

JWST 1.5 μm and 4.8 μm Photometry of Y Dwarfs

LOÏC ALBERT^{*},^{1,2} SANDY K. LEGGETT^{*},³ PER CALISSENDORFF,⁴ THOMAS VANDAL,^{5,2} J. DAVY KIRKPATRICK,⁶
DANIELLA C. BARDALEZ GAGLIUFFI,^{7,8} MATTHEW DE FURIO,⁹ MICHAEL MEYER,⁴ CHARLES A. BEICHMAN,¹⁰
ADAM J. BURGASSER,¹¹ MICHAEL C. CUSHING,¹² JACQUELINE KELLY FAHERTY,¹³ CLÉMENCE FONTANIVE,^{5,2}
CHRISTOPHER R. GELINO,⁶ JOHN E. GIZIS,¹⁴ ALEXANDRA Z. GREENBAUM,¹⁵ FRANTZ MARTINACHE,¹⁶
MAMADOU N'DIAYE,¹⁶ BENJAMIN J. S. POPE,^{17,18} THOMAS L. ROELLIG,¹⁹ JOHANNES SAHLMANN,²⁰
ANAND SIVARAMAKRISHNAN,^{13,21,22} AND MARIE YGOUF¹⁰

¹*Département de Physique, Observatoire du Mont-Mégantic and Trottier Institute for Research on Exoplanets, Université de Montréal, C.P. 6128, Succ. Centre-ville, Montréal, H3C 3J7, Québec, Canada*

²*Institut Trottier de Recherche sur les exoplanètes, Université de Montréal*

³*NOIRLab - Gemini North (HI)*

⁴*Department of Astronomy, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA*

⁵*Département de Physique and Observatoire du Mont-Mégantic, Université de Montréal, C.P. 6128, Succ. Centre-ville, Montréal, H3C 3J7, Québec, Canada.*

⁶*California Institute of Technology*

⁷*Department of Physics & Astronomy, Amherst College, 25 East Drive, Amherst, MA 01003, USA*

⁸*Department of Astrophysics, American Museum of Natural History, 200 Central Park West, New York, NY 10024, USA*

⁹*Department of Astronomy, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA*

¹⁰*Jet Propulsion Laboratory*

¹¹*University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA*

¹²*Ritter Astrophysical Research Center, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Toledo, 2801 W. Bancroft Street, Toledo, OH 43606, USA*

¹³*Astrophysics Department, American Museum of Natural History, 79th Street at Central Park West, New York, NY 10024*

¹⁴*University of Delaware*

¹⁵*IPAC, Mail Code 100-22, Caltech, 1200 E. California Blvd., Pasadena, CA 91125, USA*

¹⁶*Université Côte d'Azur, Observatoire de la Côte d'Azur, CNRS, Laboratoire Lagrange, France*

¹⁷*School of Mathematics and Physics, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia*

¹⁸*Centre for Astrophysics, University of Southern Queensland, West Street, Toowoomba, QLD 4350, Australia*

¹⁹*MS 245-6, NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035*

²⁰*European Space Agency (ESA), European Space Astronomy Centre (ESAC), Camino Bajo del Castillo s/n, 28692 Villanueva de la Cañada, Madrid, Spain*

²¹*Space Telescope Science Institute, 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA*

²²*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Johns Hopkins University, 3701 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA*

ABSTRACT

Brown dwarfs lack nuclear fusion and cool with time; the coldest known have an effective temperature below 500 K, and are known as Y dwarfs. We present a *James Webb Space Telescope (JWST)* photometric dataset of Y dwarfs: twenty-three were imaged in wide-field mode, 20 using NIRC*am* with the F150W and F480M filters, and 3 using NIRISS with the F480M filter. We present an F480M vs. F150W – F480M color-magnitude diagram for our sample, and other brown dwarfs with F150W and F480M colors synthesized from *JWST* spectra by Beiler et al. (2024). For one target, WISEA J083011.95+283716.0, its detection in the near-infrared confirms it as one of the reddest Y dwarfs known, with F150W – F480M = 9.62 mag. We provide its updated parallax and proper motion. One of the Beiler et al. Y dwarfs, CWISEP J104756.81+545741.6, is unusually blue, consistent with strong CO absorption seen in its spectrum which the F480M filter is particularly sensitive to. The strong CO and the kinematics of the object suggest it may be very low-mass and young. We update the resolved photometry for the close binary system WISE J033605.05–014350.4 AB, and find that

the secondary is almost as cold as WISE 085510.83–071442.5, with $T_{\text{eff}} \lesssim 300$ K, however the F150W – F480M color is significantly bluer, possibly suggesting the presence of water clouds. Astrometry is measured at the *JWST* epoch for the sample which is consistent with parallax and proper motion values reported by Kirkpatrick et al. (2021) and Marocco et al. (in prep).

Keywords: Brown dwarfs – Y-dwarfs – Infrared photometry – Proper motions

1. INTRODUCTION

Y dwarfs are the coolest known class of brown dwarfs - objects with insufficient mass for sustained nuclear fusion at their core (Burrows et al. 2001). The Y dwarfs have effective temperatures (T_{eff}) less than 500 K (Kirkpatrick et al. 2021), and the coldest Y dwarf currently known, WISE 085510.83–071442.5, has $T_{\text{eff}} \approx 260$ K (Leggett et al. 2021; Luhman et al. 2024, see also Section 5). Evolutionary models (Marley et al. 2021) calculate that field Y dwarfs, with ages of a few Gyr (e.g. Kirkpatrick et al. 2021; Best et al. 2024), have masses of about 10 Jupiter-masses (M_{Jup}), within the planetary-mass regime, such that properties of giant planets and cold brown dwarfs overlap significantly (Morley et al. 2014; Showman et al. 2019). Ultimately, establishing the nature of these low-mass objects, planets or brown dwarfs, needs to involve their formation pathways. To progress along that question requires a diversity of approaches: comparing and contrasting the properties of low-mass companions to host stars, e.g. orbital eccentricities (Bowler et al. 2020), exploring the lower mass limits of star-formation (Kirkpatrick et al. 2021, 2024) and characterizing the Y dwarf multiplicity to understand their formation (Fontanive et al. 2023).

With our *JWST* Cycle 1 program (PID 2473, PI Loïc Albert), we explore the multiplicity of 20 Y dwarfs with NIRCам kernel phase interferometry (Martinache 2010; Ceau et al. 2019; Kammerer et al. 2023), using the F150W and F480M filters. In this paper we report the photometric measurements for the sample, and also provide checks on the published proper motions and parallaxes of Kirkpatrick et al. (2021). A companion paper (Vandal et al. in prep.) presents the results of the search for companions for the entire sample. An early discovery of the first binary Y dwarf system from this program was presented by Calissendorff et al. (2023). Another companion paper presents detailed modeling of the photometry of WISEA J083011.95+283716.0 (Matuszewska et al. in prep.). We supplement the photometry determined as part of program 2473 with measurements of cold brown dwarfs using the F480M filter, executed as part of the Cycle 1 GTO programs 1189 (PI Thomas L Roellig) and 1230 (PI Catarina Alves de Oliveira).

Section 2 describes the sample and the observations. Section 3 describes the data reduction and presents the photometric measurements. Section 4 discusses the kinematics of the sample. The brown dwarf colors are explored using color-magnitude diagrams and models, in Section 5. Section 6 presents our conclusions.

