

# Turnbridge Public Review Evidence and Archive Corroboration Memo

Prepared from the Turnbridge Alumni Archive, full memo/chatlog record, indexed public reviews, provided Google review capture, provided review screenshots, and rechecked Rehabs.com and Glassdoor pages.  
Date: 2026-06-22.

## Scope and standard

This memorandum is a due-diligence synthesis. It is not a court finding, regulator finding, licensing decision, or final factual determination. It distinguishes public pages checked during drafting, provided Google material, screenshots of Google reviews, and archive allegations that require corroboration through records or witnesses.

**The central finding is narrow but important: 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, and review-integrity concerns. That pattern warrants written questions and record requests. It does not, by itself, prove every specific allegation.**

## Primary evidentiary inputs

- Provided Google Reviews capture: 4.3 average rating, 246 reviews, with mixed positive and negative review entries. [A2]
- Provided Google screenshots: Sarah Glenn Leventis, Leighann Hutchinson, David M, Eliza Taylor, and Aria. [A3]
- Rehabs.com: 3.5 average rating across 74 reviews; visible negative reviews by Jessica, Samuel, and NunyaBizness. [A4]
- Glassdoor: 2.8/5 across 45 employee reviews; 41% recommend; visible employee-review excerpts on management/culture concerns. [A5, A6]
- Archive/full memo: firsthand and secondhand incidents, staff-vetting notes, bad-review index, and positive-review integrity analysis. [A7, A8]

# 1. Method and Reliability Controls

Google Maps reviews are dynamic and difficult to reproduce through static retrieval. Accordingly, Google-review evidence in this memo is treated as provided-source evidence: the text capture and screenshots should be preserved, dated, and, where possible, paired later with live Google profile URLs or video capture. Rehabs.com and Glassdoor were rechecked through live web retrieval during drafting. The report deliberately avoids calling any review fraudulent unless the evidence supports that label.

| Class | Evidence type                            | Reliability treatment                                                                          | Examples                                                              |
|-------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A     | Live public page checked during drafting | Direct public-source evidence, subject to page changes.                                        | Rehabs.com; Glassdoor; official Turnbridge site.                      |
| B     | Provided Google capture or screenshot    | Relevant evidence; preserve original files and later pair with live URLs/video where possible. | Google capture; Sarah Glenn Leventis, Aria, Eliza Taylor screenshots. |
| C     | Archive allegation / memory / chatlog    | Use as allegation and corroboration lead; do not present as independent proof.                 | Firsthand Accounts; Full Memo incidents.                              |

## Terminology rule

*For positive reviews, this memo uses “review-integrity concern,” “low-probative review,” “relationship-based review,” or “clustered positive-review pattern.” It avoids “fake” or “sham” as a factual conclusion unless specific proof exists. The phrase “sham” appears only as the language of a negative Rehabs.com reviewer or as shorthand for the review-integrity topic.*

## 2. Google Review Capture: Public Pattern Evidence

The provided Google capture lists Turnbridge at 189 Orange St, New Haven, CT, 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, and money-related concerns.

