3. K.G. recounted beating adolescent client with W.H. at adolescent house

Approx. date recounted: 2024 Underlying incident date: To be confirmed

Location: Adolescent house [exact house to confirm]

People involved: K.G.; W.H.; adolescent client [name to confirm]

Type: Relayed client-on-client violence; adolescent-program safety; peer assault; supervision concern

In 2024, K.G. recounted a story of "beating the shit out of" and kicking an adolescent client while the client was on the ground, allegedly with W.H., at an adolescent house.

This is included as a relayed account of serious client-on-client violence in an adolescent-program context. The account requires corroboration, but if accurate it would raise questions about supervision, adolescent safety, incident documentation, separation, discipline, and staff awareness.

Potential corroboration:

- K.G.'s account
- W.H.'s account
- The adolescent client's account
- Other clients present
- Adolescent house rosters
- Staff schedules
- Incident reports or house logs
- Medical records or injury documentation, if any
- Contemporaneous texts or disclosures

Archive classification: Relayed allegation / client-culture and adolescent-safety lead requiring corroboration.

4. D.W. allegedly called Q.R. an anti-gay slur after disagreements during C.M.'s group at 520 Whitney Avenue

Approx. date: Approximately December 2021

Location: 520 Whitney Avenue

People involved: D.W.; Q.R.; C.M. [group facilitator / staff role to confirm]; other group participants

Type: Anti-gay slur; group-setting hostility; peer conflict; staff-supervision concern

In approximately December 2021, client D.W. called client Q.R. an anti-gay slur after they had disagreements during C.M.'s group at 520 Whitney Avenue.

This is included because the alleged slur occurred in the context of a treatment group or group-adjacent setting. If staff were present or aware, the incident raises questions about whether identity-based hostility was interrupted, documented, and clinically addressed.

Potential corroboration:

- Q.R.'s account
- D.W.'s account
- C.M.'s account
- Other clients present in the group
- Group schedule / 520 Whitney records
- Clinical notes, incident reports, or staff notes

Archive classification: Firsthand / relayed client-culture concern; group-setting documentation and staff response to confirm.

5. L.B. allegedly used a racial slur toward D.W. and threw fried chicken at him, leading to a fistfight

Approx. date: Late 2021

People involved: L.B.; D.W.; other clients who related the incident

Type: Racialized harassment; peer violence; client-on-client assault / fight; staff-supervision concern

In late 2021, I heard that client L.B. called client D.W. a racial slur and threw fried chicken at D.W., leading to a fistfight.

It was related by other clients that L.B. had no previous issues with D.W. before the incident.

This is included because it raises questions about racialized harassment, peer violence, provocation, supervision, and whether staff documented or addressed racist conduct and the resulting fight.

Potential corroboration:

- D.W.'s account
- L.B.'s account
- Other clients who witnessed or heard about the incident
- Staff present or responding
- House logs
- Incident reports
- Medical records, if any
- Disciplinary records or separation records

Archive classification: Relayed client-culture / racialized harassment / peer-violence allegation requiring corroboration.

6. Deleted Reddit comment defending old Turnbridge staff culture and disparaging clients

Approx. date: Public Reddit thread date to preserve through screenshot / archive

Platform: Reddit / r/troubledteens

People referenced: "Chris" / "Chris Meyer" context [authorship unverified]

Type: Public-comment lead; staff-culture discourse; anti-client rhetoric; anti-"woke" framing

A deleted Reddit commenter in r/troubledteens defended older Turnbridge / Ford Street staff culture, disparaged critical clients, used anti-"woke" language, and singled out "a guy named Chris" as "by far the best SS and employee," adding that clients got him in trouble. My recollection / interpretation is that the comment fit the broader pattern of defending Chris Meyer or the older support-staff culture while disparaging clients as soft, liberal, or deserving of the program's coercive structure.

I suspect the commenter may have been Chris Meyer, given the tone, the unusually personal defense of "Chris," the surrounding Turnbridge / Chris Meyer discussion, and my own prior experiences with Meyer. However, authorship is unverified, and the comment does not conclusively identify the commenter or specify Chris Meyer by full name in a verifiable way.

This should be treated only as an unattributed public Reddit lead relevant to Turnbridge staff culture and the Chris Meyer discussion cluster. It should not be presented as proof of authorship or proof that Chris Meyer made the comment unless additional evidence is located.

Potential corroboration:

- Reddit thread screenshot
- Wayback capture
- Reddit archive capture
- Anyone who saw the commenter's username before deletion
- Account metadata, if obtainable
- Other Reddit discussion around Chris Meyer and Turnbridge staff culture

Archive classification: Public Reddit lead; authorship unverified.

7. Staff member allegedly said a trans woman placed in the men's young-adult program was "emotionally terrorized"

Approx. date heard: Circa 2023 Underlying placement date: Circa early 2021

People involved: Trans woman client [name not included]; staff member [name to confirm]

Type: Gender-identity safety concern; placement concern; peer culture; staff-witnessed / staff-reported concern

Circa 2023, I heard from a staff member that a trans woman who had been placed in the men's young-adult program circa early 2021 was "emotionally terrorized" while attending.

This is included as a serious gender-identity safety and placement concern. If accurate, it raises questions about whether Turnbridge safely placed transgender clients, whether peer harassment was anticipated or addressed, whether staff documented identity-based harm, and whether the client was protected from an unsafe environment.

Potential corroboration:

- The staff member's account
- The trans woman client's account, if legally and ethically obtainable
- Program placement records
- Clinical notes
- Incident reports
- Staff communications
- Other clients present during the relevant period
- Policies on transgender client placement and safety

Archive classification: Staff-relayed gender-identity safety concern; requires corroboration.

8. Q.R. allegedly made and circulated group chat using D.W.'s mugshot / arrest article

Approx. date: Approximately December 2021

People involved: Q.R.; D.W.; other clients who received or saw the group chat

Type: Peer humiliation; criminal-record mockery; cyberbullying / group-chat harassment; client culture; staff-response concern

In approximately December 2021, Q.R. allegedly made a group chat using D.W.'s mugshot and arrest article. My recollection is that this was widely shared around and mocked.

This is included because it raises questions about peer humiliation, cyberbullying, mocking of arrest history, client privacy, and whether Turnbridge staff monitored or intervened when clients used another client's public-record material for group humiliation.

Potential corroboration:

- Screenshots of the group chat, if preserved
- D.W.'s account
- Q.R.'s account
- Other clients who received or saw the group chat
- Staff who became aware of it
- Incident reports, clinical notes, or group discussions addressing it
- Contemporaneous messages or disclosures

Archive classification: Firsthand / relayed client-culture and cyber-humiliation concern requiring corroboration.

9. Allegation that a client who "snitched" was knocked out on the first floor of 189 Orange Street

Approx. date heard: Early 2023 Underlying incident date: To be confirmed

Location: First floor of 189 Orange Street clinical building

People involved: Client who allegedly "snitched" [name to confirm]; client who allegedly knocked him out [name to confirm]; witnesses to confirm

Type: Retaliatory peer violence; "snitching" culture; clinical-building safety; supervision concern; incident-reporting concern

In early 2023, I heard that a client who had "snitched" was "knocked out" by another client on the first floor of the clinical building at 189 Orange Street.

I did not personally witness this incident. It is included as a relayed allegation because, if accurate, it raises serious questions about retaliation culture, client-on-client violence, supervision inside the clinical building, incident documentation, and whether clients were protected from violence after reporting or disclosing information.

This allegation should not be stated as proven unless corroborated through witnesses, clinical-building records, incident reports, staff accounts, CCTV, or medical documentation.

Potential corroboration:

- Identity and account of the client who was allegedly knocked out
- Identity and account of the client who allegedly assaulted him
- Witnesses who saw or heard about the incident at the time
- 189 Orange Street clinical-building staff present that day
- CCTV footage, if available
- Incident reports
- Clinical notes
- Medical records or injury documentation, if any
- Staff communications concerning retaliation, "snitching," or peer violence
- Contemporaneous texts, messages, or client disclosures about the incident

Archive classification: Relayed allegation of retaliatory peer violence / clinical-building safety concern requiring corroboration.

VI. Publicly Available Records / Staff-Vetting Relevance

The staff-vetting portion of the archive should remain focused on six names currently intended for that section:

- Peter McConnell
- Tom Marzili / Tom Marzilli
- Mark Grasso / Mark David Grasso
- Dayton Kingery
- Ian Parker
- Chris Meyer / Chris Myer

Additional names should not be inserted without specific verification and a clear reason for inclusion. These items should be framed as staff-vetting questions, not as final findings of unfitness. The correct question is whether Turnbridge checked public records, licensing histories, public posts, prior-conduct concerns, transportation concerns, and rehiring records before placing staff in authority over vulnerable clients.