2. SAMPLE AND OBSERVATIONS

2.1. Sample Selection

The target list of Y dwarfs was selected from the literature as available in 2020. We selected spectroscopically confirmed brown dwarfs as listed in Kirkpatrick et al. (2019, Table 11) with $T_{\text{eff}} < 500$ K within 15 pc of the Sun. For the NIRCам program (PID 2473), brown dwarfs calculated to be too close to known background objects during Cycle 1 were removed from the sample as were known binary brown dwarfs. Two targets in that sample were observed for PI Albert as part of GTO programs (PIDs 1189 and 1230) using NIRISS in imaging mode which included two additional targets in the 15-pc Y-dwarfs sample (WISE J085510.83–071442.5 and WISEPA J182831.08+265037.8) as well as an additional PSF calibration target, UGPS J072227.51–054031.2, a nearby T9 brown dwarf. The full sample is listed in Table 1 with discovery references, effective temperature values, parallax measurements, and CatWISE 2020 W2 magnitudes. Hereafter, the targets will be written as WISE-hhmm, e.g. WISE-0855.

2.2. *JWST* NIRCам Imaging

NIRCам enables dual band imaging in the blue ($\lambda \leq 2.4 \mu\text{m}$) and red ($\lambda \geq 2.5 \mu\text{m}$) channels simultaneously (Rieke et al. 2023). For the blue channel, we selected the F150W ($1.5 \mu\text{m}$) wide band filter ($\Delta\lambda/\lambda = 10\%$) because most Y dwarfs had measurements in the ground-based *H*-band filter which is centered near $1.6 \mu\text{m}$ (c.f. Kirkpatrick et al. (2019, 2021)). For the red channel we selected a filter at a wavelength where the Y dwarfs emit significant flux, the F480M ($4.8 \mu\text{m}$) medium band filter ($\Delta\lambda/\lambda = 5\%$) (Schneider et al. 2015; Morley et al. 2014).

We observed the sample in 5 groups of 4 targets and specified that observations within a group were to be

Table 1. Sample of Brown Dwarfs

Short Name	Full Name	Disc.	T_{eff}	T_{eff}	Parallax	W2
		Ref.	Est. K	Ref.		
NIRCam F150W+F480M Survey (Program ID 2473)						
WISE-0304	WISE J030449.03–270508.3	1	465 ± 88	a	73.1 ± 2.6	15.578 ± 0.041
WISE-0336AB	WISE J033605.05–014350.4AB	2	460 ± 79	b	99.8 ± 2.1	14.664 ± 0.023
WISE-0359	WISE J035934.06–540154.6	2	443 ⁺²³ ₋₁₉	c	73.6 ± 2.0	15.412 ± 0.026
WISE-0410	WISEPA J041022.71+150248.5	3	451 ± 88	a	151.3 ± 2.0	14.104 ± 0.017
WISE-0535	WISE J053516.80–750024.9	2	496 ⁺²⁸ ₋₂₃	c	68.7 ± 2.0	14.996 ± 0.020
WISE-0647	WISE J064723.23–623235.5	4	393 ± 88	a	99.5 ± 1.7	15.115 ± 0.018
WISE-0713	WISE J071322.55–291751.9	2	464 ± 88	a	109.3 ± 2.1	14.327 ± 0.016
WISE-0734	WISE J073444.02–715744.0	2	466 ⁺²⁴ ₋₂₀	c	74.5 ± 1.7	15.241 ± 0.022
WISE-0825	WISE J082507.35+280548.5	5	387 ⁺¹⁵ ₋₁₅	c	152.6 ± 2.0	14.655 ± 0.024
WISE-0830	WISEA J083011.95+283716.0	6	367 ± 79	a	90.6 ± 13.7 [†]	16.004 ± 0.072
WISE-1141	WISEA J114156.67–332635.5	7	460 ± 79	a	104.0 ± 2.9	14.632 ± 0.030
WISE-1206	WISE J120604.38+840110.6	8	472 ⁺²⁶ ₋₂₀	c	84.7 ± 2.1	15.173 ± 0.023
WISE-1405	WISEPC J140518.40+553421.4	3	392 ⁺¹⁶ ₋₁₅	c	158.2 ± 2.6	14.098 ± 0.014
WISE-1446	CWISEP J144606.62–231717.8	9	351 ⁺¹⁶ ₋₁₃	c	103.8 ± 5.0	15.955 ± 0.072
WISE-1541	WISEPA J154151.66–225025.2	3	411 ⁺¹⁸ ₋₁₇	c	166.9 ± 2.0	14.218 ± 0.030
WISE-1639	WISEA J163932.75+184049.4	9	511 ± 79	a	61.9 ± 4.7	15.481 ± 0.036
WISE-1738	WISEPA J173835.53+273258.9	3	450 ± 88	a	130.9 ± 2.1	14.519 ± 0.017
WISE-2056	WISEPC J205628.90+145953.3	3	481 ⁺²⁶ ₋₂₀	c	140.8 ± 2.0	13.925 ± 0.016
WISE-2220	WISE J222055.31–362817.4	2	452 ± 88	a	95.5 ± 2.1	14.807 ± 0.024
WISE-2354	WISEA J235402.79+024014.1	8	347 ⁺¹³ ₋₁₁	c	130.6 ± 3.3	15.018 ± 0.030
NIRISS F480M Imaging (Program ID 1230)						
UGPS-0722	UGPS J072227.51–054031.2	10	569 ± 45	a	242.8 ± 2.4	12.198 ± 0.008
WISE-0855	WISE J085510.83–071442.5	11	250 ± 50	a	439.0 ± 2.4	13.820 ± 0.029
NIRISS F480M Imaging (Program ID 1189)						
WISE-1828	WISEPA J182831.08+265037.8	3	406 ± 88	a	100.3 ± 2.0	14.393 ± 0.016

NOTE— Discovery references are – 1: Pinfield et al. (2014); 2: Kirkpatrick et al. (2012); 3: Cushing et al. (2011); 4: Kirkpatrick et al. (2013); 5: Griffith et al. (2012); 6: Bardalez Gagliuffi et al. (2020); 7: Tinney et al. (2014); 8: Schneider et al. (2015); 9: Marocco et al. (2020); 10: Lucas et al. (2010); 11: Luhman (2014).

T_{eff} references are – a: Kirkpatrick et al. (2024); b: Kirkpatrick et al. (2021); c: Beiler et al. (2024).

Parallaxes are from Kirkpatrick et al. (2021) except for WISE-1446 where the parallax is from Beiler et al. (2024).

[†] Updated astrometry for WISE-0830 is given in Table 4.

The W2 magnitudes are proper-motion corrected values (`w2mpo_pm`) from the CatWISE2020 Catalog (Marocco et al. 2021), curated by IRSA.

executed within 3 days. This strategy was designed to minimize any wavefront drift and, for each target, to be able to use the 3 other targets as point source function (PSF) reference stars (assuming they were not binaries).