### Key negative Google entries visible in the provided capture

| Reviewer                                                            | Visible concern category                                                                                                                                                                                           | Memo significance                                                                                                                    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Sarah Glenn Leventis</b>                                         | Former-client account; alleges only few employees wanted the best for clients; manipulation of vulnerable parents/children; money motive; “not like the website”; reviews taken down / requested positive reviews. | Important because it connects treatment experience, marketing mismatch, money motive, and review-integrity concerns.                 |
| <b>Leighann Hutchinson / Margaret Doty</b>                          | Family review alleging suicidal child not adequately heard or checked on; broken glass/self-harm; “could have died.”                                                                                               | Directly relevant to supervision, monitoring, self-harm-risk protocols, room safety, and staff checks.                               |
| <b>Aria</b>                                                         | Family review alleging weak package checks, weapons/drugs entering, ineffective pat-downs, dismissive workers, unsafe facility despite safety marketing.                                                           | Directly relevant to contraband control, peer safety, facility safety, and marketing-vs-reality claims.                              |
| <b>Eliza Taylor</b>                                                 | Former-client review alleging cash grab, little treatment, poor post-discharge sobriety, and later success at a different program.                                                                                 | Relevant to money motive, treatment quality, outcomes, and family reliance on marketing.                                             |
| <b>David M</b>                                                      | Sibling review alleging all-around awful family experience; reviewer identifies own recovery/program experience and recommends alternatives.                                                                       | Relevant because it is not simply a client resentment review; it is a family/sibling perspective with comparative program context.   |
| <b>Garland Alban</b>                                                | Parent/family review alleging lack of transparency, poor communication, and non-individualized curriculum.                                                                                                         | Relevant to family disclosure, informed consent, and marketing claims.                                                               |
| <b>Tyler A</b>                                                      | Family review alleging claims on website not met and lack of challenge/development.                                                                                                                                | Relevant to marketing mismatch and treatment-expectation concerns.                                                                   |
| <b>Sabio Adelina</b>                                                | Parent review alleging Phase II directors were condescending/rude/arrogant and promises were not fulfilled.                                                                                                        | Relevant to staff conduct, family communication, and phase-specific concerns.                                                        |
| <b>Coleen Huggins Hayback</b>                                       | Parent review alleging emotional/verbal abuse by therapist, dishonesty, and failed family therapy calls.                                                                                                           | Relevant to staff conduct, clinical oversight, family communication, and complaint handling.                                         |
| <b>HP</b>                                                           | Identity-related safety review alleging Turnbridge was not good for trans, non-binary, LGBT, or BIPOC clients and lacked diversity/accountability.                                                                 | Relevant to suitability for clients whose mental health/substance issues intersect with identity and to staff/culture due diligence. |
| <b>Maria Griffin</b>                                                | Review alleging acceptance for mental health followed by removal/ER after an incident and lack of meaningful treatment.                                                                                            | Relevant to admissions fit, acuity screening, and response to mental-health incidents.                                               |
| <b>Jacob Lachman</b>                                                | Former-client review alleging admissions misrepresented length of stay and program details.                                                                                                                        | Relevant to admissions representations and consent.                                                                                  |
| <b>Riv g</b>                                                        | Former-client review alleging abuse/manipulation and being treated as unsafe when wanting to leave.                                                                                                                | Relevant to autonomy, discharge pressure, complaint framing, and family relationship pressure.                                       |
| <b>Steven O</b>                                                     | Review alleging residential/non-medical framing, expensive billing, and difficulties leaving.                                                                                                                      | Relevant to marketing, billing, and autonomy concerns.                                                                               |
| <b>Leila Terry</b>                                                  | Adolescent-patient review alleging medication concerns and adverse side effects.                                                                                                                                   | Relevant to medication oversight and psychiatric prescribing questions.                                                              |
| <b>Lauren Killingsworth</b>                                         | Neighborhood review alleging Turnbridge SUV driver nearly hit pedestrians while looking at phone with passengers.                                                                                                  | Relevant to transportation safety and supervision outside residences.                                                                |
| <b>Amanda Nelson / Chris Earhart / Kaden Harkins</b>                | Admissions/deposit/phone interaction complaints.                                                                                                                                                                   | Relevant to pre-admission conduct and family-facing process.                                                                         |
| <b>Joseph Camara / AP! / Roman rosales / Mart 456 / “Poop Fart”</b> | Short negative entries with limited detail.                                                                                                                                                                        | Low probative individually; still part of the negative review corpus.                                                                |

### 3. Google Positive-Review Pattern and Review-Integrity Concerns

The Google capture also contains extensive positive material, including detailed parent reviews, alumni reviews, professional/referrer 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 1-3 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.
- 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

**Use this language: “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; and multiple relationship-based positive reviews. 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.”**