1. Peter McConnell

Turnbridge role: Publicly identified by Turnbridge as a former case manager, former Young Men's Program director, and later professional-development staff member.

Public-record concern: Public-indexed police results surfaced a possible Peter McConnell arrest trail involving Harassment 2nd Degree and Threatening 2nd Degree in 2017.

Type: Public-record vetting concern; harassment / threatening-related charges; leadership-level staff-vetting concern.

Peter McConnell should be treated as a priority public-record vetting item because the institutional role is more significant than ordinary support staff. He was publicly presented by Turnbridge as someone who moved from case management into Young Men's Program leadership and later professional development. The available indexed material requires final verification through original police posts, court dockets, archived pages, or official records showing full name, age/location, docket information, and disposition. The current record should therefore be phrased cautiously: public-indexed police results surfaced possible matching arrest/charge material, but final identity and disposition verification are still needed before using stronger language. Correction / exclusion note: A later 2023 Coventry / CT Insider item previously considered in this archive appears to involve a different McConnell and should not be used as Peter McConnell evidence.

Archive classification: Serious possible public-record vetting issue involving a higher-level Turnbridge figure.
Identity/disposition

verification required before stating as confirmed.

2. Chris Meyer / Chris Myer

Turnbridge role: Publicly identified by Turnbridge as Phase I Support Staff / "Unsung Hero" material, and separately preserved in prior

archive material.

Public-record concern: Public police-log reporting names Christopher William Meyer, age 35, of Ford Street, Hamden, and lists charges of second-degree breach of peace, first-degree stalking, second-degree harassment, and voyeurism with malice. Prior archive / Reddit context: In a prior Turnbridge Reddit post, I wrote that Turnbridge employed Chris Meyer of Hamden, that he assaulted a client and was subsequently rehired, and that he was later arrested for criminal stalking. In an earlier comment, I described the same memory as: "I remember him beating up a client and then getting rehired the next day," followed by the later stalking-related arrest.

Deleted Reddit lead: A deleted Reddit commenter defended older Turnbridge / Ford Street staff culture, disparaged critical clients,

used anti-"woke" language, and singled out "a guy named Chris" as "by far the best SS and employee," adding that clients got him in trouble. I suspect the commenter may have been Chris Meyer, but authorship is unverified.

Additional firsthand context: During a late-2022 client transport to New York City, I remember Meyer discussing the Fair Haven /

"Fast Eddie" murder and saying, as I remember it, that he was the person who was supposed to be killed by the person later charged in that case.

Type: Public-record vetting concern; stalking / harassment / voyeurism-related charges; alleged client assault / rehiring concern;

support-staff vetting concern; staff-culture lead; transportation / judgment concern; local-crime-story boundary concern. Chris Meyer should be treated as a major public-record, staff-retention, transportation, and staff-culture item. Turnbridge publicly presented Chris Meyer as Phase I support staff whose duties included safety, transportation, medication-adherence observation, and daily contact with residents. Prior archive / Reddit material preserves my recollection that Chris Meyer assaulted or beat up a client and was then rehired or allowed to return to work shortly afterward. That allegation should be treated as a recollection requiring corroboration through witnesses, employment records, incident reports, shift logs, client accounts, or internal communications. Separate from that recollection, public police-log reporting later listed charges against Christopher William Meyer including second-degree breach of peace, first-degree stalking, second-degree harassment, and voyeurism with malice. Arrests and charges should not be described as convictions unless final court disposition is verified. However, the public charges are relevant to the institutional question of whether Turnbridge adequately screened, supervised, retained, rehired, or protected staff placed in direct

authority over vulnerable clients. The late-2022 NYC transportation account is also relevant to the Chris Meyer staff-vetting record. I personally remember Meyer being hired to drive me into New York City for a film-related obligation. During that ride, he allegedly ran red lights, spoke on the phone with multiple women about ways he was lying to them, told me how much my parents were paying him, recounted a Fairhaven drug-buying story involving his girlfriend, a large Black man, and a dog, told me about the Fair Haven / "Fast Eddie" murder, and said, as I remember it, that he was the person who was supposed to be killed by the person later charged in the "Fast Eddie" case. This should not be treated as a criminal allegation against Meyer. It is a staff-conduct, transportation-safety, confidentiality, professional-boundary, and judgment concern. Public reporting separately anchors that Edward Andrew "Fast Eddie" Thompson was killed in Fair Haven in 2011, that Larry Johnson was arrested on a warrant for murder, that police said Thompson was not the intended target, and that Johnson was later found not guilty. That public reporting does not verify Meyer's statement and does not establish any involvement by Meyer. It is included only because Meyer's alleged statement about being the intended target may be relevant to staff judgment, boundaries, and the appropriateness of discussing local violence during a client transport. The deleted Reddit comment should also be preserved carefully. The comment defended older Turnbridge / Ford Street culture, disparaged critical clients, used anti-"woke" language, and singled out "a guy named Chris" as "by far the best SS and employee," adding that clients got him in trouble. I suspect the commenter may have been Chris Meyer, given the tone, the unusually personal defense of "Chris," the surrounding Turnbridge / Chris Meyer discussion, and my own prior experiences with Meyer. However, authorship is unverified, and the comment does not identify the commenter or specify Chris Meyer by full name. It should be treated only as an unattributed public Reddit lead relevant to Turnbridge staff culture and the Chris Meyer discussion cluster. Any stronger attribution would require additional evidence, such as screenshots showing the account before deletion, account metadata, admissions by the commenter, or corroboration from someone who saw the account before it was deleted.

Potential corroboration:

- Turnbridge "Unsung Hero" page / archived copy
- Staff rosters
- Employment records

- Transportation records
- Family payment records
- Staff code of conduct / transportation policies
- HR records
- Incident reports
- Rehiring / discipline records
- Patch / Southington police-log clipping
- Court disposition records for Christopher William Meyer
- Reddit thread screenshots / Wayback captures
- Witness accounts about the alleged client assault / rehiring
- Witness accounts about Meyer's staff conduct
- Communications arranging the NYC ride
- My parents' recollection of the transportation arrangement
- Contemporaneous texts, therapist disclosures, or family disclosures about the ride
- Public reporting on the Fair Haven / "Fast Eddie" murder case
- Any witness, text, or prior disclosure confirming Meyer stated he was the intended target

Archive classification: Public-record vetting issue + alleged client-assault / rehiring concern + firsthand transportation / staff-conduct

concern + unattributed Reddit staff-culture lead. Final disposition should be verified before using any stronger language than "charged." Authorship of the deleted Reddit comment remains unverified. Meyer's alleged statement about being the intended target in the "Fast Eddie" case is preserved as a firsthand recollection of what he said during a client transport, not as a verified fact.

3. Thomas Marzili / Tom Marzilli

Turnbridge role: Publicly identified by Turnbridge as Executive Director of Residential Services / senior men's and adolescent residential-services figure.

Public-record concern: Colorado Division of Professions and Occupations primary-source lookup lists Thomas Paul Marzilli's credential as "Unlicensed Psychotherapist" with license status "Voluntary Surrender." The board/program action lists voluntary surrender/relinquishment effective May 23, 2016.

Type: Public-record vetting concern; licensing / professional-credential concern; leadership-level concern.

Thomas Marzili / Tom Marzilli should be treated as a leadership-level licensing item. Turnbridge publicly presents him as a senior residential-services figure. Colorado primary-source licensing records list a Thomas Paul Marzilli credential as an Unlicensed Psychotherapist with a voluntary surrender / relinquishment action in 2016. This item should be phrased carefully. The record should not be overstated beyond what the licensing source shows. The current public-record language is: Colorado licensing records list voluntary surrender / relinquishment of an Unlicensed Psychotherapist credential. Any stronger claim about misconduct, discipline, or underlying facts should require the underlying board documents or additional official records.

Archive classification: Public-record licensing / leadership-vetting issue. Underlying board documents should be preserved if available.

4. Dayton Kingery

Turnbridge role: Later employed at Turnbridge as support staff / support staff manager, according to public employment materials

previously reviewed. Public record: Arrested and charged in California with felony vandalism, resisting arrest, making criminal threats, and elder-abuse-related conduct. Source context: Incident partially captured in publicly circulated video, including Reddit PublicFreakout post.