Integration times range, for a given target, between 30 minutes and 2.5 hours which provided a signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) > 1000 in F480M. Achieving such a high SNR (or roughly 10^7 photons) at 4.8 μm was crucial to be able to use the kernel phase interferometry analysis technique for our binary search. The SNRs in F150W were much lower (10 to 100) because of the extremely red H – $W2$ colors of ≥ 6 magnitudes, for this sample of Y dwarfs. Note that this high SNR is consid-

ered separately from the *absolute* flux calibration uncertainty for NIRCam currently listed at 0.9% (F480M) and 0.4% (F150W) in the respective *photom* reference files found on the *JWST Calibration Reference Data System*¹ (CRDS).

Each target was observed over the $2'2 \times 2'2$ field of view of module B in FULL readout mode with dithered exposures. The first 12 targets used a 5-point subpixel dither type (SMALL-GRID-DITHER) that was found to be suboptimal for bad pixel correction. It was switched

¹ <https://jwst-crds.stsci.edu/>

to a larger ($2''9\text{-}8''9$) 5-point primary dither strategy (INTRAMODULEBOX) enabling better bad pixel interpolation for the remaining 8 targets. We attempted to center the target near pixels 1200, 700 on the long wave detector (F480M band) corresponding to pixels near 400,1400 in the short wave detector NIRCB2 (F150W band) by using a target offset of $\Delta\alpha, \Delta\delta = +22''0, -8''0$. Errors in the position epoch entered in the *Astronomer Proposal Tool* caused significant deviations, in one case resulting in having the target off the F150W channel for 2 dithers. Table 2 lists the observations for targets observed as part of Program 2473.

2.3. JWST NIRISS Imaging

The target list was supplemented with three additional brown dwarfs, UGPS-0722, WISE-0855 and WISE-1828, observed with NIRISS in imaging mode using filters F480M + CLEARP to search for companions (see Table 2). One of the sources, UGPS-J0722, is a late T dwarf and not a Y dwarf, and is warmer than the rest of the sample, with $T_{\text{eff}} \approx 540$ K (e.g. Leggett et al. 2021).

The WISE-0855 observation was accompanied by a contemporaneous calibrator star observation of UGPS-0722, intended to serve as a PSF reference for both WISE-0855 and WISE-1828. During the first epoch of observations of WISE-0855 and UGPS-0722 the Fine Guidance Sensor lost the guide star lock and repeat observations of both targets were performed. A large SNR (> 1000) was achieved for all three targets. Observations are un-dithered (staring) and centered on a bad-pixel-free region of the NIRISS detector. All observations with NIRISS were obtained in FULL subarray mode, except UGPS-0722, which was observed in SUB80 (80×80 pixels) to prevent saturation.

3. DATA REDUCTION AND PHOTOMETRY

3.1. NIRC*am*

We downloaded the stacked images and associated catalogues constructed from the 5 dithered exposures (*id.fits*) processed by the Data Management System (DMS) (Bushouse et al. 2022), version 1.9.6. The photometry catalogues produced by the default DMS level 3 pipeline contained anomalous magnitude entries for a few targets which prompted us to revisit this step by performing our own aperture photometry using the photutils package version 1.8.0 (Bradley et al. 2023). For each filter (F480M/F150W), we first determined the centroid of the PSF by fitting a quadratic function in the 3×3 pixels around the pixel with peak intensity, then estimated the local sky level from statistics in an annulus with radii

of 4.92/6.082 and 7.083/9.496 pixels around the PSF center and subtracted this level. Next we performed aperture photometry by summing pixel flux within a radius of 3.757/3.199 pixels, defined in the CRDS reference file, `jwst_nircam_apcorr_0004.fits`, as the radius encompassing 70% of the PSF encircled energy. Finally, we applied an aperture correction by multiplying the extracted flux by 1.4863/1.4485. This yielded flux measurements, F , expressed in megajansky/steradian that we converted to Vega magnitudes by applying the $\text{mag}_{AB} - \text{mag}_{\text{vega}} = -3.85/-2.15$ mag offset (reference: `jwst_nircam_abstovegaoffset_0002.fits`) from the AB magnitude:

$$\text{mag}_{AB} = -2.5 \log_{10} \left(\frac{F[MJy/sr] \times T \times A[sr/pixel]}{3631[Jy] \times 10^{-6}[MJy/Jy]} \right) \quad (1)$$

where T is the throughput calibration, $\text{PHOT-MJSR} = 1.456 \pm 0.006/2.338 \pm 0.021$, A is the steradian to pixel area conversion, $\text{PIXAR_SR} = 9.332 \times 10^{-14}/2.287 \times 10^{-14}$, found in the `jwst_nircam_photom_0153/0150.fits` reference file.

The measurement uncertainty considers the readout noise and photon noise given as a pixel map by the DMS pipeline (the ERR extension of the cal.fits) but also includes the uncertainty in subtracting the background level. These combine to very small statistical errors of order 0.08% (F480M) and 0.2-2% (F150W). The absolute flux calibration uncertainty is added in quadrature and, with a precision of 0.4% in the F480M, dominates the error budget for the photometric measurements reported in Table 2. For the F150W filter, the absolute calibration uncertainty, 0.9%, is comparable to the statistical noise.

3.2. Photometry of the binary WISE 0336A+B

We present updated photometry for both components of the known binary WISE-0336A/B from that reported in Calissendorff et al. (2023). We treated the A+B components as unresolved to obtain the aperture photometry of the system in exactly the same manner as for the other NIRC*am* targets. We then used the binary contrast published in Calissendorff et al. (2023) of $\Delta F_{480M} = F_{480M_B} - F_{480M_A} = 1.81_{-0.31}^{+0.14}$ and $\Delta F_{150W} = F_{150W_B} - F_{150W_A} = 2.82_{-0.11}^{+0.19}$ to calculate the magnitude of each component separately. The uncertainties were propagated using a Monte Carlo simulation of 5×10^5 realizations. Results are resilient to aperture size selection.

3.3. NIRISS

We reprocessed the data with the DMS version 1.12.5 enabling the `charge_migration` step, up to the end of