## 4. Rehabs.com Evidence

Rehabs.com was rechecked during drafting. The visible Turnbridge page lists a 3.5 overall rating across 74 reviews and shows categories including accommodations/amenities, treatment effectiveness, and meals/nutrition. It also lists review keywords including staff, safe, room, clean, facility, group, admissions, insurance, detox, and counselor. The visible recent reviews include three negative entries and two positive entries.

| Reviewer     | Rating / role       | Visible allegation or review content                                                                                                                   | Relevance                                                                            |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Jessica      | 2.0 / Loved One     | Alleges lack of professionalism/expertise, no accountability, ineffective supervision, disorganization, and profit motive.                             | Staff quality, supervision, accountability, money motive.                            |
| Samuel       | 2.3 / Former Client | Raises client safety, staff supervision, staff conduct, complaint handling, incident reporting, staff vetting, and sexual-boundary complaint concerns. | Directly overlaps archive categories and family due-diligence questions.             |
| NunyaBizness | 2.3 / Loved One     | Alleges unsafe phone contact involving a minor client and a person connected to prior sexual harm, and later sexual assault by another patient.        | Sexual safety, supervision, family wishes, outside contact, patient-on-patient harm. |
| haleigh      | 5.0 / Loved One     | Very short positive review: "great, affective!!"                                                                                                       | 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.                                               | A detailed positive counterweight; should not be dismissed absent contrary evidence. |

**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.**

## 5. Glassdoor and Employee-Review Context

Glassdoor was rechecked during drafting. The public pages list 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 include 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.

| Source point                         | Observed data                                                                                                 | Due-diligence significance                                                                        |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Overall employee score</b>        | 2.8/5 across 45 reviews; 41% would recommend.                                                                 | Suggests mixed employee experience; not determinative of care quality but relevant to culture.    |
| <b>Management/culture categories</b> | Senior management and compensation/benefits listed at 2.5; career opportunities at 2.6.                       | Can matter where direct-care quality depends on staffing, retention, training, and supervision.   |
| <b>Visible negative excerpts</b>     | Allegations of no management, poor pay, rude/judgmental upper staff, HR/payroll issues, and ethical concerns. | Support asking how Turnbridge audits staff conduct, management response, training, and retention. |
| <b>Countervailing evidence</b>       | Glassdoor also shows positive employee reviews and positive clinical-growth descriptions.                     | The employee record is mixed; it should be used cautiously, not as one-sided proof.               |

## 6. Archive Allegations Compared with Public Review Themes

The archive/full memo contains firsthand allegations, relayed accounts, and public-record staff-vetting notes. This memo treats those items as allegations requiring corroboration. The value of the public reviews is that they independently raise similar risk categories from other vantage points.

| Archive category             | Archive examples                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Public-review overlap                                                                                                                                                               | Records to request                                                                                                      |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Peer safety</b>           | M.J./C. CCTV incident; 90 Ford chair assault; A.S. threats; M.S. Venmo/outing threat; younger client allegedly returned to housing with feared peer.                                                              | Aria alleges weak contraband controls; Leighann/Margaret alleges self-harm monitoring failure; NunyaBizness alleges patient-on-patient sexual assault; Samuel raises client safety. | Incident reports, separation plans, CCTV logs, rosters, house logs, complaint notes.                                    |
| <b>Sexual boundaries</b>     | L.M. incident at 1212 Quinnipiac; Mark Grasso allegedly overheard disclosure; E./M.S. incident after movie trip; Liam and Steve Tobey relayed concerns.                                                           | NunyaBizness review raises sexual-safety allegations; Samuel explicitly raises sexual-boundary complaints.                                                                          | Clinical notes, mandated-reporting records, staff schedules, protection plans, family communications.                   |
| <b>Staff conduct/vetting</b> | Six-name staff-vetting cluster: Peter McConnell, Tom Marzili, Mark Grasso, Dayton Kingery, Ian Parker, Chris Meyer; plus conduct allegations involving Drew Behr, Douglas Roberto, Dave Murphy, Will, and others. | Google and Rehabs.com reviews allege dismissive or uncaring staff; Glassdoor raises management/staff-culture concerns.                                                              | Background-check policies, licensing checks, social-media/public-history review, HR files, discipline/rehiring records. |
| <b>Money/marketing gap</b>   | Archive alleges due-diligence mismatch between marketing image and lived conditions.                                                                                                                              | Sarah Glenn Leventis, Eliza Taylor, Jessica, Steven O, Philip Spano, and others allege money motive or marketing mismatch.                                                          | Admissions scripts, length-of-stay representations, refund policies, complaint/discharge records, outcome data.         |
| <b>Review integrity</b>      | Bad Review Index and positive-review analysis track suspicious or low-probative reviews.                                                                                                                          | Sarah Glenn Leventis alleges some positive reviews were requested from former staff/clients; Google capture includes recent clustered positives and one-line positives.             | Review-solicitation policies, internal communications, staff/alumni requests, incentives, removal requests.             |

