

NEW VERY LOW MASS BINARIES IN THE TAURUS STAR-FORMING REGION

Q.M. KONOPACKY^{1,2}, A.M. GHEZ^{1,2}, E.L. RICE¹, AND G. DUCHÊNE³

Draft version June 2, 2021

ABSTRACT

We surveyed thirteen very low mass (VLM; $M \lesssim 0.2 M_{\odot}$) objects in the Taurus star-forming region using near-infrared diffraction-limited imaging techniques on the W.M. Keck I 10 m telescope. Of these thirteen, five were found to be binary, with separations ranging from $0''.04$ to $0''.6$ and flux ratios from 1.4 to 3.7. In all cases, the companions are likely to be physically associated with the primaries (probability $\gtrsim 4\sigma$). Using the theoretical models of Baraffe et al. (1998), we find that all five new companions, as well as one of the primaries, are likely brown dwarfs. The discovery of these systems therefore increases the total number of known, young VLM binaries by $\sim 50\%$. These new systems, along with other young VLM binaries from the literature, have properties that differ significantly from older field VLM binaries in that the young systems have wider separations and lower mass ratios, supporting the idea that VLM binaries undergo significant dynamical evolution $\sim 5 - 10$ Myr after their formation. The range of separations of these binaries, four of which are over 30 AU, argues against the ejection scenario of brown dwarf formation. While several of the young, VLM binaries discovered in this study have lower binding energies than the previously suggested minimum for VLM binaries, the apparent minimum is still significantly higher than that found among higher mass binaries. We suggest that this discrepancy may be due to the small mass of a VLM binary relative to the average perturbing star, leading to more substantial changes in their binding energy over time.

Subject headings: binaries: visual — stars: low-mass, brown dwarfs — stars: pre-main sequence

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the first observational detection of brown dwarfs - objects whose mass ($\lesssim 0.08 M_{\odot}$) is too small for them to achieve hydrogen fusion but larger than the majority of known planets - the mechanism for their formation has been a hotly pursued and elusive puzzle. Current theories include formation of very low-mass cores in turbulent clouds (e.g. Padoan and Nordlund, 2004), additional fragmentation in higher-mass cores (e.g. Boss 2002), fragmentation out of high mass discs (e.g. Rice et al. 2003), premature ejection from a natal cloud core (e.g. Bate et al. 2002), and photo-erosion of cores by nearby OB stars (e.g. Whitworth and Zinnecker, 2004). Over the past few years, extensive surveys of star-forming regions have been undertaken to identify larger numbers of VLM members (e.g. Zapatero Osorio et al. 2000, Ardila et al. 2000, Luhman 2004a, Guieu et al. 2006). By studying the properties of brown dwarfs and VLM stars at very young ages, one may gain substantial insight into their origins.

One such property that is useful for gaining this insight is multiplicity fractions of VLM stars and brown dwarfs. Many formation scenarios make predictions as to the percentage of these objects that would be expected to be found in binaries. A number of field VLM star and brown dwarf multiplicity studies have been carried out and have found very low overall binary fractions ($\sim 5\text{-}10\%$), mass ratio distributions that are strongly peaked toward equal masses, and a sharp decline in the binary fraction beyond separations of 20 AU (e.g. Burgasser et al., 2003, Close et al., 2003, Bouy et al., 2003, Gizis et al. 2003). When compared with higher mass studies of field

stars (e.g. Duquennoy & Mayor 1991), these suggest that the maximum binary separation decreases with mass. However, these results may be affected by dynamical evolution given the substantial age of the targets. Indeed, multiplicity studies of stellar objects have shown evidence for dynamical evolution, as the binary fraction of these objects is generally found to be much higher in young star-forming regions than in the field (e.g. Ghez et al. 1993, Leinert et al. 1993, Simon et al. 1995). Thus, surveys of younger ($\sim 1 - 5$ Myr) VLM systems are much more likely to reveal the pristine outcome of the brown dwarf formation process. Such work has just begun over the last few years and includes studies in Upper Scorpius (distance = 145 pc, age ~ 5 Myr; Kraus et al. 2005, Bouy et al. 2006) and Taurus (distance = 140 pc, age $\sim 1\text{-}5$ Myr; Kraus et al. 2006). To date, only a handful of young, VLM binaries have been detected.

