District	Score Value	Diff from Mean	Score Name	Tolerance	Projection	Choice
MD03	0.28	0.48	Mercator	5000	CvxHullPTB	nochoice
MD03	0.58	0.09	Local LCC	500	ReockPTB	nochoice
NC12	0.29	0.5	Local AEA	5000	CvxHullPTB	nochoice
NC12	0.03	0.17	Mollweide	0	PolsbyPopp	choice
MD02	0.42	0.35	Robinson	5000	CvxHullPTB	nochoice
MD02	0.49	0	Local LCC	1000	ReockPTB	nochoice
FL05	1	0.52	Local AEA	5000	ReockPTB	choice
FL05	0.04	0.16	Mollweide	0	PolsbyPopp	choice
NC01	0.26	0.32	EPSG:102003	5000	Schwartzbe	nochoice
NC01	0.37	0	Gall	100	ReockPS	choice
PN07	0.47	0.31	Local LCC	5000	CvxHullPTB	nochoice
PN07	0.35	0.02	Gall	500	ReockPT	choice
TX33	0.43	0.33	Local LCC	500	CvxHullPTB	nochoice
TX33	0.25	0.12	Gall	500	ReockPT	choice
NC04	0.34	0.43	Gall	5000	CvxHullPTB	nochoice
NC04	0.15	0.14	Mollweide	50	ReockPT	nochoice
IL04	0.42	0.34	Local LCC	50	CvxHullPTB	nochoice
IL04	0.27	0.06	Robinson	1000	ReockPT	nochoice
TX35	0.36	0.41	Mollweide	5000	CvxHullPTB	nochoice
TX35	0.05	0.15	Mollweide	0	PolsbyPopp	choice

. Recall that each of district which appeared incontrovertibly gerrymandered was paired with two histograms, one of which made the district's compactness score seem like an outlier and the other of which made it seem reasonable. The districts' scores are listed here, along with the absolute value of their difference from the mean of the distribution. The set of implementation choices made for each distribution is also shown: the compactness score, the simplification tolerance of the data, the map projection, and whether or not districts which comprised the entirety of their political superunit (districts in which a choice of boundaries was not possible) were included.