Table 2. F150W and F480M Photometry of our Y dwarf Sample

Short Name	Observing Date Mid Exposure (UT)	Int. Time (minutes)	F150W (Vega Mag)	F480M (Vega Mag)
WISE-0304	2022-09-23T21:58:02	89.5	21.872 ± 0.010	15.428 ± 0.005
WISE-0336AB	2022-09-22T13:13:10	40.3	22.038 ± 0.012	14.538 ± 0.005
WISE-0336A ^a	2022-09-22T13:13:10	40.3	22.114 ± 0.016	14.727 ^{+0.054} _{-0.023}
WISE-0336B ^a	2022-09-22T13:13:10	40.3	24.938 ^{+0.175} _{-0.105}	16.534 ^{+0.120} _{-0.252}
WISE-0359	2022-09-23T17:51:38	89.5	22.281 ± 0.010	15.268 ± 0.005
WISE-0410	2022-09-23T23:43:56	26.8	20.167 ± 0.010	13.999 ± 0.005
WISE-0535	2022-06-27T22:27:30	62.6	22.866 ± 0.013	14.795 ± 0.005
WISE-0647	2022-11-11T16:38:29	58.2	23.332 ± 0.013	14.919 ± 0.005
WISE-0713	2022-11-12T08:42:33	31.3	20.445 ± 0.010	14.183 ± 0.005
UGPS-0722 ^b	2023-04-17T22:33:44	18.9	17.26 ± 0.03	12.016 ± 0.011
WISE-0734	2022-06-28T00:07:35	76.1	21.706 ± 0.011	15.162 ± 0.004
WISE-0825	2022-11-12T10:10:45	40.3	22.831 ± 0.014	14.418 ± 0.005
WISE-0830	2022-11-12T22:49:59	120.8	25.261 ± 0.026	15.644 ± 0.005
WISE-0855 ^b	2022-11-19T09:25:29	36.5	23.98 ± 0.10	13.679 ± 0.011
WISE-1141	2023-06-29T22:27:31	40.3	20.580 ± 0.010	14.582 ± 0.005
WISE-1206	2023-02-27T21:31:43	71.6	21.227 ± 0.010	15.112 ± 0.005
WISE-1405	2023-03-02T12:43:40	25.1	21.756 ± 0.012	13.930 ± 0.005
WISE-1446	2023-03-02T09:15:03	143.2	23.672 ± 0.013	15.694 ± 0.005
WISE-1541	2023-03-02T11:18:04	28.6	22.004 ± 0.011	14.018 ± 0.005
WISE-1639	2023-06-28T21:47:19	13.4	21.316 ± 0.014	13.487 ± 0.005
WISE-1738	2022-06-29T17:21:58	31.3	20.365 ± 0.010	14.464 ± 0.005
WISE-1828 ^b	2022-07-28T17:52:53	35.8	23.07 ± 0.10	14.242 ± 0.011
WISE-2056	2023-06-28T09:03:58	22.4	20.057 ± 0.001	13.762 ± 0.005
WISE-2220	2023-07-01T21:31:28	49.2	21.161 ± 0.011	14.745 ± 0.005
WISE-2354	2022-06-29T19:09:18	58.2	23.098 ± 0.013	14.930 ± 0.005

NOTE— ^a The individual F150W and F480M magnitudes for the WISE-0336 system were determined from the aperture photometry for the unresolved system and the flux ratios for each component measured by Calissendorff et al. (2023).

^b The F150W magnitudes for UGPS-0722, WISE-0855 and WISE-1828 were synthesized from spectroscopic observations by Lucas et al. (2010); Luhman et al. (2024); Cushing et al. (2021). Uncertainties for these values were estimated to be equal to the spectral flux calibration uncertainty.

level 2 which produced *cal.fits* images. Then we ran a custom 1/f correction on the 3 data sets observed in FULL mode (both WISE-0855 observations and WISE-1828 observation) while using directly the *cal.fits* for UGPS-0722 because the 1/f imprint is less pronounced on the SUB80 images. Using the custom 1/f corrected data changed the photometry by less than 1% compared to using the *cal.fits* directly.

To extract photometry of NIRISS F480M images, we adopted the same procedure as performed on the NIRCam data sets and used by the DMS pipeline. We used the prescribed aperture and sky annulus radii of 4.68, 7.80 and 11.74 pixels, respectively while the aperture correction is 1.458 (70% encircled energy), found in *jwst_niriss_apcorr_0008.fits*. The AB to Vega magnitude offset is $mag_{AB} - mag_{Vega} = -3.4268$, the $PHOTMJSR = 1.220 \pm 0.013$ and $PIXAR.SR$

$= 1.009 \times 10^{-13}$ (*jwst_niriss_abstovegaoffset_0003.fits*, *jwst_niriss_photom_0043.fits*). The photometry has very small statistical errors of order 0.07%. The absolute flux calibration uncertainty is added in quadrature and, with a precision of 1.04%, dominates the error budget for the the F480M photometric measurements reported in Table 2.

In order to compare the colors of these three NIRISS sources to the rest of our sample, we synthesized F150W photometry from available near-infrared spectra (Lucas et al. 2010; Luhman 2014; Cushing et al. 2021). The *JWST* user documentation supplies filter transmissions which include instrument system throughput for each camera; we used the F150W NIRCam transmission for consistency with the other measurements. For reference, we explored the differences between the NIRCam and NIRISS photometric systems by synthe-

Table 3. Astrometry for the NIRC*am* Sample

Short Name	MJD (days)	α_{2000} (deg(mas))	δ_{2000} (deg(mas))	No. of Gaia Anchors	Offset from K21 Model		σ^a
					α (mas)	δ (mas)	
WISE-0304	59845.91531	46.2048671(20.0)	-27.0839387(15.8)	4	13.9 ± 21.7	-37.3 ± 19.7	2.0
WISE-0336	59844.55082	54.0202647(16.4)	-1.7351151(15.2)	6	-18.4 ± 17.9	-12.3 ± 16.7	1.3
WISE-0359	59845.74420	59.8912978(15.0)	-54.0343645(15.2)	3	2.6 ± 15.7	-3.8 ± 16.4	0.3
WISE-0410	59845.98885	62.5983013(15.8)	15.0390435(19.0)	4	3.1 ± 17.1	1.3 ± 20.0	0.2
WISE-0535	59757.93577	83.8183968(18.2)	-75.0066568(16.7)	110	4.2 ± 19.1	25.5 ± 17.9	1.4
WISE-0647	59894.69340	101.8468599(15.4)	-62.5418782(17.4)	13	10.5 ± 15.9	-5.7 ± 17.9	0.7
WISE-0713	59895.36289	108.3454431(16.6)	-29.2992193(17.4)	98	-4.6 ± 18.0	-17.7 ± 18.6	1.0
WISE-0734	59758.00527	113.6771949(16.6)	-71.9624680(16.9)	14	0.7 ± 16.9	-6.8 ± 17.4	0.4
WISE-0825	59895.42414	126.2804168(15.5)	28.0959557(15.9)	7	5.5 ± 17.0	-4.5 ± 17.2	0.4
WISE-0830	59895.95138	127.5492249(29.2)	28.6142199(23.1)	4	182.9 ± 309.9^b	112.1 ± 198.7^b	0.8
WISE-1141	60124.93578	175.4823320(18.6)	-33.4434263(20.2)	15	32.7 ± 22.2	-12.7 ± 23.5	1.6
WISE-1206	60002.89703	181.4985345(16.0)	84.0186397(23.0)	3	2.0 ± 17.7	16.9 ± 24.0	0.7
WISE-1405	60005.53033	211.3120210(16.9)	55.5733955(15.1)	4	-1.0 ± 19.3	13.2 ± 16.8	0.8
WISE-1446	60005.38545	221.5254686(20.8)	-23.2903901(15.6)	14	195.8 ± 323.1	113.0 ± 168.5	0.9
					52.4 ± 85.4^c	60.9 ± 80.8^c	1.0 ^b
WISE-1541	60005.47089	235.4616164(17.1)	-22.8407867(17.1)	31	3.7 ± 18.6	29.7 ± 18.6	1.6
WISE-1639	60123.90787	249.9258850(16.3)	-68.8055121(15.8)	106	-4.4 ± 18.4	-24.3 ± 18.1	1.4
WISE-1738	59759.72360	264.6493275(16.4)	27.5485376(15.6)	19	-7.9 ± 17.4	8.9 ± 16.8	0.7
WISE-2056	60123.37776	314.1235676(16.5)	15.0000852(16.2)	44	19.1 ± 17.8	3.0 ± 17.6	1.1
WISE-2220	60126.89686	335.2318522(21.2)	-36.4718910(17.5)	6	-0.6 ± 22.7	-3.0 ± 18.9	0.2
WISE-2354	59759.79813	358.5132467(20.6)	2.6693245(16.3)	3	-46.6 ± 24.0	-39.8 ± 20.3	2.8

NOTE—^a The last column (Offset from K21 Model - σ) compares the measured and modelled positions and expresses the offset in units of the combined model + measurement uncertainties. ^b For WISE-0830 the model was updated; results are given in Table 4. ^c For WISE-1446, comparison with the model of Marocco et al. (in prep.) shows good agreement and improved precision.