## 7. Staff-Vetting and Staff-Conduct Due-Diligence

The staff-vetting portion of the archive should be limited to the six names currently intended for that section: Peter McConnell, Tom Marzili, Mark Grasso, Dayton Kingery, Ian Parker, and Chris Meyer. Additional names should not be inserted without specific verification and a clear reason for inclusion.

- Peter McConnell: archive flags a public-indexed harassment/threatening hit requiring identity and disposition verification, plus alleged ideological boundary concerns at 520 Whitney Avenue.
- Tom Marzili / Marzilli: archive flags Colorado credential surrender/relinquishment material requiring precise source attachment and spelling/identity handling.
- Mark Grasso: archive flags public posts discussing criminal life/record and alleges he overheard a sexual-boundary disclosure at 1212 Quinpiac without meaningful protective response.
- Dayton Kingery: archive flags public arrest/charge reporting requiring precise source attachment and identity handling.
- Ian Parker: archive flags 2016 assault/disorderly conduct charge reporting as public-record vetting material.
- Chris Meyer: archive flags public police-log charges and separate transport/judgment concerns, plus archive material preserving a recollection that he allegedly assaulted a client and was later rehired or allowed back.

### Professional framing

**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, and rehiring records before placing staff in authority over vulnerable clients.**

## 8. 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.

| Area                          | Records / questions                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Incident documentation</b> | All incident reports, house logs, and clinical notes for 189 Orange, 90 Ford, 1212 Quinnipiac, 520 Whitney/Whitney-Canner, East Haven, and Phase III incidents identified in the archive. |
| <b>CCTV</b>                   | Footage-retention policy; access logs; who reviewed footage; whether footage was replayed outside a formal investigation.                                                                 |
| <b>Peer separation</b>        | Policies and actual records showing separation after assault, threats, sexual-boundary complaints, coercion, harassment, or client fear.                                                  |
| <b>Sexual safety</b>          | Complaint protocols; mandated-reporting decision records; family-notification records; response to unsafe outside contact; protection plans.                                              |
| <b>Contraband/self-harm</b>   | Package-check logs, search policies, room-check logs, sharps/broken-glass records, suicidal-ideation monitoring logs.                                                                     |
| <b>Staff vetting</b>          | Background checks, public-record searches, licensing checks, social-media/public-history review, HR discipline records, rehiring decisions.                                               |
| <b>Admissions/retention</b>   | Length-of-stay representations, admissions scripts, family communications, refund/withdrawal rules, discharge-against-advice records.                                                     |
| <b>Review integrity</b>       | Any internal communications soliciting, coordinating, incentivizing, pressuring, suppressing, or removing public reviews.                                                                 |

## 9. Findings and Recommended Use

Finding 1: The negative public reviews are specific enough to warrant preservation. They 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, 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, or professional/referral-adjacent and should not be used as safety proof. The star average is therefore insufficient as a due-diligence answer.