In this paper, we report the discovery of five new VLM binaries in Taurus. In contrast to field VLM binaries, the majority of these new binaries have separations greater than 20 AU. These new binaries increase the number of known young systems by $\sim 50\%$ and suggest a higher binary fraction among young, VLM objects. In §2, we describe our observations and analysis, in §3 we present our results, in §4 we compare our results to other work and discuss the implications for brown dwarf formation scenarios, and in §5 we summarize our findings.

2. OBSERVATIONS AND DATA ANALYSIS

The observations were made using the Keck I 10 m telescope with the facility Near Infrared Camera (NIRC, Matthews & Soifer 1994, Matthews et al. 1996) in speckle imaging mode on 2004 December 19 and 2005 November 12-13. In its high angular resolution modes, NIRC has a pixel scale of 20.45 ± 0.03 mas/pixel. The total field of view of NIRC in this mode is $5''.2$. For each target, four to six stacks of 190 images, each 0.137 seconds integration time, were obtained through the K band-pass filter ($\lambda_0 = 2.2 \mu\text{m}$, $\Delta\lambda =$

¹ UCLA Division of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1562; quinn, ghez@astro.ucla.edu

² Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1565

³ Laboratoire d'Astrophysique, Observatoire de Grenoble, Université Joseph Fourier - BP 53, F-38041, Grenoble Cedex 9, France; Gaspard.Duchene@obs.ujf-grenoble.fr

TABLE 1
OBSERVATION SUMMARY

Target	Sp. Type	K (mag) ^a	Date of Observation	Calibrator	Ref ^b
CFHT-Tau 7	M6.5	10.4	2005 Nov 13	FZ Tau	2
CHFT-Tau 17	M5.75	10.8	2005 Nov 13	DO Tau	2
CFHT-Tau 18	M6.0	8.7	2005 Nov 13	FZ Tau	2
CFHT-Tau 19	M5.25	10.5	2005 Nov 13	SAO 76547	2
CFHT-Tau 20	M5.5	9.8	2005 Nov 12	FZ Tau	2
CFHT-Tau 21	M1.25	9.0	2005 Nov 13	SAO 76547	2
J04161210	M4.75	10.3	2004 Dec 19	CW Tau	1
J04213459	M5.5	10.4	2005 Nov 13	SAO 76547	1
J04284263	M5.25	10.5	2004 Dec 19	SAO 76628	1
J04380083	M7.25	10.1	2004 Dec 19	DO Tau	1
J04403979	M5.5	10.2	2005 Nov 13	DO Tau	1
J04442713	M7.25	10.8	2005 Nov 13	SAO 76727	1
J04554535	M4.75	10.5	2005 Nov 12	SU Aur	1

^a From the 2MASS point source catalog

^b Source identified as VLM object by Luhman (2004; Ref 1) or Guieu et al. (2006; Ref 2)

0.4 μm). Along with these target stacks, we obtained stacks of darks, sky, and point source calibrators, all of which are used in the reduction process. Using these stacks, we generate power spectra of each of the targets using Fourier transform techniques (Labeyrie 1970). The procedure of speckle data analysis, including the creation of power spectra, are described in some detail in Konopacky et al. (2007) and Ghez et al. (1995), and this study uses the same approach. Binary star power spectra exhibit a characteristic sinusoidal pattern, which is used to obtain the binary separation, position angle, and flux ratio. Shift-and-Add images (Christou 1991) were also generated from each data set to enhance our sensitivity to high flux ratio, wide binary systems. Table 1 lists all targets observed, as well as the point sources used for calibration.