Table 4. Updated *Spitzer* + *JWST* astrometry model for WISEA J083011.95+283716.0.

Model parameter	Value ($\chi^2_\nu = 0.749$, 18 data points)
Epoch (t_0)	58850 (MJD)
R.A. at t_0 (α_{ICRS})	$127.549366^\circ \pm 6.8$ mas
Decl. at t_0 (δ_{ICRS})	$28.615822^\circ \pm 5.6$ mas
Parallax (ϖ)	99.2 ± 6.5 mas
P.M. R.A. ($\mu_{\text{R.A.}}$)	-190.2 ± 8.4 mas yr ⁻¹
P.M. Decl. ($\mu_{\text{Decl.}}$)	-2011.0 ± 6.9 mas yr ⁻¹

sizing F150W and F480M magnitudes for each camera for five Y dwarfs with *JWST* spectra across the bandpasses (Beiler et al. 2024). The five Y dwarfs had a range in T_{eff} of 350 K to 500 K, and the differences in the photometry were small, with no trend seen with T_{eff} . We found an average difference for NIRC*am* - NIRISS of $\Delta F_{150W} = -0.040 \pm 0.012$ and $\Delta F_{480M} = -0.010 \pm 0.001$ magnitudes. Any systematic difference due to the different F480M throughput

for the two cameras are therefore similar in size to the absolute flux calibration uncertainty.

4. ASTROMETRY — PROPER MOTION AND PARALLAX

The most recent parallax measurements place the brown dwarfs of our sample at a distance of 16 pc, or closer, to the Sun. All have significant proper motion, mostly derived from *Spitzer* observations obtained between 2010 and 2019 (Kirkpatrick et al. 2021). Our *JWST* observations obtained in 2022 and 2023 can therefore test the published astrometry by extrapolating the proper motion and parallax model over a 3 - 4 year time frame.

To propagate the motion of our targets proper motion and parallax, we use the SkyCoord module of Astropy and convert celestial coordinates to the Geocentric Celestial Reference System (GCRS). To eliminate the annual aberration which is the dominant motion, we measure angular positions relative to a virtual distant reference point at the celestial position of each target. We

neglect the parallax due to *JWST* being at the Lagrange point 2 which introduces parallax errors of less than 1%, or typically ~ 1 mas at the distance of our targets.

The initial position measurements of all sources including the brown dwarfs (RA_ICRS, DE_ICRS) come from the catalogue produced by the default DMS level 3 product on the stacked frame. We downloaded the most recent version of the catalogues found on MAST, based on the calibration software version 1.15.1. In each field, the astrometry is then anchored on available Gaia DR2 sources (from 3 to 100), taking proper motion and parallax into account. Experimentations with 4 targets having more than 40 Gaia stars in the NIRCcam field of view show that, after applying an offset in right ascension and declination, residuals appear unstructured with no obvious rotation or scale pattern. Also, for about half our targets, there is insufficient Gaia-measured stars (≤ 7) to confidently constrain the 4-parameter affine transformation (offsets, rotation, scale). Therefore, for the purpose of this astrometry check, anchoring only considers right ascension and declination offsets. Anchoring uncertainties range between 15 and 29 mas per axis, (See Table 3).

As our baseline model for the brown dwarf astrometry, we adopt the Kirkpatrick et al. (2021, hereafter K21 in the text and figures) proper motion and parallax. In the case of WISE-1446, we adopt the more precise parallax and proper motion measurements of Marocco et al. (in prep.). These models include an epoch of reference, t_0 , and corresponding celestial positions, α_{ICRS} , δ_{ICRS} at t_0 . To check predictions of the model, we propagate the target position to the epoch of our *JWST* observation and compare it with our measured position. The propagated position uncertainties are obtained by performing a Monte Carlo simulation using 1000 trials. The uncertainty of each model parameter (parallax, proper motion, t_0 , α_{ICRS} and δ_{ICRS}) is assumed to be a gaussian distribution centered on the parameter value. For all but one brown dwarf, WISE-2354, we confirm that the position of the target in the *JWST* images agrees with predicted positions within 2σ . The disagreement for WISE-2354 is at the 2.8σ level. That is too small to impact future *JWST* follow ups as, in absolute term, the error is well under 100 mas or roughly one NIRCcam long-wave pixel.

In general, the propagated model uncertainties at the epoch of our *JWST* observation (2022) are very small (4 to 12 mas per axis). However, the K21 model for two brown dwarfs, WISE-0830 and WISE-1446, has a large total uncertainty of ≥ 350 mas. In the case of WISE-0830, we decided to update the model because even a single *JWST* measurement offered the opportunity to

improve its precision, especially as the *JWST* measurement happened to sample a parallax peak. We ran the existing tool described in Kirkpatrick et al. (2019, 2021) by combining this measurement to the existing suite of Spitzer and WISE measurements already available. The *JWST* spacecraft barycentric (XYZ) position was considered in our calculations. Results are presented in Table 4. The new parallax places WISE-0830 at a distance of $10.1_{-0.6}^{+0.7}$ pc, about 10% closer than previously thought ($11.0_{-1.5}^{+2.0}$ pc). For WISE-1446, we were able to test a recent and more precise astrometry model (Marocco et al. in prep.) which shows a better agreement with our observation and has an improved precision of ≤ 100 mas.

5. BROWN DWARF COLORS

Figure 1 shows a color magnitude diagram with the new data presented here as black filled circles. Our homogeneous *JWST* photometry confirms the large intrinsic scatter (~ 1 mag) previously seen for Y dwarfs in color-magnitude diagrams (e.g. Kirkpatrick et al. 2021; Leggett et al. 2021), which excludes measurement noise or filter transformations as an explanation.

Other filled circles in Figure 1 represent F150W and F480M colors synthesized from spectra by Beiler et al. (2024, their Tables 7 and 9), using NIRCcam bandpasses. The symbol color indicates the T_{eff} value determined by Beiler et al. (2024) via bolometric luminosities determined from empirical SEDs built with MIRI and NIRSpec spectra. Colored rings around black points indicate the Beiler et al. (2024) T_{eff} values for those sources. The empirical Beiler et al. (2024) T_{eff} range for each symbol color is indicated along the right axis of the top left panel.

