

### Supplementary Materials:

Case 1: Regardless of the state of the system, there is a flow of rate  $\lambda\pi_T$  into the outbreak state. Thus, the time to outbreak is exponentially distributed with the rate  $\lambda\pi_T$ .

Case 2: There is always a zero probability of outbreak.

5 Case 3: The flow rate to the start of the outbreak is  $\lambda\pi_T$  when the system is not full, and  $\lambda\pi_{NT}$  when it is full. Hence, the probability that an outbreak has occurred at time  $t$  is given by

$$p(t) = 1 - \exp(-\lambda[(t - s(t))\pi_T + s(t)\pi_{NT}]),$$

where  $s(t)$  is the amount of time that the system has spent at full capacity by time  $t$ . The benefit of tracing lies in both reducing  $\lambda$  and in reducing  $s(t)$ . To see why limiting  $\lambda$  cannot stop

10 an outbreak, note that the probability that an outbreak starts satisfies  $p(t) \geq$

$1 - \exp(-\lambda t\pi_T)$ . Thus, the risk from Case 1 is a lower bound, and the findings from Case 1 applies to that lower bound.

Case 4: In a system with  $n$  serving stations without truncation, the value  $\lambda = \mu n$  is a critical value for the system. When  $\lambda < \mu n$ , the system is subcritical and has a steady state distribution.

15 With  $\lambda > \mu n$ , there is no steady state distribution system, and the process will eventually exceed any finite value with probability 1. Since our model has a truncated system, the results are less extreme, but the simulation shows that the results still change dramatically in the region around  $\lambda = \mu n$ .