All targets were selected from Luhman (2004a) and Guieu et al. (2006) based upon their K band magnitudes. These two studies found 22 and 17 new VLM objects in the Taurus star-forming region, respectively. Among the stars from these studies, fifteen are brighter than the speckle magnitude limit of $K \lesssim 11$, which is required to achieve sufficient signal-to-noise in a single short exposure image. During three nights at Keck, we observed thirteen of these targets, six from Guieu et al. (2006) and seven from Luhman (2004a) (J04554757 and J04555288 from Luhman (2004a) were not observed). While there has been a range of definitions of VLM objects in the literature, in this study we define a VLM object as an object with a mass $\lesssim 0.2 M_{\odot}$. One of the targets observed during this program, CFHT-Tau 21, has a spectral type of M1.25 and is not a VLM object by our definition. Thus, we report it here for completeness, but exclude it from further analysis. Table 1 lists the spectral type and total K band magnitude for each of the target stars. Our VLM sample has spectral types that range from M4.75 to M7.25 and corresponding masses that range from $0.2 M_{\odot}$ to $0.05 M_{\odot}$ at the average age of Taurus (~ 3 Myr).

3. RESULTS

Of the thirteen targets observed, five were found to be binaries. The parameters of each binary system are summarized in Table 2. As listed in Table 3, sensitivity estimates show that, in general, companions with $\Delta K = 3$ could have been detected at the 3σ confidence level, all the way down to an angular separation of $0''.02$, the minimum detectable separation using the speckle technique (see Ghez et al. 1993, Konopacky et al. 2007). Using the models of Baraffe et al. (1998, $\alpha =$




FIG. 1.— The mass ratio q versus the separation (in AU) of the VLM binaries found in our survey and those found in other studies of both young and old VLM binaries. This figure demonstrates the differences in the parameters of the old and the young samples. The truncation of field VLM binaries at separation > 20 AU and $q < 0.8$ is not seen amongst young VLM binaries. Also shown are the 3σ sensitivity limits of our survey. The lines represent the sensitivities of the best 25, 50, and 75% of our sample. Quoted sensitivities are from the 50% curve.

1.0), these 3σ magnitude difference sensitivities can be converted to an estimate of detectable q (where $q \equiv M_{\text{secondary}} / M_{\text{primary}}$). For all of the targets in the sample, the ΔK to q conversion is quite similar and is well-described by the equation $q = 0.077\Delta K^2 - 0.526\Delta K + 0.966$. This survey therefore was generally sensitive to $q \sim 0.23$ at ~ 3 AU, a region of parameter space completely inaccessible to many past surveys. Figure 1 shows the 3σ sensitivity limits on q versus distance from the primary source.

Because only one epoch of data on these targets has thus far been obtained, the physical association of the five binaries via common proper motions cannot be confirmed. Instead, Table 2 lists the probability of association based upon the number of sources of comparable brightness to the secondaries in the region and the separation of the two stars. These probabilities were calculated following the method of Brandner et al. (2000), using their equation 1. The 2MASS

TABLE 2
BINARY SYSTEM PROPERTIES

Target	Sep. (")	P.A. (degrees)	Flux Ratio (K)	M_K Primary	M_K Secondary	Prob. of Background Object	\sim Primary Mass (M_\odot)	\sim Secondary Mass (M_\odot)
CFHT-Tau 7	0.224 ± 0.002	292.92 ± 0.17	1.40 ± 0.09	5.26 ± 0.18	5.61 ± 0.20	4.6×10^{-6}	0.07	0.06
CHFT-Tau 17	0.575 ± 0.002	235.37 ± 0.31	3.70 ± 0.55	4.62 ± 0.18	6.08 ± 0.27	1.1×10^{-4}	0.1	0.06
CFHT-Tau 18	0.216 ± 0.002	268.56 ± 0.34	2.28 ± 0.25	2.92 ± 0.18	3.77 ± 0.19	1.7×10^{-6}	0.1	0.06
J04284263	0.621 ± 0.007	349.97 ± 0.83	2.29 ± 0.39	5.07 ± 0.18	5.97 ± 0.26	6.3×10^{-5}	0.15	0.06
J04403979	0.041 ± 0.003	289.98 ± 4.59	2.08 ± 0.29	4.59 ± 0.29	5.68 ± 0.94	3.3×10^{-7}	0.15	0.08

TABLE 3
LIMITS ON MASS RATIO FOR UNDETECTED COMPANIONS TO SINGLE STARS

Target	Est. Mass (M_\odot)	0''02	0''05	0''1	0''2	0''8	1''0
CFHT-Tau 19	0.15	0.28	0.15	0.13	0.12	0.10	0.10
CFHT-Tau 20	0.12	0.32	0.32	0.120	0.17	0.10	0.10
CFHT-Tau 21	0.70	0.79	0.35	0.24	0.19	0.10	0.10
J04161210	0.20	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.14	0.12
J04213459	0.12	0.35	0.18	0.17	0.14	0.10	0.10
J04380083	0.05	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.30
J04442713	0.05	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.15	0.12	0.10
J04554535	0.20	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.16	0.10

NOTE. — These values represent the 3σ limits on q , the mass ratio, as a function of distance from the primary for each of the targets found to be single in our sample.