5.1. Comparison to Models

We compare the photometry to synthetic photometry calculated by four cool brown dwarf models, each based on different atmosphere prescriptions. As a baseline model, the Sonora Bobcat models assume equilibrium chemistry (Marley et al. 2021). But, given the evidence for out-of-equilibrium chemistry in the atmosphere of ultracool dwarfs, the Sonora Elf Owl models include disequilibrium chemistry (Mukherjee et al. 2024), the ATMO2020++ models use disequilibrium chemistry and introduce adjustments to the adiabat profile (Leggett & Tremblin 2023), while Lacy & Burrows (2023) introduce water clouds in their disequilibrium models because the atmospheres of the coldest Y dwarfs, those with $T_{\text{eff}} \lesssim 400$ K, are cold enough for water to condense (e.g. Morley et al. 2014). We note that the Sonora




Figure 1. F480M vs. F150W–F480M color-magnitude diagrams. Black circles represent new measurements presented here. Colored dots are synthesized colors from Beiler et al. (2024) where the symbol color indicates T_{eff} , determined by Beiler et al. from luminosity measurements. Colored rings similarly indicate T_{eff} ; the symbol color for a given T_{eff} range is indicated along the right axis of the top left panel. The warmest and coldest objects in our sample, the WISE-0336 binary system, and outliers, are identified in the top left panel. The other panels compare the data to various model sequences; surface gravity and metallicity properties are indicated by line type as shown in the legend in the top right panel. Sequences in the top right panel are from disequilibrium chemistry and adiabat-adjusted ATMO2020++ models (Leggett et al. 2021; Meisner et al. 2023). The middle panels show Sonora sequences, equilibrium-chemistry Bobcat on the left (Marley et al. 2021), and on the right disequilibrium chemistry Elf Owl (Mukherjee et al. 2024). The bottom panels show disequilibrium chemistry models from Lacy & Burrows (2023) with and without water clouds. Model T_{eff} values are indicated along the right axes and plus symbols along the model sequences indicate colors at those T_{eff} . For the Elf Owl panel the outer axis T_{eff} values refer to the metal-poor sequence and the inner values to the solar metallicity sequences; for the other models the M_{480M} values are more similar across the metallicity range.

Cholla (Karalidi et al. 2021) and Diamondback (Morley et al. 2024) models do not include atmospheres as cold as those of the Y dwarfs.

All model sequences in Figure 1 are cloud-free except for the Lacy & Burrows (2023) sequence shown in the bottom right panel. Solar and sub-solar metallicities are included. Surface gravities of $\log g = 4.0 \text{ cm s}^{-2}$ and 4.5 cm s^{-2} are shown. From evolutionary models we estimate that field dwarfs with ages of 2 to 4 Gyr have $\log g \approx 4.5 \text{ cm s}^{-2}$ for $325 \lesssim T_{\text{eff}} \text{ K} \lesssim 550$ and $\log g \approx 4.0 \text{ cm s}^{-2}$ for $200 \lesssim T_{\text{eff}} \text{ K} \lesssim 325$ (Marley et al. 2021). Model sequences’ line types indicate metallicity and gravity, as shown in the legend in the top right panel.

Figure 1 indicates that the ATMO2020++ (Phillips et al. 2020; Leggett et al. 2021; Meisner et al. 2023; Leggett & Tremblin 2024a) and the Lacy & Burrows (2023) models reproduce the observed colors better than the Sonora Bobcat or Elf Owl models (Marley et al. 2021; Mukherjee et al. 2024). The T_{eff} values from the ATMO2020++ and the Lacy & Burrows (2023) models are also in good agreement with the values measured by Beiler et al. (2024) from the observed luminosities, while the Bobcat and Elf Owl models are not.

For brown dwarfs warmer than 350 K, the Sonora Bobcat F150W – F480M colors appear to be too red, while the Elf Owl colors appear to be too blue (assuming that this local sample of brown dwarfs is not unusually metal-poor). The likely cause of the red Bobcat color is the exclusion of disequilibrium chemistry, which increases the abundance of CO and CO₂ (e.g. Zahnle & Marley 2014) which absorb light at $\lambda \approx 4.7 \mu\text{m}$ and $4.2 \mu\text{m}$ respectively (e.g. Tu et al. 2024, their Figure 5), thereby decreasing the F480M flux. The likely cause of the blue Elf Owl color is an excess of near-infrared flux at F150W; it seems that standard radiative-convective atmospheres for cold brown dwarfs produce an excess of energy in the near-infrared (e.g. Leggett et al. 2017, 2021; Karalidi et al. 2021), which is the issue that the ATMO2020++ models address empirically by changing the pressure-temperature profile such that the deeper regions, where the near-infrared energy emerges, is colder. Although empirical, the adjustment is physically motivated by thermal changes due to rapid rotation and/or chemical changes in the deep layers due to condensation (e.g. Leggett et al. 2021; Leggett & Tremblin 2024a).

The ATMO2020++ sequence does appear to show a systematic offset in color. This may be partly due to the definition of the F150W bandpass. For cold brown dwarfs the signal through this filter comes only from the narrow *H*-band flux peak at the extreme red of the

bandpass. Hence the color is sensitive to the definition of the red cut-off of the filter.

The ATMO2020++ and the Lacy & Burrows (2023) models calculate that the F480M absolute magnitude is a good indicator of T_{eff} for 275 K to 600 K brown dwarfs because of its relatively small dependence on metallicity and gravity ($\Delta M_{\text{F480M}} \sim 0.3 \text{ mag}$ for $\Delta \log g$ or $\Delta [\text{m}/\text{H}] \sim 0.5 \text{ dex}$) — compare the *y*-axis locations of the plus symbols in Figure 1. On the other hand, these models calculate that the F150W – F480M color is sensitive to both gravity and metallicity

($\Delta(\text{F150W} - \text{F480M}) \sim 1.0 \text{ mag}$ for $\Delta \log g$ or $\Delta [\text{m}/\text{H}] \sim 0.5 \text{ dex}$) — compare the *x*-axis locations of the plus symbols in Figure 1.

5.2. Superluminous or Very Red Brown Dwarfs

WISE-0535 and WISE-1828 appear to be superluminous and/or redder than the other dwarfs in Figure 1. WISE-0830 may be a colder example of this group. We discuss each of these brown dwarfs individually below, in RA order.

A preliminary analysis of the spectral distribution of WISE-0535 using ATMO2020++ synthetic spectra by Leggett & Tremblin (2024b) indicates that its superluminosity is due to multiplicity. We address this further in our companion paper Vandal et al. in prep.

This work and Matuszewska et al. (in prep.) present the first near-infrared detection of the cold brown dwarf WISE-0830. Its location in Figure 1 suggests that it is a typical field dwarf with $T_{\text{eff}} \approx 350 \text{ K}$. However WISE-0830 may be superluminous, depending on the, currently poorly-defined, color-magnitude trend for the coldest objects. Superluminosity suggests lower metallicity, higher gravity (older age), or multiplicity. WISE-0830 has the highest tangential velocity in our sample (108 km s^{-1} , Bardalez Gagliuffi et al. 2020) possibly supporting an older age and lower metallicity for this Y dwarf, compared to typical field dwarfs.

The extreme colors of WISE-1828 may indicate that it is multiple, has a high gravity, or is metal-poor. Recent studies using *JWST* imaging data find no evidence of a companion at separations $> 0.5 \text{ au}$ (De Furio et al. 2023). Recent spectral analyses of *JWST* NIRSpec and MIRI data by Lew et al. (2024) and (Barrado et al. 2023) find that the metallicity is approximately solar, and that the luminosity is consistent with evolutionary models if the system is a tight binary — an order-of-magnitude estimate by Lew et al. (2024), based on the radial velocity, suggests a separation of 20 Jupiter radii. Leggett & Tremblin (2024a) find a good fit to the *JWST* NIRSpec and MIRI data with ATMO2020++ solar metallicity models if the system is an equal-mass binary with

unusually high gravity i.e. a relatively massive and old system.