Type: Public-record vetting concern; out-of-state arrest/charge history.

Dayton Kingery was publicly reported as having been arrested and charged with felony vandalism, resisting arrest, making criminal threats, and elder-abuse-related conduct before later Turnbridge employment. Dayton is included here not as a claim about his character, but because his publicly reported arrest/charge history appears relevant to Turnbridge's staff-vetting practices. The institutional question is whether Turnbridge appropriately screened and supervised direct-access support staff, not whether any individual employee should be reduced to a public incident.

Archive classification: Public-record vetting issue. Final disposition should be verified before using any stronger language than "arrested/charged."

5. Ian Parker

Turnbridge role: Publicly indexed as Turnbridge case manager, 2021-2023.

Public record: WestportNow and Patch reported that Ian Parker, age 25, of Westport, was arrested on December 16, 2016 and charged with second-degree assault and disorderly conduct after police found a male party bleeding from the head. The articles also referenced a prior August 2016 narcotics/paraphernalia arrest and an outstanding failure-to-appear warrant. Additional identity anchor: Public recovery testimonial by Ian Parker describes Westport background, recovery timeline, and later work as a case manager in a long-term treatment center.

Type: Public-record vetting concern; criminal-charge history; warrant/disposition issue.

Ian Parker was publicly indexed as a Turnbridge case manager during the 2021-2023 period. Public reporting from 2016 described an Ian Parker, age 25, of Westport, charged with second-degree assault and disorderly conduct, with prior narcotics/paraphernalia arrest history and an outstanding failure-to-appear warrant referenced in the reporting. A later recovery testimonial provides additional identity anchors connecting the Westport Ian Parker profile to a long-term-treatment case-management role. I personally observed that Ian Parker appeared very eager to restrain me on his first day on the job during a violent incident.

Archive classification: Public-record vetting issue + firsthand observation of staff behavior. Final court disposition should be verified.

6. Mark David Grasso / Mark Grasso

Turnbridge role: Staff member present at / associated with 1212 Quinipiac Avenue during the late-2022 L.M. disclosure incident,

based on my firsthand identification. Archive incident connection: Mark David Grasso is the staff member I identify as having overheard my late-2022 disclosure to E.O. that L.M. had gotten on top of me, grabbed my penis, and refused to get off. Public-record / public-material concern: Public materials identify a Mark Grasso of Bridgeport as a Family ReEntry recovery coach and quote him saying addiction "landed me in prison" before recovery. A public Instagram profile using the handle @markdgrassoct22 and display name "Mark David Grasso" matches the staff member I remember as Mark. Specific charge history, docket details, conviction status, or disposition should not be stated unless official records are located and confirmed.

Type: Staff identity anchor; staff-vetting / reentry-background context; sexual-boundary disclosure response; alleged failure to initiate

meaningful protective action. Mark David Grasso should be treated as both a staff-response item and a staff-vetting context item. In late 2022, at 1212 Quinipiac Avenue, I told E.O. that L.M. had gotten on top of me, grabbed my penis, and refused to get off. Mark David Grasso / Mark Grasso overheard me relay this disclosure. My memory is that Mark said words to the effect that it sounded crazy and that I should "feel free" to report it to higher-ups if I felt like it. To my knowledge, no meaningful protective action followed, and L.M. continued to harass me afterward. I identify this staff member as Mark David Grasso. A public Instagram profile using the handle @markdgrassoct22 and display name "Mark David Grasso" matches the person I remember as Mark. Public materials also identify a Mark Grasso of Bridgeport in recovery / reentry work, including Family ReEntry, and quote him saying addiction "landed me in prison" before he turned his life around. This material is included for staff-vetting and institutional-response context. The issue is not whether a person with a recovery or reentry history should be categorically excluded from direct-care work. The institutional questions are whether Turnbridge adequately vetted, trained, supervised, and documented staff placed around vulnerable clients, and whether staff responded appropriately when a sexual-boundary disclosure was made in their presence. This entry should not state any specific criminal charge, conviction, docket, or disposition unless official records are located and confirmed. The current public-record language should remain limited to: public materials identify Mark Grasso of Bridgeport in recovery / reentry work and quote him saying addiction "landed me in prison"; specific charge / docket / disposition details remain unconfirmed.

Potential corroboration:

- Turnbridge employment records confirming Mark David Grasso / Mark Grasso's role and dates

- Staff schedules or shift logs for 1212 Quinnipiac Avenue in late 2022
- E.O.'s account of my disclosure and Mark's response
- Incident reports, clinical notes, or house logs concerning the L.M. disclosure
- Other clients aware of L.M.'s later harassment
- Screenshot / archive of @markdgrassoct22 showing display name Mark David Grasso
- Public Family ReEntry / recovery-coach materials identifying Mark Grasso
- Official Connecticut docket records, if any, confirming charge history, disposition, incarceration history, or dropped charges
- Contemporaneous texts, journal entries, therapist disclosures, or family disclosures from the time

Archive classification: Firsthand disclosure + staff overhearing + alleged failure to respond, with later staff-identity anchor and public

staff-vetting / reentry-background context requiring official-record verification.

VII. Public Review Evidence and Archive Corroboration

Public reviews do not prove every specific archive allegation. Their value is that they independently raise overlapping risk categories from other vantage points: families, former clients, loved ones, neighbors, and employees. The public review record independently echoes several categories already present in the archive: peer-safety concerns, supervision failures, sexual-boundary and complaint-handling concerns, staff-quality concerns, money / retention concerns, admissions / marketing mismatch, and review-integrity concerns. The pattern warrants written questions and record requests. It does not, by itself, prove every specific allegation.

1. Google Review Capture: Public Pattern Evidence

The archived Google Reviews capture lists Turnbridge at 189 Orange Street, New Haven, Connecticut, with a 4.3 average rating from 246 reviews. The capture includes detailed positive reviews, detailed negative reviews, short one-line reviews, rating-only entries, and a recent cluster of positive entries around "2 months ago." This mixed record is more probative than a simple star average because the negative reviews allege concrete safety, staffing, transparency, admissions, identity-related, medication, and money-related concerns. Because Google Maps reviews are dynamic, this material should be preserved with dated screenshots, original image files, and, where possible, live profile URLs or screen recordings showing the path from the Google listing to each review. Key negative Google entries visible in the archived capture Sarah Glenn Leventis Former-client account alleging that only a few employees wanted what was best for clients; manipulation of vulnerable parents and children; money motive; "not like the website"; and review-management concerns, including the allegation that some reviews can be taken down and some five-star reviews were requested from former staff and clients.

Memo significance: Important because it connects treatment experience, marketing mismatch, money motive, and review-integrity

concerns. Leighann Hutchinson / Margaret Doty Family review alleging that a suicidal child was not adequately heard or checked on, obtained broken glass, cut himself, and "could have died."

Memo significance: Directly relevant to supervision, monitoring, self-harm-risk protocols, room safety, and staff checks.

Aria Family review alleging weak package checks, weapons/drugs entering, ineffective pat-downs, dismissive workers, and an unsafe facility despite safety marketing.

Memo significance: Directly relevant to contraband control, peer safety, facility safety, and marketing-vs-reality claims.

Eliza Taylor Former-client review alleging cash grab, little treatment, poor post-discharge sobriety, and later success at a different program.

Memo significance: Relevant to money motive, treatment quality, outcomes, and family reliance on marketing.

David M Sibling review alleging an all-around awful family experience. The reviewer identifies his own recovery/program experience and recommends alternatives.

Memo significance: Relevant because it is not simply a client resentment review; it is a family / sibling perspective with comparative

program context. Garland Alban Parent/family review alleging lack of transparency, poor communication, and non-individualized curriculum.

Memo significance: Relevant to family disclosure, informed consent, and marketing claims.

Tyler A Family review alleging claims on the website were not met and lack of meaningful challenge/development.

Memo significance: Relevant to marketing mismatch and treatment-expectation concerns.

Sabio Adelina Parent review alleging Phase II directors were condescending, rude, arrogant, and that promises were not fulfilled.

Memo significance: Relevant to staff conduct, family communication, and phase-specific concerns.

Coleen Huggins Hayback Parent review alleging emotional/verbal abuse by a therapist, dishonesty, and failed family therapy calls.

Memo significance: Relevant to staff conduct, clinical oversight, family communication, and complaint handling.

HP Identity-related review alleging Turnbridge was not good for trans, non-binary, LGBT, or BIPOC clients and lacked diversity/accountability.

