Coding round 1: identified all interview data related to use of managed fire in each case. Round 2 coding then coded *within* the data identified in Round 1. Coding round 2: identified factors that affected response strategy choices within the managed fire coded data

Coding round 2: codes used to identify factors that affected response strategy choices within the managed fire coded data

Theme	Origin	Codes	Examples
Factors shap- ing response strategies	Thompson 2014, Steelman and McCaffrey 2011, Williamson et al. 2007; our interest	External influences	 External types of influences from the public or entities who are not involved in fire response Perceptions of public, elected official, or other stakeholder/partner support or lack of support for managed fire Social conditions under which support did or did not exist; including concerns for smoke Importance of research in justifying need for managed fire External partner engagement in any pre-planning or risk analysis
	Thompson 2014, Steelman and McCaffrey 201, Williamson et al. 2007; our interest	Institutional influences	This code is really anything that has to do with the agency (mainly FS). Internal types of influences Leadership support Performance measures and targets Agency culture, beliefs, norms Any mention of processes that establish the context in which managed fire can be used: i.e., L/RMPs, fire management plans, NEPA Any internal enablers of managing fire Any internal barriers to managing fire such as budgets or capacity Internal silos
	Thompson 2014	Individual risk	 Individual decision biases Individual concerns for risk to oneself Individual liability
	Thompson et al. 2018, Barnett et al. 2016	Decision support tools/risk analytics	 References to use of support tools or analytics in the context of managed fire During incident tools: i.e., WFDSS, geospatial data on control lines Post incident: i.e., evaluation of effectiveness of control lines and fuels treatments Anything to do with PODs
Examples of using managed fire	Our interest, Steelman and McCaffrey 2011	Managed fire stories	Specific incidents on which managed fire was used; descriptions of how, why, outcomes
Pandemic impact	Our interest and awareness of agency policies, pandemic effects	Pandemic impact	 Direction to not use managed fire as a result of the pandemic and shift to full suppression How risk was considered during the pandemic Impacts of not being able to use managed fire for a year

Emergent codes	Any discussion of buried, coded, or otherwise opaque use of managed fire that doesn't call it that or plays it down	Dark boundary	 Any discussion of buried, coded, or otherwise opaque use of managed fire that doesn't call it that or plays it down Examples of fire being managed, but the term not being used Examples of "not talking about it" Discussion of how managed fire can come out of the dark into being discussed more openly
	Our observations/2018 interview data about differences in agency missions and approaches to managed fire in both states, yet also the apparent substantial interagency cooperation evident in Utah and in some NM interviews	Interagency	 Any discussion of the difference between agencies in their missions and responsibilities in fire suppression, different approaches to managed fire—"hard boundaries" Restrictions and inhibitions to use of managed fire that are related to these agencies' differences Organizational liability May also include description of how and why these hard boundaries get overcome and examples of working well across them—interagency involvement and cooperation. This may include use of prescribed fire and the role it plays in laying the groundwork.
	Round 2 interview data	Human caused	Reference to 2020 or 2021 wildfires that were human caused and did not offer much opportunity for managed fire as they were not naturally ignited