5.3. *A Blue Candidate Very Young Jupiter-Mass Brown Dwarf*

CWISEP J104756.81+545741.6 (hereafter WISE-1047, identified as “1047” in Figure 1) is not in our imaging sample, but is in the spectroscopic sample of Beiler et al. (2024), who synthesize *JWST* colors. Beiler et al. (2024) also provide a trigonometric parallax measurement for WISE-1047, whose discovery is presented in Meisner et al. (2020). Beiler et al. (2024) measure a parallax of 68.1 ± 4.9 mas, and calculate apparent magnitudes from their spectra of $F150W = 22.10$ and $F480M = 16.33$; the NIRSpec absolute calibration uncertainty is estimated to be less than 3% or 0.03 mag.

Figure 1 shows that WISE-1047 is blue or subliminous. Tu et al. (2024) point out that the *JWST* spectra for this Y dwarf shows unusually strong CO₂ and CO absorption (see their Figure 4). Atmospheric models calculate that decreasing gravity results in increasing CO and CO₂ absorption and that these features are less sensitive to changes in metallicity (Karalidi et al. 2021; Lacy & Burrows 2023; Leggett & Tremblin 2024a). The bandpass of the F480M filter directly samples the CO absorption, making it a useful indicator of the strength of this feature, an effect which could be masked by a broader filter.

Figure 1 suggests $\log g \ll 4.0$ and $T_{\text{eff}} \approx 400$ K for WISE-1047. Evolutionary models (e.g. Marley et al. 2021) then suggest a mass less than 3 Jupiter-masses and an age less than 0.2 Gyr for this Y dwarf. Taking the proper motion for this source from Kirkpatrick et al. (2021) and the parallax from Beiler et al. (2024), the BANYAN Σ tool (Gagné et al. 2018) calculates a 52% likelihood that WISE-1047 is a member of the Argus association, which has an age of ~ 40 Myr (Zuckerman 2018). If this brown dwarf is indeed this young, then its mass is only 1 Jupiter-mass and $\log g \approx 3.3$. Further improvement to the distance measurement, and a radial velocity measurement, would be useful for this object.

5.4. *The Coldest Brown Dwarfs and Water Clouds*

Water clouds are first expected to impact the photosphere when brown dwarfs cool to $T_{\text{eff}} \sim 350$ K (e.g. Burrows et al. 2003; Morley et al. 2014; Lacy & Burrows 2023). The Lacy & Burrows (2023) disequilibrium chemistry sequences shown in Figure 1 are for clear atmospheres and for atmospheres with thin water clouds at pressures of 0.4 bar with particle size of $10 \mu\text{m}$ (E10-type). The addition of clouds makes F150W brighter

and F480M fainter (Lacy & Burrows 2023), resulting in the bluer F150W – F480M colors seen in Figure 1.

The coldest objects in our sample are WISE-0336B and WISE-0855, with $T_{\text{eff}} \lesssim 300$ K. The WISE-0336 binary components are separated by $0''.09$ or 1 au (Calissendorff et al. 2023). The reanalysis of the photometry for the system presented here produces colors within 0.07 magnitudes of the Calissendorff et al. (2023) values. Figure 1 suggests that WISE-0336A is a typical field Y dwarf with T_{eff} between 400 K and 450 K, and that WISE-0336B is slightly warmer than WISE-0855 but colder than the other Y dwarfs in the sample, with T_{eff} between 275 K and 300 K. If the system has an age of ~ 2 Gyr (e.g. Best et al. 2024), then the component masses are approximately 12 and 5 Jupiter-masses (Marley et al. 2021).

Interestingly, WISE-0336B is significantly bluer than WISE-0855. Given that WISE-0336A appears to have a gravity and metallicity typical of the field, the bluer color for 0336B is unlikely to be due to an unusually low gravity or high metallicity. Instead, the Lacy & Burrows (2023) models suggest the difference is either that the atmosphere of WISE-0336B is cloudy and that of WISE-0855 is clear, or that WISE-0855 is cloudy but has a significantly higher gravity and/or lower metallicity than WISE-0336B. Recent analyses of *JWST* data for WISE-0855 support the former scenario, as Kühnle et al. (2024) find no evidence of water clouds, and the metallicity and gravity appears typical of the field (Luhman et al. 2024; Kühnle et al. 2024). The detection of water clouds may also be dependent on the surface gravity of the brown dwarf or on the viewing angle: observations of L dwarfs suggest that the vertical extent of the water clouds is dependent on gravity (Suárez et al. 2023; Suárez & Metchev 2023), and the structured nature of surface storms and clouds results in colors being dependent on viewing angle (Vos et al. 2017).

6. CONCLUSIONS

We share one of the first homogeneous photometric datasets of Y-type brown dwarfs observed with *JWST*. The sample consists of 20 Y dwarfs observed with NIRCam in F150W and F480M, simultaneously, and 3 Y dwarfs observed with NIRISS in F480M. We present an F480M vs. F150W – F480M color-magnitude diagram which confirms that Y dwarfs have a large, ~ 1 mag, scatter at a given *near-infrared* – $5 \mu\text{m}$ color, as noted in previous studies.

Of the different atmosphere models (Sonora Bobcat, Sonora Elf Owl, ATMO2020++ and Lacy & Burrows), ATMO2020++ and Lacy & Burrows best reproduce the

colors of the 350 K – 500 K Y dwarfs overall, while the Cloudy and Clear Lacy & Burrows models reproduce the colors of the 300 K objects best. Both cloudy and clear atmospheres seem to be required to explain the observed colors of the coldest Y dwarfs.

We provide a photometry update for the Y+Y binary brown dwarf, WISE-0336A/B, and find that only the Cloudy Lacy & Burrows model reproduces the colors of the faint secondary WISE-0336B. WISE-0336B appears to be a cloudy version of WISE-0855, with $T_{\text{eff}} \lesssim 300$ K.

We jointly present here and in Matuszewska et al. (in prep.) the first near-infrared detection of WISE-0830 and confirm its extremely red F150W – F480M color (Figure 1, top left panel). The red color may be an indication of low metallicity and/or high gravity (i.e. and older-than-average age) for this high-velocity Y dwarf.

The F480M filter is particularly sensitive to the CO absorption band at $\lambda \approx 4.7 \mu\text{m}$. We find that one of the 400 K Y dwarfs in the Beiler et al. (2024) sample, WISE-1047, is unusually blue in F150W – F480M, and Tu et al. (2024) notes that the spectrum of this brown dwarf has unusually strong CO (and CO₂) absorption. This spectral signature is indicative of low gravity according to atmospheric models, and the BANYAN Σ tool (Gagné et al. 2018) calculates a 52% likelihood that WISE-1047 is a member of the ~ 40 Myr-old Argus association; evolutionary models then imply that the object is extremely low-mass, only ~ 1 Jupiter-mass.

Finally, the astrometry at the *JWST* observation epoch is measured and we find agreement within 2σ with the proper motion and parallax models of Kirkpatrick et al. (2021) and Marocco et al. (in prep.), apart from one target, WISE-2354. The 2.8σ disagreement for WISE-2354 is nevertheless smaller than a NIRCcam long-wave pixel. We updated the astrometry model of WISE-0830 by folding in our NIRCcam measurement to reduce its parallax uncertainty by a factor of 2. This now puts WISE-0830 at a slightly smaller distance than previously measured of $10.1^{+0.7}_{-0.6}$ pc.