Memo significance: Relevant to suitability for clients whose mental-health/substance issues intersect with identity and to staff/culture

due diligence. Maria Griffin Review alleging acceptance for mental health followed by removal / ER transfer after an incident and lack of meaningful treatment.

Memo significance: Relevant to admissions fit, acuity screening, and response to mental-health incidents.

Jacob Lachman Former-client review alleging admissions misrepresented length of stay and program details.

Memo significance: Relevant to admissions representations and consent.

Riv g Former-client review alleging abuse / manipulation and being treated as unsafe when wanting to leave.

Memo significance: Relevant to autonomy, discharge pressure, complaint framing, and family relationship pressure.

Steven O Review alleging residential / non-medical framing, expensive billing, and difficulties leaving.

Memo significance: Relevant to marketing, billing, and autonomy concerns.

Leila Terry Adolescent-patient review alleging medication concerns and adverse side effects.

Memo significance: Relevant to medication oversight and psychiatric prescribing questions.

Lauren Killingsworth Neighborhood review alleging a Turnbridge SUV driver nearly hit pedestrians while looking at a phone with passengers.

Memo significance: Relevant to transportation safety and supervision outside residences.

Amanda Nelson / Chris Earhart / Kaden Harkins Admissions / deposit / phone interaction complaints.

Memo significance: Relevant to pre-admission conduct and family-facing process.

Joseph Camara / AP / Roman Rosales / Mart 456 / "Poop Fart" Short negative entries with limited detail.

Memo significance: Low probative individually, but still part of the negative review corpus.

2. Google Positive-Review Pattern and Review-Integrity Concerns

The archived Google capture also contains extensive positive material, including detailed parent reviews, alumni reviews, professional/referrer reviews, family-member reviews, and very short positive entries. A rigorous memo should not dismiss detailed positive family accounts merely because negative reviews exist. At the same time, not all positive reviews carry equal due-diligence weight for client safety. Observed positive-review features

- A visible cluster of positive reviews appears around "2 months ago," including detailed parent reviews, short one-line reviews, and

several accounts with one to three total reviews. Clustering alone does not prove manipulation, but it warrants preservation and date/profile review.

- Several positive entries disclose professional, business, referral, or staff-adjacent relationships: examples include a reviewer who says

they run a business and have worked with Turnbridge; a reviewer who had the privilege of touring campuses and collaborating with the team; a marketer describing the business side; and referring professionals or social workers praising particular staff or the program. These reviews may be genuine, but they are less probative of residential client safety than direct client/family incident accounts.

- Several recent short positive entries are extremely thin: "Great place," "Amazing place," "Very nice place," "The staff has been great,"

and similar statements. These are not evidence of wrongdoing, but they do not answer safety questions about incident reporting, separation after threats, contraband control, or sexual-boundary complaint response.

- Some adjacent family-member positive reviews warrant contextual review where timing, adjacency, sparse detail, single-reaction

engagement, and archive context suggest the review may require additional verification. These features do not prove falsity; they reduce probative value as evidence of safety.

- The strongest review-integrity lead is Sarah Glenn Leventis's review, which alleges that reviews can be taken down and that some

five-star reviews were requested from former staff and clients. That allegation requires independent corroboration, but it belongs in the record because it is specific and directly tied to reputation management. Professional characterization The public review record contains review-integrity concerns, including a former-client allegation of solicited positive reviews; a recent cluster of positive reviews; some thin one-line reviews; relationship-based positive reviews; and adjacent or similarly engaged positive reviews that may warrant context. These patterns do not prove fraud, but they reduce the value of the star average as a safety proxy and justify requesting incident-level data.

3. Rehabs.com Evidence

Rehabs.com was checked during drafting. The visible Turnbridge page listed a 3.5 overall rating across 74 reviews and showed categories including accommodations/amenities, treatment effectiveness, and meals/nutrition. It also listed review keywords including staff, safe, room, clean, facility, group, admissions, insurance, detox, and counselor. The visible recent reviews included three negative entries and two positive entries. Jessica - 2.0 / Loved One Visible review allegations include lack of professionalism / expertise, no accountability, ineffective supervision, disorganization, and profit motive.

Relevance: Staff quality, supervision, accountability, money motive.

Samuel - 2.3 / Former Client Visible review concerns include client safety, staff supervision, staff conduct, complaint handling, incident reporting, staff vetting, and sexual-boundary complaint concerns.

Relevance: Directly overlaps archive categories and family due-diligence questions.

NunyaBizness - 2.3 / Loved One Visible review alleges unsafe phone contact involving a minor client and a person connected to prior sexual harm, and later sexual assault by another patient.

Relevance: Sexual safety, supervision, family wishes, outside contact, patient-on-patient harm.

This item should be described carefully. It is a public-review allegation, not a verified finding. Safe wording: One parent / loved-one review alleges that a minor client was permitted to maintain unsafe outside contact with a person connected to prior sexual harm, despite family concern, and that the client was later sexually assaulted while at Turnbridge. This review is preserved as a public-review allegation raising questions about supervision, sexual-safety protocols, outside-contact boundaries, family communication, documentation, and protection after disclosure. haleigh - 5.0 / Loved One Very short positive review: "great, affective!!"

Relevance: Low probative weight due to minimal detail; not evidence of falsity.

Anne - 5.0 Detailed positive family account emphasizing long-term treatment, family support, and 14 months of care.

Relevance: A detailed positive counterweight; should not be dismissed absent contrary evidence.

Rehabs.com significance Rehabs.com strengthens the archive not because every review is negative, but because its visible negative entries independently raise the same categories: supervision, staff conduct, complaint handling, sexual safety, and money motive. These are precisely the categories for which records should exist.

4. Glassdoor and Employee-Review Context

Glassdoor was checked during drafting. The public pages listed Turnbridge at 2.8/5 across 45 reviews, 41% recommending to a friend, 44% positive business outlook, and category ratings including 2.5 senior management and 2.5 compensation/benefits. Visible negative excerpts included allegations of poor management, poor pay, only people who do not care lasting, management lying about raises/promotions, and upper staff being rude or judgmental. These employee reviews do not prove client incidents, but they are relevant to the staff-retention and supervision environment in which client safety is managed.

Employee-review significance

- The overall employee score suggests mixed employee experience; it is not determinative of care quality but is relevant to culture.
- Senior-management and compensation / benefits concerns can matter where direct-care quality depends on staffing, retention, training,

and supervision.

- Visible negative excerpts support asking how Turnbridge audits staff conduct, management response, training, and retention.
- Glassdoor also shows positive employee reviews and positive clinical-growth descriptions. The employee record is mixed and should be

used cautiously, not as one-sided proof.

VIII. Archive Allegations Compared with Public Review Themes

The public reviews independently raise similar risk categories from other vantage points. The overlap does not prove every archive allegation. It supports requesting records.

1. Peer safety

Archive examples:

- M.J. / C.S. CCTV incident
- 90 Ford chair assault involving C.
- A.S. threats
- M.S. Venmo / outing threat
- Younger client allegedly returned to housing with feared peer

Public-review overlap:

- Aria alleges weak contraband controls.
- Leighann Hutchinson / Margaret Doty alleges self-harm monitoring failure.
- NunyaBizness alleges patient-on-patient sexual assault.
- Samuel raises client safety.

Records to request:

- Incident reports
- Separation plans
- CCTV logs
- Rosters
- House logs
- Complaint notes

2. Sexual boundaries

Archive examples:

- L.M. incident at 1212 Quinnipiac
- Mark Grasso allegedly overheard disclosure
- E. / M.S. incident after movie trip
- Liam and Steve Tobey relayed concerns

Public-review overlap:

- NunyaBizness raises sexual-safety allegations.
- Samuel explicitly raises sexual-boundary complaints.

Records to request:

- Clinical notes
- Mandated-reporting records
- Staff schedules
- Protection plans
- Family communications

3. Staff conduct / vetting

Archive examples:

- Six-name staff-vetting cluster: Peter McConnell, Tom Marzili, Mark Grasso, Dayton Kingery, Ian Parker, Chris Meyer
- Conduct allegations involving Drew Behr, Douglas Roberto, Dave Murphy, Will, and others
- Chris Meyer transportation and public-record cluster
- Liam staff-boundary / termination-context cluster

Public-review overlap:

- Google and Rehabs.com reviews allege dismissive or uncaring staff.
- Glassdoor raises management / staff-culture concerns.

Records to request:

- Background-check policies
- Licensing checks
- Social-media / public-history review
- HR files
- Discipline / rehiring records
- Termination / separation records
- Staff transportation records

4. Money / marketing gap

Archive examples:

- Archive alleges due-diligence mismatch between marketing image and lived conditions.
- Chris Meyer transportation account includes recollection that he disclosed how much my parents were paying him.