All-Sky Point Source Catalog Statistics Service⁴ was used to find the number of sources of comparable brightness to the secondary within one square degree centered on the primary. These source densities were then used to calculate the probability that these objects are chance background sources. These probabilities are given in Table 2. We find that all are likely to be physically associated with probabilities of the secondary being a background object of $\lesssim 10^{-4}$, and thus conclude that the detected binaries are physically associated with each other.

The observed properties can be used to estimate the component masses and mass ratios using pre-main sequence evolutionary models. Luhman (2004a) and Guieu et al. (2006) list for each target an estimated extinction value A_V (in the case of the binaries, we assume this value is the same for both components). The absolute K-band magnitudes for the targets were calculated using these values, m_K , and a distance of 140 ± 10 pc (Bertout et al. 1999) for Taurus. The unresolved spectral types were used to estimate the temperatures of the brighter component of each pair, via the temperature scale in Luhman et al. (2003). Thus, using M_K and these temperatures, a mass and age for each primary was found using the theoretical models of Baraffe et al (1998). Subsequently, the masses of the secondary components were found via interpolating along the isochrone derived for the primary to find the mass consistent with the M_K values for each secondary. The masses derived from this method are given in Table 2 and Table 3. As shown in Figure 2, all five secondaries are likely to be substellar, in addition to one out of five of the primaries.

For the majority of the targets, the calculated ages are consistent with the age of Taurus. However, a few targets have an M_K and temperature that predict an age younger than 1 Myr (see Figure 2), which is beyond the range covered by the

Baraffe et al. (1998) models, but is occasionally seen among T Tauri stars (Kenyon & Hartmann 1995). Hence, in the case of these systems, we fix the age to 1 Myr and use this, with the temperature of the target, to estimate its mass. One of the binaries, CFHT-Tau 18, falls into this category. In this case, a new estimate of M_K for the primary component was derived by fixing its age, which was then used to derive the mass of the secondary (via the ΔK calculated from the flux ratio). Since the model masses are quite independent of age and luminosity at this stage of evolution, this age adjustment has negligible impact on the derived masses.

4. DISCUSSION

The discovery of five binaries in a sample of twelve VLM objects increases the number of known, young, VLM binaries by $\sim 50\%$. This enables a more statistically robust assessment of VLM binary properties. In order to derive an unbiased binary star fraction from our magnitude-limited survey ($m_k \lesssim 11$), we remove the one binary, CFHT-Tau 7, that has a primary with $m_k > 11$ when resolved into its constituent components. This leaves four binaries in a sample of eleven objects. Only two other similar surveys of young, VLM objects exist in the literature⁵. Kraus et al. (2005) surveyed 12 VLM objects in Upper Scorpius and found three binaries, and more recently, Kraus et al. (2006) targeted 22 VLM objects in Taurus and found two binaries. Figures 1 and 2 plot the properties of the binaries from these two surveys, along with those found in our study. Combining all three surveys (eight binaries out of 45 targets) yields a binary fraction of $18 \pm 4\%$, with *no* evidence of a difference between the two star-forming regions.