Finding 3: The employee-review record is relevant but not dispositive. Glassdoor's 2.8/5 rating and visible management/culture allegations support asking staff-quality questions, but employee reviews alone cannot prove client-safety incidents.

Finding 4: The archive's strongest posture remains records-based. The memo should ask Turnbridge, regulators, and journalists to test the allegations through incident reports, CCTV logs, rosters, staff schedules, HR records, family communications, clinical notes, medication logs, and review-solicitation records.

### 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, staff-vetting concerns, and review-integrity concerns were documented and addressed."**

## Appendix A. Provided Google Review Screenshots

The following screenshots were provided on 2026-06-22 and should be preserved with original filenames. For formal filing, pair them with live Google URLs/profile captures or a screen recording showing path from the Google listing to each review.

### Sarah Glenn Leventis - former-client review alleging money motive, marketing mismatch, and review-management concerns.



**Sarah Glenn Leventis**  
3 reviews

 5 years ago

Honestly my experience at Turnbridge wasn't all bad to say the least, but the bad parts definitely overshadowed most of the good. Let me begin by saying there are only very few employees that want what's best for the clients. I went to turnbridge in April 2019 and "graduated" the program in November 2020. I will say Turnbridge did completely change my life and I am a very different person today. Its a shame that companies like Turnbridge manipulate vulnerable parents and children into going and keeping them until they have all the money they need from you. The main purpose of this post is to hopefully get the attention of the parents reading the reviews about where they want to send their kids. Let me make is very clear Turnbridge is one of the worst possible choices you could send your kid or loved one. As a former client and being in this program for over a year... it's not like the website... it's honestly really sad how much this program has gone downhill and has become extremely apparent that they are only in it for the money. My best advice is if you do choose to send your loved one here make sure to not buy into there manipulation. I could go on for another 20 minutes about this place, but it's not worth it because this place is already going under and with high hopes will be out of business soon. If you want anymore information please feel free to reach out!

Btw - Most of the reviews on google, yelp, and other sites can be taken down by the company. I know this for a fact after speaking to previous employees. If you scroll down to all of the "5 star" reviews you can see that they were from years ago and some of the reviews they asked former staff and clients to write!

  34 

### Leighann Hutchinson / Margaret Doty - family review alleging suicidal child was not adequately monitored and accessed broken glass.



**Leighann Hutchinson**  
Local Guide · 43 reviews · 3 photos

 2 years ago

I wouldn't put a child in that hellish place, the staff are a bunch of uncaring individuals who do not check on the the boys , my great great-son could have died. He told them that he was suicidal, but it was like they were not hearing him. He had gotten a hold of broken shards of glass and cut himself, this is a terrible place . If you love you children do not send them there. It needs to be shut down permanently. The staff needs to have their licenses revoked. Margaret Doty

  12 

## David M - sibling review alleging an all-around awful experience and recommending alternatives.



**David M**  
3 reviews



★☆☆☆☆ 3 years ago

Please reconsider before sending your loved one here. My younger brother went here and it was an all-around awful experience for the whole family. I am 23 years old with 4 years clean and a graduate of The Last House in Los Angeles California. Structured programs such as The Last House and Ethos House (both located in L.A., California) are better alternatives if your loved one is severely struggling and has been in and out of treatment already. I would not recommend Turnbridge to someone who is young and in need of a life-changing experience.



## Eliza Taylor - former-client review alleging cash grab, little treatment, and poor post-discharge outcome.



**Eliza Taylor**  
1 review



★☆☆☆☆ 3 years ago

Do not send your child here! This program is a total cash grab, they do not care about your child or helping them whatsoever, they will just keep them as long as possible to get as much money as they can while providing horrible and very little treatment. After my family spent their savings to send me here, I was only sober for 25 days after discharge. Afterwards I went to an amazing rehab called Naukeg in western Mass, this place saved my life, I will be celebrating my two years of sobriety this month. I now know what good sufficient recovery looks like and Turnbridge is not it!