Public-review overlap:

- Sarah Glenn Leventis, Eliza Taylor, Jessica, Steven O, Philip Spano, and others allege money motive or marketing mismatch.

Records to request:

- Admissions scripts
- Length-of-stay representations
- Refund policies
- Complaint / discharge records
- Outcome data
- Family payment policies
- Staff transportation-payment policies

5. Review integrity

Archive examples:

- Bad Review Index and positive-review analysis track suspicious or low-probative reviews.

Public-review overlap:

- Sarah Glenn Leventis alleges some positive reviews were requested from former staff / clients.
- Google capture includes recent clustered positives and one-line positives.

Records to request:

- Review-solicitation policies
- Internal communications
- Staff / alumni review requests
- Incentives
- Removal requests

IX. General Patterns Observed

These are not presented as single-event allegations. They are recurring patterns observed or experienced in the Turnbridge environment, and later echoed in public-review material.

1. Fistfights / client-on-client violence

There were repeated physical altercations and violent incidents among clients, including incidents significant enough to be captured on CCTV.

2. Sexual assault / sexual-boundary violations

I experienced and/or was aware of sexual-boundary incidents involving clients. In at least one instance, a staff member overheard my disclosure and appeared to leave further action up to me rather than initiating a clear protective response. Public reviews independently raise related sexual-safety and patient-on-patient harm concerns, especially the Rehabs.com loved-one review preserved above.

3. Casual cruelty by higher-ups and support staff

I observed staff and higher-level personnel treat client suffering, humiliation, violence, or fear as material for mockery. The repeated replaying of CCTV footage while laughing at clients is central to this pattern.

4. Inadequate response to threats and harassment

I observed failures to meaningfully discipline or separate clients after threats, harassment, coercion, or violence.

5. Vetting concerns for direct-access staff and leadership-adjacent staff

Publicly available records concerning later Turnbridge staff raise questions about whether Turnbridge adequately screened people placed in direct-access roles with vulnerable clients, especially support staff, case managers, program directors, and professional-development personnel. The six-name staff-vetting cluster should remain focused on Peter McConnell, Tom Marzili / Marzilli, Mark Grasso, Dayton Kingery, Ian Parker, and Chris Meyer. The Chris Meyer item is especially significant because it combines multiple categories: Turnbridge's own public description of him as Phase I support staff; a firsthand transportation / judgment concern; a prior archive / Reddit recollection involving alleged client assault and rehiring; public police-log charge reporting; a deleted Reddit lead defending "Chris" and old Turnbridge staff culture; and the new recollection that Meyer discussed the "Fast Eddie" murder and allegedly said he was the intended target. These items should not be collapsed into a single proven finding, but together they raise serious staff-vetting, supervision, retention, transportation, and family-disclosure questions.

6. Licensing and professional-credential concerns in leadership

Public licensing records concerning senior leadership figures raise additional questions about whether Turnbridge adequately evaluated professional histories, credential status, prior license actions, and the appropriateness of placing individuals in residential-services leadership.

7. Ideological / political boundary concerns from staff

My experience included staff using treatment authority to moralize or pathologize clients' politics, identities, and perceived laziness. This was especially concerning where queer-presenting or left-wing clients were redirected into political conversations about conservatism, socialism, personal responsibility, and leftists allegedly being irresponsible.

8. Shame-based family-pressure rhetoric

My experience included staff using clients' parents and family dependency as material for shaming. The Dave Murphy Phase 3 East Haven lecture is one example: clients were framed as lazy, burdensome, and people whose parents could not take care of them, rather than as vulnerable young people in a treatment setting.

9. Failure to respond to coercion / outing threats between clients

My experience included situations where coercion, outing threats, harassment, and threats through social media were disclosed to staff but not meaningfully addressed. The Phase II movie-trip / Venmo incident involving M.S. is one example: after I reported that I felt pressured to send money under threat of being outed, the response I remember was dismissive rather than protective.

10. House security / staff judgment concerns

Secondhand allegations heard from multiple people raised concerns about house security and staff judgment, including the allegation that Douglas Roberto left a Phase 3 house open, that a masked intruder entered, and that a client was allegedly involved in searching the house rather than staff contacting authorities or following a clear safety protocol. This allegation requires corroboration, but it fits the broader concern about supervision, reporting, and client safety.

11. Staff sexual-boundary / inappropriate self-disclosure concerns

The Steve Tobey / C.R. allegation raises a separate concern about staff discussing their own sex addiction, cheating, marriage collapse, and client masturbation in a treatment setting. If corroborated, this would fit a broader concern about staff using clients as containers for their own sexual material, projecting their own recovery issues onto clients, or pressuring clients around sexual behavior in ways that blur treatment boundaries.

12. Client autonomy / attempted departure / outside-contact interference concerns

Secondhand allegations and firsthand memories of client statements raise concerns about how Turnbridge handled clients who expressed that they had been brought to the program against their wishes or who attempted to leave through outside support. The J. airport story and H. denied-access story are included as separate accounts in which clients allegedly tried to leave or obtain help leaving through girlfriends, after which Turnbridge allegedly contacted or spoke with the girlfriend's father or family authority figure. Public reviews also raise related autonomy, discharge-pressure, difficulty-leaving, and "being treated as unsafe when wanting to leave" themes.

13. Medical safety / medication-access concerns

My experience included an incident in which a staff member allegedly refused to provide access to an inhaler during an asthma attack after saying I was "faking it" and that other clients said I was "getting high" off albuterol. Public reviews separately raise medication and self-harm monitoring concerns, including Leila Terry's medication-related review and Leighann Hutchinson / Margaret Doty's self-harm monitoring allegation.

14. Staff physical-boundary / judgment concerns

The Will inhaler incident overlaps with broader staff-boundary concerns because I remember the same staff member restraining and tickling clients and telling clients stories about robbing gas stations in ski masks with toy guns and not getting caught. These details require corroboration, but if corroborated they would raise questions about physical boundaries, judgment, and direct-care suitability.

15. Therapist-boundary / adolescent-program cruelty concerns

The allegation involving adolescent-program client J. and Matt Fields / Matthew Fields, LMFT raises a separate concern about therapist judgment, cruelty / humiliation, and possible discouragement of disclosure in an adolescent-treatment context. If corroborated, this would fit a broader concern about whether vulnerable adolescent clients were protected from humiliating, unsafe, or professionally inappropriate comments by clinical staff, and whether staff attempted to suppress reporting after crossing boundaries.

16. Staff transportation / client-contact boundaries

The Chris Meyer transportation account raises a separate concern about staff transportation and client-contact boundaries. A staff member transporting a vulnerable client should not allegedly drive recklessly, disclose family payment arrangements, conduct chaotic personal calls, discuss drug-world stories, or recount local murder-related material during a

paid client transport. The added "Fast Eddie" detail makes this concern more serious as a boundary / judgment issue. I remember Meyer saying, during the client transport, that he had been the person who was supposed to be killed by the person later charged in the "Fast Eddie" case. Public reporting says Edward Andrew "Fast Eddie" Thompson was killed in Fair Haven, that Larry Johnson was arrested on a warrant for murder, that police said Thompson was not the intended target, and that Johnson was later found not guilty. This public reporting does not verify Meyer's alleged statement. It only confirms that the real-world case existed and involved an official statement that Thompson was not the intended target. The due-diligence issue is why a staff member in a client-transport role would discuss this material with a vulnerable client. Public reviews also raise transportation-safety concerns, including a neighborhood Google review alleging a Turnbridge SUV driver nearly hit pedestrians while looking at a phone with passengers.

17. Staff-culture / Reddit discourse concerns

The deleted Reddit comment defending older Turnbridge / Ford Street culture and praising "a guy named Chris" is not proof of authorship and should not be attributed to Chris Meyer as fact. However, it is relevant as a public-comment lead because it disparages critical clients, frames newer clients / parents in anti-"woke" terms, and suggests that clients got "Chris" in trouble. In context with the Chris Meyer discussion cluster, it should be preserved as an unattributed staff-culture lead requiring careful caveating.