The VLM binary fraction in nearby star-forming regions appears to be higher than that found in the field. To make a direct comparison, we define a binary fraction over the same separation (4 to 100 AU) and mass (0.04 to 0.2 M_\odot) range covered by the combined young, VLM sample. Specifically, the field statistics are culled from the works of Close et al. (2003), Bouy et al. (2003), and Gizis et al. (2003), which survey objects of late M and early to mid-L spectral types, with the surveys of mid-M type stars of Siegler et al. (2005) and Reid and Gizis (1997, using only the stars of spectral type M5-M9 in their sample) and the T dwarf survey of Burgasser et al. (2003); all surveys included are reported to be complete to at least $q \sim 0.5$. This produces a sample of 39 binaries among 219 objects, which results in a bias-corrected (see Burgasser et al. 2003 for method) field VLM binary fraction of $8 \pm$

⁵ Recently, Bouy et al. (2006) presented a number of new binaries they found in Upper Scorpius. These binaries are quite interesting in that many are quite wide and a number are VLM. However, they do not include in their work the complete list or number of targets they observed. Thus, for the purposes of this paper, we cannot include these binaries in our binary fraction analysis.

⁴ <http://irsa.ipac.caltech.edu/applications/Stats/>




FIG. 2.— The temperatures and absolute K-band magnitudes of each of our targets and those of the companions found (filled red symbols). The primaries and secondaries that correspond to each other are numbered as such. The isochrones shown are those of the age of Taurus, ~ 1 -5 Myr, and several mass tracks are also shown, as well as the spectral types that correspond to various temperatures (Luhman et al. 2003). It is clear from this figure that several targets are substantially brighter than would be expected for members of Taurus, giving age estimates younger than 1 Myr (where the Baraffe et al. 1998 tracks end). This lead us to use only the temperatures to estimate the appropriate mass, after fixing the age to 1 Myr. Also shown are those targets from other surveys of young, VLM stars that we use to construct our entire sample of VLM targets from star-forming regions (green and blue open symbols). The green open symbols are sources also in Taurus, while the blue symbols are sources in Upper Scorpius, which appropriately cluster around slightly older isochrones than the Taurus members.

2%. This value is a factor of two less and 2.2σ lower than the young, VLM binary fraction.

In addition to the binary fractions discussed above, the properties of VLM systems, namely the separation and the mass ratio, show differences as a function of age. Figure 1 plots the binary mass ratio for the young and field surveys discussed above, along with three other binaries discovered with high angular resolution imaging (Luhman 2004b, Chauvin et al. 2005, White et al. 1999, Bouy et al. 2006), as a function of separation. In contrast to the field population, young, VLM binaries frequently have separations larger than 20 AU, as well as smaller (more unequal) mass ratios. This suggests that the young VLM binaries are wider and have a flatter mass ratio distribution than field binaries, or equivalently that many of the young VLM binaries have smaller binding energies than their older counterparts.

The differences in these parameters are quantified with both one-dimensional and two-dimensional K-S tests, comparing the separations and mass ratio distributions of these field VLM binaries with the young VLM binaries. In one dimension, the separation distributions have a 1% probability of similarity and the mass ratio distributions have a 0.02% probability of similarity. Additionally, in two dimensions, the distribution of both parameters taken together has only a 0.07% probability of similarity. Thus, we can say with a fairly high degree of certainty that the properties of young VLM binaries differ substantially from those of old VLM binaries.

These differences support the idea that there may be substantial evolution in the properties of VLM binaries ~ 5 -10 Myr after their formation (Burgasser et al. 2006). The disruption of binaries with separations greater than 20 AU via




FIG. 3.— Binding energy as a function of total mass for the VLM binaries, both young and in the field, discussed above, in addition to a number of known, stellar binaries (Close et al. 1990, Duquennoy & Mayor 1991, Fischer & Marcy 1992, Reid & Gizis 1997, Reid et al. 2001). Though three of the new binaries in Taurus have binding energies below the limit from Close et al. (2003), they do not have binding energies as low as those of stellar binaries.

interactions with their environment, i.e. their formative cluster, shortly after their initial formation would seem to be a plausible zeroth-order explanation for the disparity. As further evidence of this idea, if we assume that evolution will eventually lead to the disruption of the four binaries found here with separations greater than 20 AU, we can calculate a new binary fraction - the fraction that will survive to eventually become a field binaries. This leaves a total of four out of 45 binaries, which yields a binary fraction of $9 \pm 5\%$. This number is perfectly consistent with the field binary fraction we calculate above.