## Aria - family review alleging weak weapon/drug/package checks and unsafe facility conditions.



Aria

3 reviews



★☆☆☆☆ 6 months ago

I have noticed that this place has quite a lot of good reviews but the experience my brother has had really makes me think that this place is a scam. The location is beautiful, yes. But the facility itself is not strict at all, they barely check for weapons or drugs, they barely check the packages family send as well, so many many people have been able to sneak in dangerous substances and weapons which is insane. My mother said they pat the kids down but they don't actually check because the kids will just tape weapons and substances on the inside of their pants and the security won't even notice. It is insane to me that this place markets itself as a "safe treatment facility" because it absolutely is not. I would think twice about sending your loved ones here because again it is not safe and they don't take things nearly as seriously as they should. They market this place as a place that is not for "high risk people" but high risk people still go there and no matter what there should always be precautions and safety regulations. From what my family has experienced, and my brother will tell you himself, it is not a safe facility and the workers are very dismissive; at the end of the day all they want is your money.



18



## Appendix B. Source Notes

[A1] Turnbridge official website, retrieved 2026-06-22. Marketing language describes Turnbridge as mental health and dual diagnosis programs for young adults and adolescents and says it has helped thousands of clients and families through a three-phased approach.

[A2] Provided Google Reviews capture, 2026-06-22. Header lists Turnbridge, 189 Orange St, New Haven, CT, 4.3 average rating, 246 reviews. Capture includes both positive and negative review text and reviewer metadata.

[A3] Provided Google review screenshots, 2026-06-22: Sarah Glenn Leventis, Leighann Hutchinson, David M, Eliza Taylor, and Aria.

[A4] Rehabs.com Turnbridge listing, retrieved 2026-06-22. Page lists overall rating 3.5 across 74 reviews and visible reviews by Jessica, Samuel, haleigh, NunyaBizness, and Anne.

[A5] Glassdoor Turnbridge overview/reviews pages, retrieved 2026-06-22. Pages list 2.8/5 across 45 reviews, 41% recommend to a friend, 44% positive business outlook, and category ratings including 2.5 senior management and 2.5 compensation/benefits.

[A6] Glassdoor keyword/location pages, retrieved 2026-06-22. Visible excerpts include allegations of poor management, poor pay, management lying about raises/promotions, and a Woodbury review alleging rude/judgmental upper staff.

[A7] Archive/full memo/chatlog record through 2026-06-22. Treated as claimant archive material and corroboration leads, not independent proof absent source records or witnesses.

[A8] Turnbridge Alumni Archive / public-facing website pages, retrieved during 2026-06-22 drafting, including homepage, Firsthand Accounts, Public Records, Public Review Evidence, Bad Review Index, and Full Memo.

### Public web citations checked during drafting

Rehabs.com Turnbridge listing: <https://rehabs.com/listings/turnbridge-1264465159/>

Glassdoor Turnbridge overview: [https://www.glassdoor.com/Overview/Working-at-Turnbridge-El\\_IE1326736.11,21.htm](https://www.glassdoor.com/Overview/Working-at-Turnbridge-El_IE1326736.11,21.htm)

Glassdoor Turnbridge reviews: <https://www.glassdoor.com/Reviews/Turnbridge-Reviews-El1326736.htm>

Glassdoor pay keyword page: [https://www.glassdoor.com/Reviews/Turnbridge-pay-Reviews-El\\_IE1326736.0,10\\_KH11,14.htm](https://www.glassdoor.com/Reviews/Turnbridge-pay-Reviews-El_IE1326736.0,10_KH11,14.htm)

Turnbridge official website: <https://www.turnbridge.com/>

Turnbridge Alumni Archive: <https://www.turnbridgeisabusive.com/>