18. Staff boundary / termination-context concerns involving Liam

The Liam allegations raise a separate staff-boundary and termination-context concern. In late 2022 or 2023, I remember Z.T. discussing the case of why Liam was fired in a hushed voice with another client and becoming hesitant to tell me details. Later, in 2023 or 2024, W.H. informed me by phone of the allegation that Liam was fired after allegedly trying to meet up with an underage former adolescent-program client while he was an adult support staff member in the young-adults program. Separately, I heard that Liam allegedly gave H.V. and C. hits from a THC pen while they were sequestered at a separate property after relapse. These allegations require corroboration, but they raise questions about staff boundaries, adolescent-program safeguards, relapse-management supervision, termination practices, internal documentation, and whether Turnbridge quietly removed staff after serious misconduct allegations without transparent reporting.

19. Public-review integrity / reputation-management concerns

The review record raises questions about whether families can rely on star averages alone. Sarah Glenn Leventis's review alleges that reviews can be taken down and that some five-star reviews were requested from former staff and clients. This allegation requires corroboration, but it is directly relevant to review integrity. The Google capture also shows positive review clusters, short one-line positive reviews, relationship-based reviews, professional/referral-adjacent reviews, and detailed positive family accounts. These should be treated as a mixed record. Positive reviews may be genuine, but they do not resolve safety questions about incident documentation, separation protocols, staff vetting, medication access, sexual-boundary complaints, transportation safeguards, or family disclosure.

20. Client property / missing-belongings response concerns

My experience also included a missing-property incident involving a PlayStation 4 left at 1212 Quinpiac around January 2023 and discovered missing around May 2023. I raised the missing PS4 with case manager Eric Regensburg, but I do not recall any meaningful effort to retrieve it, document it, investigate it, or create a missing-property report. The PS4 was never returned.

This raises a broader due-diligence question about how Turnbridge documented, safeguarded, investigated, and resolved missing client property inside residential housing.

21. Client culture / identity-based hostility / peer humiliation concerns

The client-culture accounts above raise a broader concern about Turnbridge / Turning Point's peer environment. The issue is not that every offensive statement by a client is automatically an institutional act. The issue is whether Turnbridge adequately supervised, interrupted, documented, and clinically addressed a peer environment where clients could be sexually shamed, mocked for perceived same-sex sexuality, called anti-gay slurs, racially targeted, physically attacked, humiliated through mugshot / arrest-article sharing, emotionally terrorized because of gender identity, or retaliated against after being labeled a "snitch."

These incidents overlap with existing archive categories: peer safety, sexual-boundary response, staff supervision, adolescent-program safeguards, identity-related safety, group culture, retaliation, clinical-building safety, and whether staff treated harmful client behavior as clinically significant or merely as ordinary peer conflict.

Due-diligence questions include how Turnbridge documented anti-gay slurs, racial slurs, sexual shaming, identity-based harassment, cyberbullying, retaliatory violence, mugshot / arrest-article sharing, and harm to transgender clients placed in gendered young-adult housing.

X. Records and Questions Required to Test the Evidence

A rigorous escalation packet should request records rather than rely on rhetoric. The public reviews and archive allegations generate specific questions that Turnbridge should be able to answer with documents.

Incident documentation Request all incident reports, house logs, and clinical notes for 189 Orange, 90 Ford, 1212 Quinpiac, 520 Whitney / Whitney-Canner, East Haven, and Phase III incidents identified in the archive. CCTV Request footage-retention policies, CCTV access logs, names of staff who reviewed footage, and records showing whether footage was replayed outside formal investigation. Peer separation Request policies and actual records showing separation after assault, threats, sexual-boundary complaints, coercion, harassment, client fear, or client-on-client violence. Sexual safety Request complaint protocols, mandated-reporting decision records, family-notification records, response to unsafe outside contact, and protection plans. Contraband / self-harm Request package-check logs, search policies, room-check logs, sharps / broken-glass records, suicidal-ideation monitoring logs, contraband reports, and environmental safety audits. Staff vetting Request background checks, public-record searches, licensing checks, social-media / public-history review, HR discipline records, rehiring decisions, and staff-retention records. Staff termination / quiet removal Request records showing whether staff were quietly let go, terminated, transferred, suspended, or separated after misconduct allegations, including any Liam-related HR or internal reporting records. Transportation Request staff transportation policies, vehicle / driver protocols, records of client transports, staff phone-use policies while driving clients, family-payment handling policies, and any incident reports involving transport safety. Admissions / retention Request length-of-stay representations, admissions scripts, family communications, refund / withdrawal rules, discharge-against-advice records, and policies governing attempts to leave. Review integrity

Request internal communications soliciting, coordinating, incentivizing, pressuring, suppressing, or removing public reviews; review-solicitation policies; staff / alumni review requests; and any requests made to platforms regarding negative reviews.

XI. Evidence To Preserve / Follow-Up List

Names to confirm

- M.J. [client involved in February 2022 M.J. / C.S. CCTV incident]
- C.S. [client involved in February 2022 M.J. / C.S. CCTV incident]
- C. [older client involved in February 2022 90 Ford Street chair assault]
- Mark Grasso
- Liam [staff last name to identify through 2021-2023 support staff / case manager logs]
- L.M.
- A.S.
- H.V.
- C. [client involved in Liam THC pen allegation; distinguish from C. in 90 Ford chair assault if records allow]
- Z.T.
- E.O.
- E.
- M.S.
- C.R.
- Mark David Grasso / Mark Grasso [staff member identified by me as present for the late-2022 1212 Quinpiac / L.M. disclosure; public

Instagram handle @markdgrassoct22; official employment records and docket details to confirm]

- J. [former adolescent-program client from 189 Orange / Matt Fields allegation; identity to distinguish from other J. entries if needed]
- Matt Fields / Matthew Fields, LMFT [therapist identified by public photo review and public Turnbridge-associated materials]

- Will [last name to confirm; summer 2022, Foxon Boulevard / Hobby Lobby-area house]
- J. [client from late-2021 airport story]
- J.'s girlfriend
- J.'s girlfriend's father
- H. [client from early-2022 denied-access story]
- H.'s girlfriend
- H.'s girlfriend's father
- Skinny younger client from early-2023 Phase 1 safety concern [name unknown]
- Heavier client returned to Phase 1 after alleged restraint / beating incident [name unknown]
- Second client who heard the early-2023 concern [name unknown]
- Second case manager present when I disclosed the M.S. Venmo / outing-threat incident to Douglas Roberto
- Client allegedly asked by Douglas Roberto to sweep the Phase 3 house after the alleged ski-mask intruder incident
- Other clients who heard or repeated the Douglas Roberto / ski-mask intruder allegation
- Other Structured Group / Carriage House clients present for Steve Tobey's alleged self-disclosure
- Other clients present for Dave Murphy's March / April 2022 East Haven lecture
- Other clients who heard J. say he felt "conned"
- Other clients who knew J. was watching The Wire and not attending groups
- Other clients who heard H. describe the denied-access / girlfriend's father incident
- Other clients present during the Will inhaler / asthma incident
- Other clients who witnessed Will allegedly restraining or tickling clients
- Other clients who heard Will allegedly tell gas-station robbery stories
- Chris Meyer / Chris Myer [employment identity, Turnbridge staff role, public police-log identity, transportation role, and court disposition]

to verify]

- Witnesses to the alleged Chris Meyer client-assault / rehiring incident
- Clients or staff who saw the deleted Reddit account before deletion or can identify the author
- Witnesses to the Chris Meyer late-2022 NYC transportation arrangement
- Family members with payment or arrangement records for the Chris Meyer ride
- W.H. [source of later phone allegation concerning Liam]
- Other client who was speaking with Z.T. during the hushed Liam discussion
- Former adolescent-program client allegedly involved in the Liam allegation, if legally and ethically obtainable

Records to seek or preserve

- CCTV footage from February 2022 M.J. / C.S. incident
- CCTV footage from February 2022 90 Ford Street chair assault involving C.
- CCTV/camera-access logs showing who reviewed or replayed footage
- Phase 1 incident reports
- 90 Ford Street shift logs
- 1212 Quinnipiac Avenue shift logs
- Mark David Grasso / Mark Grasso employment / shift records showing assignment or presence at 1212 Quinnipiac Avenue around the

L.M. disclosure

- Records or witness accounts showing that Mark Grasso overheard my disclosure to E.O. about L.M.