However, the situation becomes substantially more complicated when comparing VLM binaries to stellar binaries. As noted by both Close et al. (2003) and Burgasser et al. (2006), there appears to be a discrepancy between the minimum observed binding energy of stellar binaries and VLM binaries. This binding energy discrepancy is shown in Figure 3. Three of the binaries discovered here have a binding energy below the previously determined limit, with a minimum around $\sim 10^{42}$ erg. This minimum is still quite discrepant from what is observed amongst field binaries, which appear to have a minimum binding energy of about $\sim 10^{41}$ erg. The stellar binding energy cutoff can be explained by the work of Weinberg et al. (1987), who show that normal interactions with the other stars and giant molecular clouds in the Galaxy typically provide a “velocity kick” of less than 1 km s^{-1} , sufficient to truncate a stellar mass binaries with separations beyond ~ 0.1 pc. However, generating a binding energy cutoff like that observed amongst the VLM binaries necessitates a velocity kick roughly three times this value.

One method of generating the higher velocity kicks for VLM objects is from the ejection scenario for VLM star and brown dwarf formation (Bate et al. 2002), which predicts typical velocity kicks of $\sim 3 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ very early in the formation process. However, numerous authors have noted the implausibility of the ejection scenario, as it predicts not only a very low frequency of binary brown dwarf systems (5% or less),

but also generates binary brown dwarfs with separations of less than 10 AU. Although recent work by Umbreit et al. (2005) shows that it is possible to form more brown dwarf binaries via ejection than initially assumed, they find a semi-major axis distribution that is severely truncated at wider separations, with no brown dwarf binaries created at separations greater than 20 AU. While this new study initially seemed a promising solution to the binding energy problem, it does not explain the young, wide binaries plotted in Figure 1.

A reasonable explanation of the binding energy discrepancy must now include the survival of some VLM binaries of separations greater than 20 AU up through at least a few million years after formation while at the same time account for the truncation seen in the field. On a number of occasions, the low-mass, low-density nature of Taurus has been invoked to explain difference observed between the multiplicity properties of the region and regions like the high-density Orion. Thus, it could be argued that the multiplicity of VLM objects found in this study is not directly comparable to field VLM objects, which would most likely have formed in higher mass star forming regions. However, the similarity of the results presented here to those found in Upper Scorpius make this an unsatisfactory explanation - indeed, it has been argued that Orion is in fact also an unusual star-forming region and most stars form in intermediate mass regions like Upper Scorpius (e.g. Kroupa 1995). Thus, the existence of wide VLM binaries in numerous star-forming regions seems to be a significant trend.

The statistical significance of the truncation of wide, VLM field binaries both now in terms of their younger counterparts and stellar binaries therefore necessitates a plausible physical explanation for their disappearance over a longer timescale than has been previously suggested. As mentioned above, the work of Weinberg et al. (1987) suggests that disruption of such binaries once they survive to become field objects is unlikely. In addition, although their eventual disruption could potentially be due to interactions within star forming regions before they disperse, Kroupa et al. (2003) show from dynamical simulations that although many VLM binaries would be disrupted in very high density regions like the Orion Nebula cluster, the majority will not be disrupted in regions like Taurus. Disruption alone thus does not appear to be the cause of the discrepancy.

However, the dynamical events a VLM binary undergoes throughout its time in its formative cluster and its eventual evolution into a field object is clearly not so simple as it becoming either disrupted or not. Most interactions will have an effect on the properties of the binary, namely in terms of hardening or softening. Thus, it could be that the impact of such interactions will be greater on a VLM binary than on a stellar binary as a result of their small size relative to the average perturbing object. For instance, Hills (1990) shows that the fractional change in binding energy is a fairly strong function of the ratio of the mass of the binary to the mass of the perturber, which would imply that hard VLM binaries on average get “harder” more quickly than stellar binaries. Such parameter evolution, first occurring in a star-forming region and then later in the field, could potentially account for some of the binding energy discrepancy. For instance, the simulations of Adams et al. (2006) show that interaction and disruption cross-sections in a star-forming region scale roughly as the square root of the mass of the primary star. More detailed calculations that take into account the effects of the relative

mass of the binary with respect to the rest of the cluster and subsequently the field population should be performed to test these effects.