- Early-2023 Phase 1 records involving any client taken off site after restraining / beating another client and then returned to shared housing

housing

- Phase II records and client/staff schedules for 520 Whitney Avenue / Whitney-Canner in early-to-mid 2022
- Peter McConnell Phase II schedules, meeting records, and client accounts concerning political / ideological lectures or private-meeting

redirections

- Public property / article records for 520 Whitney Avenue as a CT Clinical Services / Turning Point sober-house property
- Phase 3 East Haven house rosters / staff schedules from March or April 2022
- Records identifying the Phase 3 transitional house in East Haven a few blocks from Hobby Lobby
- Records identifying the Turnbridge house a few blocks from Foxon Boulevard / Hobby Lobby in summer 2022
- Dave Murphy schedules, meeting notes, house logs, or client accounts concerning the March / April 2022 "lazy / burden on parents"

lecture

- Will's full name, employment records, and staff schedules for the Foxon Boulevard / Hobby Lobby-area house in summer 2022
- Medication logs showing inhaler access, denial, or request timing during the Will / asthma incident
- House logs or shift notes from the day of the asthma attack
- Medical records, therapist disclosures, family disclosures, or contemporaneous messages concerning the asthma attack or inhaler

denial

- Witness accounts from clients present when I asked Will for the inhaler
- Witness accounts from clients who heard Will say I was "faking it" or "getting high" off albuterol
- Witness accounts from clients who saw Will restrain or tickle clients
- Witness accounts from clients who heard Will tell stories about gas-station robberies with ski masks and toy guns
- Phase II Tuesday movie-trip schedules around November 2022
- Records showing a Phase II outing to see Nope
- 520 Whitney Avenue house roster from the November 2022 movie-trip period
- Venmo record showing \$50 payment to M.S.
- Social-media messages / threat texts from M.S.
- Douglas Roberto case-management notes or records concerning my disclosure about the Venmo / outing threat
- Identity and records of the second case manager present during that disclosure
- C.R.'s direct account concerning the Steve Tobey allegation
- Other client accounts concerning the Steve Tobey allegation
- J.'s direct account concerning the Matt Fields / 189 Orange walk allegation
- Other adolescent-program clients who may have heard J. describe the Matt Fields / 189 Orange allegation
- Employment records confirming Matt Fields / Matthew Fields, LMFT's adolescent-program role, dates, and assignment to 189 Orange and his last name
- Staff schedules showing Matt Fields assigned to 189 Orange during late 2021 / early 2022
- Clinical-building records, appointment schedules, or movement/walk records involving J. and Matt Fields
- Prior complaints, clinical notes, staff communications, or contemporaneous disclosures concerning Matt Fields' conduct with adolescent

clients

- Liam employment records / termination timeline
- W.H.'s direct account of the 2023/2024 phone call concerning the Liam allegation

- Call logs, texts, notes, or contemporaneous messages connected to the W.H. phone call
- Z.T.'s account of the late-2022 or 2023 hushed discussion concerning why Liam was fired
- The other client who was speaking with Z.T. during that hushed discussion
- Internal Turnbridge records concerning any complaint, investigation, mandated report, or separation involving Liam
- Former adolescent-program client's account, if legally and ethically obtainable
- Records showing whether Liam was quietly let go, fired, suspended, transferred, or otherwise separated
- Staff schedules for separate-property relapse sequestering involving H.V. and C.
- Records connecting Liam to separate-property relapse sequestering involving H.V. and C.
- Records concerning allegations that Liam gave clients THC pen hits while on or around staff duty
- Written reports involving L.M., A.S., C., M.J., C.S., M.S., E., C.R., Will, Matt Fields / Matthew Fields, Liam, or adolescent-program client J.
- House logs, police reports, incident reports, 911 calls, or internal communications concerning the alleged Douglas Roberto / ski-mask

intruder incident

- HR / termination records showing whether Douglas Roberto was fired and when
- J.'s direct account concerning being brought to Turnbridge against his wishes, feeling "conned," not attending groups, arranging a plane

ticket, and the alleged girlfriend's-father contact

- J.'s girlfriend's account
- J.'s girlfriend's father's account
- J.'s flight / airline records, if preserved
- Texts or call logs between J. and his girlfriend
- Turnbridge records concerning J.'s intake, consent status, discharge attempt, departure, or return
- Staff notes or communications around J. leaving / attempting to leave
- H.'s direct account concerning the alleged denied-access / girlfriend's-father contact
- H.'s girlfriend's account
- H.'s girlfriend's father's account
- Texts or call logs between H. and his girlfriend
- Turnbridge records concerning H.'s intake, consent status, attempted departure, discharge request, or outside contact
- Staff notes or communications around H. attempting to leave
- Public articles and archived copies for Peter McConnell, Chris Meyer / Chris Myer, Thomas Marzili / Marzilli, Dayton Kingery, Ian Parker,

and Douglas Roberto

- Court dispositions where available, especially for public-record items currently described only as arrests/charges
- Original police/news/court sources for Peter McConnell identity and disposition verification
- Records confirming exclusion of the separate 2023 Coventry / different-McConnell item from Peter McConnell evidence
- Chris Meyer criminal case / court disposition records
- Chris Meyer incident reports, staff schedules, HR/rehiring records, witness accounts, and internal communications concerning the

alleged client assault / beating and alleged return to work afterward

- Patch / Southington police-log clipping naming Christopher William Meyer, age 35, of Ford Street, Hamden, and listing charges
- Court disposition records for Christopher William Meyer
- Turnbridge "Unsung Hero" / staff-profile materials for Chris Meyer / Chris Myer

- Records showing Chris Meyer transportation duties, rehiring, client-contact responsibilities, or late-2022 transportation arrangements
- Family payment records, calendar records, texts, emails, or other records concerning the late-2022 Chris Meyer NYC transport
- Contemporaneous therapist, family, or client disclosures about the Chris Meyer car ride
- Public reporting anchoring the Fair Haven / "Fast Eddie" murder story
- Records or witness accounts showing that Chris Meyer discussed the "Fast Eddie" case during a client transport
- Any witness, text, note, or disclosure confirming Meyer stated he was the intended target in the "Fast Eddie" case
- Transportation policy addressing staff discussion of personal criminal histories, local violence, drug-world stories, or sexual / relationship

content with clients

- Records showing whether Turnbridge knew of or evaluated Meyer's personal-history disclosures, transportation judgment, or

client-contact boundaries

- Reddit thread screenshots / Wayback captures involving the deleted commenter who defended old Turnbridge / Ford Street culture and

praised "a guy named Chris"

- Evidence, if any, identifying the deleted Reddit commenter before deletion
- Witnesses who remember seeing the deleted Reddit account name or account history
- Colorado DORA licensing documents / online documents for Thomas Paul Marzilli voluntary surrender / relinquishment action
- Archived Google Reviews capture
- Original Google review screenshots: Sarah Glenn Leventis, Leighann Hutchinson / Margaret Doty, David M, Eliza Taylor, Aria
- Live Google URLs or video captures showing path from Turnbridge Google listing to each review
- Rehabs.com screenshots and live page captures
- Glassdoor screenshots and live page captures
- Bad Review Index backup
- Positive-review pattern notes
- Review-solicitation / review-removal communications, if obtainable
- Internal policies on public reviews, review requests, reputation management, or removal requests

Additional records to seek or preserve for PS4 / client property concerns

- 1212 Quinnipiac client-property records from January-May 2023
- Property inventory or missing-property report concerning the PS4, if any
- Eric Regensburg case-management notes concerning the missing PS4
- Staff schedules and house logs for 1212 Quinnipiac during the relevant period
- Client-property policies, reimbursement policies, and missing-belongings procedures
- Communications with family, staff, or clients about the PS4 being left at 1212 Quinnipiac or later missing
- Records concerning Eric Regensburg leaving or planning to leave for a Florida job, if relevant to timeline reconstruction

Additional records to seek or preserve for client-culture concerns

- Clinical staff present during the early-2023 D. / L.M. sexual-shaming incident, including Chris Rush
- Other clients present during the early-2023 sexual-shaming incident
- Group schedule, clinical schedule, or room assignment for the early-2023 incident
- Clinical notes or incident notes concerning the false L.M. sexual allegation / sexual shaming
- H.V.'s account of allegedly calling J. an anti-gay slur, if obtainable