5. SUMMARY

In a survey of thirteen newly-discovered VLM members of the Taurus star-forming region, we identified five new binary systems. Follow-up observations are still required to confirm that these binaries are associated. Proper motion measurements would provide the most definitive confirmation. Additional constraints could be applied in the interim by obtaining either colors or spectral types for the secondaries in these systems. Still, statistical arguments show that they are associated to a high degree of certainty. As a result of these discoveries, we were able to statistically compare the properties of young, VLM binaries to their older counterparts in the field. We found that our study and those of other young VLM objects suggest that the binary fraction of VLM objects is higher in star-forming regions like Taurus and Upper Scorpius than in the field. Additionally, four of our five binaries have separations beyond 20 AU, a configuration previously found to be rare for VLM binaries. These wide binaries, coupled with the statistically significant truncation of field VLM binaries beyond 20 AU, suggest that dynamical evolution produces the observed field VLM binary properties. Along these lines, we find that it is difficult to produce these results using the ejection scenario of VLM object formation, as wide binaries are not expected to survive this process. Dynamical perturbations may play a role in determining the final distribution of VLM binary systems, as their small mass relative to the average mass of a perturbing object can cause them to be more readily hardened over time than stellar mass binaries. More simulations that take into the effects of the mass of a VLM binary with respect to the rest of either the cluster or the field population are needed to determine if such dynamics are sufficient to explain the binding energy discrepancy.

The authors thank observing assistants Steven Magee, Madeline Reed, and Terry Stickel and support astronomer Mark Kassiss for their help in obtaining the observations and Elise Furlan and Jessica Lu for their helpful suggestions. We also thank an anonymous referee for constructive feedback. Support for this work was provided by the NASA Astrobiology Institute and the Packard Foundation. QMK is supported by the NASA Graduate Student Research Program (NNG05-GM05H) through JPL. This publication makes use of data products from the Two Micron All Sky Survey, which is a joint project of the University of Massachusetts and the Infrared Processing and Analysis Center/California Institute of Technology, funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation. The W.M. Keck Observatory is operated as a scientific partnership among the California Institute of Technology, the University of California and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Observatory was made possible by the generous financial support of the W.M. Keck Foundation. The authors also wish to recognize and acknowledge the very significant cultural role and reverence that the summit of Mauna Kea has always had within the indigenous Hawaiian community. We are most fortunate to have the opportunity to conduct observations from this mountain.

REFERENCES

- Adams, F.C., Proszkow, E.M., Fatuzzo, M., and Myers, P.C. 2006, *ApJ*, 641, 504
- Ardila, D., Martín, E.L., & Basri, G. 2000, *AJ*, 120, 479
- Baraffe, I., Charbier, G., Allard, F., & Hauschildt, P.H. 1998, *A&A*, 337, 403
- Bate, M.R., Bonnell, I.A., Bromm, V., 2002, *MNRAS*, 332, 65
- Bertout, C., Robichon, N., & Arenou, F., 1999, *A&A*, 352, 574B
- Billères, M., Delfosse, X., Beuzit, J.-L., Forveille, T., Marchal, L., & Martín, E.L. 2005, *A&A*, 440, 55
- Boss, A. 2002, *ApJ*, 568, 743
- Bouy, H., Brandner, W., Martín, E.L., Delfosses, X., Allard, F., & Basri, G., 2003, *AJ*, 126, 1526
- Bouy, H., Martín, E.L., Brandner, W., & Bouvier, J. 2005, *AJ*, 129, 511
- Bouy, H., Martín, E.L., Brandner, W., Zapatero-Osorio, M.R., Béjar, V.J.S., Schirmer, M., Huéamo, N., & Ghez, A.M. 2006, *A&A*, 451, 177
- Brandner, W. et al., 2000, *A&A*, 120, 950
- Burgasser, A.J., Kirkpatrick, J.D., Reid, I.N., Brown, M.E., Miskey, C.L., Gizis, J.E., 2003, *ApJ*, 586, 512
- Burgasser, A.J., Reid, I.N., Siegler, N., Close, L., Allen, P., Lowrance, P., & Gizis, J., 2006, *Protostars and Planets V*, ed. Reipurth et al., Univ. Arizona Press
- Christou, J.C., 1991, *PASP*, 102, 1040
- Close, L.M., Richer, H.B., & Crabtree, D.R., 1990, *AJ*, 100, 1968
- Close, L.M., Siegler, N., Freed, M., Biller, B., 2003, *ApJ*, 587, 407
- Duquennoy, A. & Mayor, M., 1991, *A&A*, 248, 485
- Fischer, D. A. & Marcy, G.W., 1992, *ApJ*, 396, 178
- Fisher, R.T., 2004, *ApJ*, 600, 769
- Ghez, A.M., Neugebauer, G., & Matthews, K. 1993, *AJ*, 106, 2005
- Ghez, A.M., Weinberger, A.J., Neugebauer, G., Matthews, K., & McCarthy, D.W., Jr. 1995, *AJ*, 110, 753
- Gizis, J.E., Reid, I.N., Knapp, G.R., Liebert, J., Kirkpatrick, J.D., Koerner, D.W., & Burgasser, A.J., 2003, *AJ*, 125, 3302
- Guieu, S., Dougados, C., Monin, J.-L., Magnier, E., & Martín, E.L., 2006, *A&A*, 446, 485
- Kenyon, S.J. & Hartmann, L. 1995, *ApJS*, 101, 117
- Konopacky, Q.M., Ghez, A.M., McCabe, C., Duchene, G., & Macintosh, B.A., 2007, *AJ*, in press
- Kraus, A.L., White, R.J., & Hillenbrand, L.A., 2005, *ApJ*, 633, 452
- Kraus, A.L., White, R.J., & Hillenbrand, L.A., 2006, *ApJ*, accepted
- Kroupa, P., Bouvier, J., Duchêne, G., & Moraux, E. 2003, *MNRAS*, 346, 354
- Labeyrie, A. 1970, *A&A*, 6, 85
- Lu, J.R., et al., in prep
- Luhman, K.L., 2004a, *ApJ*, 617, 1216
- Luhman, K.L., 2004b, *ApJ*, 614, 398
- Luhman, K. L., Stauffer, J.R., Muench, A.A., Rieke, G.H., Lada, E. A., Bouvier, J., & Lada, C. J. 2003, *ApJ*, 593, 1093
- Mathews, K., Ghez, A.M., Weinberger, A.J., & Neugebauer, G. 1996, *PASP*, 108, 615
- Mathews, K., & Soifer, B. T. 1994, *Infrared Astronomy with Arrays, The Next Generation*, ed. I. McLean (Dordrecht: Kluwer), 239
- Martín, E.L., Barrado y Navascués, D., Baraffe, I., Bouy, H., & Dahm, S., 2003, *ApJ*, 594, 525
- Martín, E.L., Brandner, W., & Bouy, H. 2006, *A&A*, submitted
- Neuhäuser, R., Brandner, W., Alves, J., Joergens, V., & Comerón, F., 2002, *A&A*, 384, 999
- Padoan, P. & Nordlund, A., 2004, *ApJ*, 617, 559
- Reid, I.N. & Gizis, J.E. 1997, *AJ*, 113, 2246
- Reid, I.N., Gizis, J.E., Kirkpatrick, J.D., & Koerner, D.W., *AJ*, 2001, 121, 489
- Rice, W.K.M., Armitage, P.J., Bate, M.R., & Bonnell, I.A. 2003, *MNRAS*, 339, 1025
- Siegler, N., Close, L.M., Cruz, K.L., Martín, E.L., & Reid, I.N. 2005, *apj*, 621, 1023
- Umbreit, S., Burkert, A., Henning, T., Mikkola, S., & Spurzem, R. 2005, *ApJ*, 623, 940
- Weinberg, M.D., Shapiro, S.L., & Wasserman, I. 1987, *ApJ*, 312, 367
- White, R.J., Ghez, A.M., Reid, I.N., & Schultz, G. 1999, *ApJ*, 520, 811
- Whitworth, A.P. & Zinnecker, H., 2004, *A&A*, 427, 299
- Whitworth, A.P. & Stamatellos, 2006, *astro-ph*, 0610039
- Zapatero Osorio, M.R., Béjar, V.J.S., Martín, E.L., Rebolo, R., Barrado y Navascués, D., & Bailer-Jones, C.A.L., 2000, *Science*, 290, 103