- J.'s account of being called an anti-gay slur after accusing H.V. of beating women
- Witnesses to the H.V. / J. late-2021 incident
- K.G.'s account of the alleged adolescent-house beating
- W.H.'s account of the alleged adolescent-house beating
- Adolescent client's account, if legally and ethically obtainable
- Adolescent house rosters, staff schedules, incident reports, and medical records connected to the K.G. / W.H. allegation
- D.W.'s account of calling Q.R. an anti-gay slur
- Q.R.'s account of the December 2021 520 Whitney group conflict
- C.M.'s group records, staff notes, or participant records from 520 Whitney Avenue around December 2021
- D.W.'s account of the racial-slur / fried-chicken incident involving L.B.
- L.B.'s account of the racial-slur / fried-chicken incident
- Witnesses to the L.B. / D.W. fistfight
- House logs, incident reports, or staff notes concerning the L.B. / D.W. fight
- Reddit thread screenshots / Wayback captures involving the deleted commenter defending "Chris" and old Turnbridge / Ford Street staff culture
- Staff member's account concerning the trans woman allegedly "emotionally terrorized" in the men's young-adult program
- Placement records and policy records concerning transgender clients in gendered programming
- Records concerning the trans woman's placement circa early 2021
- Clinical notes, incident reports, or staff communications concerning gender-identity harassment or emotional terrorization
- Screenshots of the Q.R. group chat using D.W.'s mugshot / arrest article, if preserved
- D.W.'s account of the mugshot / arrest-article group chat
- Q.R.'s account of the group chat
- Other clients who received, saw, or mocked the group chat
- Staff notes or clinical interventions concerning the mugshot / arrest-article group chat
- Identity and account of the client allegedly "knocked out" on the first floor of 189 Orange Street after being labeled a "snitch"
- Identity and account of the client who allegedly knocked him out
- Witnesses to the alleged 189 Orange first-floor incident
- 189 Orange Street clinical-building staff present at the time
- CCTV footage from the first floor of 189 Orange Street, if available
- Incident reports, clinical notes, medical documentation, or staff communications concerning the alleged 189 Orange "snitch" retaliation incident

XII. Findings and Recommended Use

Finding 1: Negative public reviews are specific enough to warrant preservation The negative public reviews do not read as a single generic complaint. They allege concrete issues: self-harm monitoring failure, contraband / weapons / drug checks, unsafe outside contact, sexual assault by another patient, staff dismissiveness, poor supervision, money motive, poor communication, admissions mismatch, identity-related unsuitability, medication concerns, and review-management concerns. Finding 2: The positive review record should be treated as mixed, not dismissed wholesale Some positive reviews are detailed parent / alumni accounts. Others are thin, relationship-based, clustered, professional / referral-adjacent, or temporally suspicious enough to require context. The star average is therefore insufficient as a due-diligence answer. Finding 3: The employee-review record is relevant but not dispositive Glassdoor's reported employee-review pattern and visible management / culture allegations support asking staff-quality questions, but employee reviews alone cannot prove client-safety incidents. Finding 4: The strongest archive posture remains records-based The memo should ask Turnbridge, regulators, journalists, and attorneys to test the allegations through incident reports, CCTV logs, rosters, staff schedules, HR records, family communications, clinical notes, medication logs, transportation records, staff-termination records, and review-solicitation records.

XIII. Recommended Public Sentence

This archive does not ask families to accept every allegation as proven. It asks Turnbridge to produce the records that should exist if client-safety complaints, sexual-boundary disclosures, self-harm risks, contraband concerns, medication concerns, staff-vetting concerns, transportation concerns, staff-retention concerns, staff-termination concerns, and review-integrity concerns were documented and addressed.

XIV. Archive-Safe Conclusion

The material above suggests a pattern of potential institutional failure involving client-on-client violence, sexual-boundary issues, coercion / harassment between clients, staff cruelty, inadequate response to threats and harassment, questionable staff vetting for direct-access and leadership-adjacent roles, possible licensing / professional-credential concerns in leadership, ideological / political boundary issues from staff, shame-based family-pressure rhetoric, house-security / staff-judgment concerns, staff sexual-boundary / self-disclosure concerns, therapist-boundary / adolescent-program cruelty concerns, client-autonomy / attempted-departure concerns, medical-safety / medication-access concerns, staff physical-boundary / judgment concerns, staff-transportation concerns, staff-retention concerns, staff-termination concerns, public-review concerns, review-integrity concerns, client-property / missing-belongings concerns, and client-culture / identity-based hostility concerns. The strongest firsthand material concerns events I personally witnessed or experienced, including staff replaying CCTV footage of client violence while mocking clients, staff inaction after a sexual-boundary disclosure, violent incidents captured on camera, staff-conduct concerns involving transportation and boundaries, staff using authority in treatment settings to moralize clients' politics and identities, staff shaming clients as lazy burdens on their parents, staff failing to meaningfully respond after I disclosed an alleged outing threat and coerced Venmo payment, and staff allegedly refusing access to an inhaler during an asthma attack.

The public-record material should be used carefully. Arrests and charges should not be described as convictions unless final court disposition is verified. Same-name hits should not be used unless multiple identity anchors confirm that the public record belongs to the same person later employed by Turnbridge. Licensing records should be described only according to what the licensing source actually shows unless underlying board documents establish additional facts. The Chris Meyer / Chris Myer material is a central staff-vetting and staff-retention cluster. It includes Turnbridge's own public identification of Meyer as Phase I support staff; a firsthand recollection of a late-2022 client-transport ride involving reckless driving, disclosure of family payment information, chaotic personal phone calls, Fairhaven drug-story material, discussion of the Fair Haven / "Fast Eddie" murder, and Meyer allegedly stating that he was the person who was supposed to be killed by the person later charged in that case; prior archive / Reddit recollections that Meyer allegedly assaulted or beat up a client and was then rehired or allowed back; public police-log reporting listing charges against Christopher William Meyer of Ford Street, Hamden; and a deleted Reddit comment defending old Turnbridge / Ford Street staff culture while singling out "a guy named Chris" as "by far the best SS and employee." These Chris Meyer items should not be collapsed into a single proven finding. The public police-log item should be described only as charge reporting unless court disposition is verified. The alleged client-assault / rehiring item should be described as a recollection requiring corroboration. The deleted Reddit comment should be described as an unattributed public Reddit lead; I suspect the commenter may have been Chris Meyer, but authorship is unverified. The "Fast Eddie" item should be described only as something Meyer allegedly discussed during the car ride; no claim should be made that Meyer was involved in the Fair Haven murder. Meyer's alleged statement that he was the intended target should be treated as a firsthand recollection of what Meyer said, not as a verified fact. The Liam material should be handled as a staff-boundary / termination-context cluster requiring corroboration. In late 2022 or 2023, I remember Z.T. discussing why Liam was fired in a hushed voice with another client and becoming hesitant to tell me details. Later, in 2023 or 2024, W.H. informed me by phone of the allegation that Liam was fired after allegedly trying to meet up with an underage former adolescent-program client while Liam was an adult support staff member in the young-adults program. Separately, I heard that Liam allegedly gave H.V. and C. hits from a THC pen while they were sequestered after relapse. These allegations should not be stated as proven without corroboration, but they raise serious questions about staff boundaries, adolescent-program safeguards, relapse-management supervision, internal reporting, termination practices, and whether serious staff-conduct concerns were documented or quietly handled. The Mark David Grasso / 1212 Quinipiac item is included as both a firsthand staff-response concern and a staff-vetting / reentry-background context note. Specific charge, docket, conviction, or disposition claims should not be made unless official records are located and confirmed. Secondhand allegations, including the Douglas Roberto / ski-mask intruder allegation, the Steve Tobey / C.R. sexual-boundary allegation, the Matt Fields / adolescent-client J. 189 Orange allegation, the J. airport story, and the H. denied-access story, should be preserved as leads requiring corroboration rather than stated as proven fact. The J. and H. stories are included because they may bear on a broader question of whether Turnbridge used outside family or third-party pressure to interfere with clients' attempts to leave or obtain help leaving. The public-review record independently echoes several categories already present in the archive: peer-safety concerns, supervision failures, sexual-boundary and complaint-handling concerns, staff-quality concerns, money / retention concerns, admissions mismatch, marketing mismatch, identity-related concerns, medication concerns, transportation concerns, and review-integrity concerns. It does not prove every specific allegation, but it

strengthens the case for written due-diligence questions and records requests. The central institutional question is not whether every allegation can be proven from memory alone, but whether Turnbridge maintained adequate supervision, documentation, reporting, staff conduct standards, pre-employment screening, professional-credential review, political / ideological boundary standards, staff-retention safeguards, staff-termination safeguards, staff-transportation safeguards, house-security protocols, sexual-boundary standards, therapist-boundary standards, adolescent-client safeguards, client-autonomy protections, outside-contact boundaries, medication-access procedures, medical-response protocols, physical-boundary standards for staff, public-review integrity controls, client-property safeguards, identity-based harassment response protocols, and client-safety procedures for people placed in direct authority over vulnerable clients. This record is held for archival preservation, institutional transparency, and due-diligence review.