L.A. acknowledges support from the Canadian Space Agency funding program # 22JWGO1-11. M.R.M., P.C., D.C.B.G., C.A.B., A.J.B., and J.A.G. gratefully acknowledge support through NASA grant Grant # JWST-GO-02473.002-A. M.D.F. is supported by an NSF Astronomy and Astrophysics Postdoctoral Fellowship under award AST-2303911. T.R. would like to acknowledge support from NASA through the JWST NIRCam project through contract number NAS5-02105 (M. Rieke, University of Arizona, PI). CF acknowledges support from the Trottier Family Foundation and the Trottier Institute for Research on Exoplanets through her Trottier Postdoctoral Fellowship. Part of the work by C.A.B. was carried out at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under a contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (80NM0018D0004). This work was authored by A.Z.G. of Caltech/IPAC under Contract No. 80GSFC21R0032 with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This research made use of Photutils, an Astropy package for detection and photometry of astronomical sources (Bradley et al. 2023).

REFERENCES

- Bardalez Gagliuffi, D. C., Faherty, J. K., Schneider, A. C., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 895, 145, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab8d25](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab8d25)
- Barrado, D., Mollière, P., Patapis, P., et al. 2023, *Nature*, 624, 263, doi: [10.1038/s41586-023-06813-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06813-y)
- Beiler, S. A., Cushing, M. C., Kirkpatrick, J. D., et al. 2024, *ApJ*, 973, 107, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ad6301](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ad6301)
- Best, W. M. J., Sanghi, A., Liu, M. C., Magnier, E. A., & Dupuy, T. J. 2024, *ApJ*, 967, 115, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ad39ef](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ad39ef)
- Bowler, B. P., Blunt, S. C., & Nielsen, E. L. 2020, *AJ*, 159, 63, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ab5b11](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ab5b11)
- Bradley, L., Sipőcz, B., Robitaille, T., et al. 2023, *astropy/photutils: 1.8.0*, 1.8.0, Zenodo, doi: [10.5281/zenodo.7946442](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7946442)
- Burrows, A., Hubbard, W. B., Lunine, J. I., & Liebert, J. 2001, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 73, 719, doi: [10.1103/RevModPhys.73.719](https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.73.719)
- Burrows, A., Sudarsky, D., & Lunine, J. I. 2003, *ApJ*, 596, 587, doi: [10.1086/377709](https://doi.org/10.1086/377709)
- Bushouse, H., Eisenhamer, J., Dencheva, N., et al. 2022, *JWST Calibration Pipeline, 1.8.2*, Zenodo, doi: [10.5281/zenodo.7325378](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7325378)
- Calissendorff, P., De Furio, M., Meyer, M., et al. 2023, *ApJL*, 947, L30, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/acc86d](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/acc86d)
- Ceau, A., Mary, D., Greenbaum, A., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 630, A120, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201935247](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201935247)
- Cushing, M. C., Kirkpatrick, J. D., Gelino, C. R., et al. 2011, *ApJ*, 743, 50, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/743/1/50](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/743/1/50)
- Cushing, M. C., Schneider, A. C., Kirkpatrick, J. D., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 920, 20, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac12cb](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac12cb)
- De Furio, M., Lew, B., Beichman, C., et al. 2023, *ApJ*, 948, 92, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/acbf1e](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/acbf1e)
- Fontanive, C., Bedin, L. R., De Furio, M., et al. 2023, *MNRAS*, 526, 1783, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stad2870](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stad2870)
- Gagné, J., Mamajek, E. E., Malo, L., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 856, 23, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aaae09](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaae09)
- Griffith, R. L., Kirkpatrick, J. D., Eisenhardt, P. R. M., et al. 2012, *AJ*, 144, 148, doi: [10.1088/0004-6256/144/5/148](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/144/5/148)
- Kammerer, J., Cooper, R. A., Vandal, T., et al. 2023, *PASP*, 135, 014502, doi: [10.1088/1538-3873/ac9a74](https://doi.org/10.1088/1538-3873/ac9a74)
- Karalidi, T., Marley, M., Fortney, J. J., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 923, 269, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac3140](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac3140)
- Kirkpatrick, J. D., Cushing, M. C., Gelino, C. R., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 776, 128, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/776/2/128](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/776/2/128)
- Kirkpatrick, J. D., Gelino, C. R., Cushing, M. C., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 753, 156, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/753/2/156](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/753/2/156)
- Kirkpatrick, J. D., Martin, E. C., Smart, R. L., et al. 2019, *ApJS*, 240, 19, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/aaf6af](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/aaf6af)
- Kirkpatrick, J. D., Gelino, C. R., Faherty, J. K., et al. 2021, *ApJS*, 253, 7, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/abd107](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/abd107)
- Kirkpatrick, J. D., Marocco, F., Gelino, C. R., et al. 2024, *ApJS*, 271, 55, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/ad24e2](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/ad24e2)
- Kühnle, H., Patapis, P., Mollière, P., et al. 2024, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2410.10933, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2410.10933](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.10933)
- Lacy, B., & Burrows, A. 2023, *ApJ*, 950, 8, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/acc8cb](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/acc8cb)
- Leggett, S. K., & Tremblin, P. 2023, *ApJ*, 959, 86, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/acfdad](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/acfdad)
- . 2024a, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2411.03549, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2411.03549](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2411.03549)
- . 2024b, *Research Notes of the American Astronomical Society*, 8, 13, doi: [10.3847/2515-5172/ad1b61](https://doi.org/10.3847/2515-5172/ad1b61)
- Leggett, S. K., Tremblin, P., Esplin, T. L., Luhman, K. L., & Morley, C. V. 2017, *ApJ*, 842, 118, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa6fb5](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa6fb5)
- Leggett, S. K., Tremblin, P., Phillips, M. W., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 918, 11, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac0cfe](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac0cfe)
- Lew, B. W. P., Roellig, T., Batalha, N. E., et al. 2024, *AJ*, 167, 237, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ad3425](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ad3425)
- Lucas, P. W., Tinney, C. G., Burningham, B., et al. 2010, *MNRAS*, 408, L56, doi: [10.1111/j.1745-3933.2010.00927.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3933.2010.00927.x)
- Luhman, K. L. 2014, *ApJL*, 786, L18, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/786/2/L18](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/786/2/L18)
- Luhman, K. L., Tremblin, P., Alves de Oliveira, C., et al. 2024, *AJ*, 167, 5, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ad0b72](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ad0b72)
- Marley, M. S., Saumon, D., Visscher, C., et al. 2021, *ApJ*, 920, 85, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac141d](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac141d)
- Marocco, F., Kirkpatrick, J. D., Meisner, A. M., et al. 2020, *ApJL*, 888, L19, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab6201](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab6201)
- Marocco, F., Eisenhardt, P. R. M., Fowler, J. W., et al. 2021, *ApJS*, 253, 8, doi: [10.3847/1538-4365/abd805](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4365/abd805)
- Martinache, F. 2010, *ApJ*, 724, 464, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/724/1/464](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/724/1/464)
- Meisner, A. M., Leggett, S. K., Logsdon, S. E., et al. 2023, *AJ*, 166, 57, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/acdb68](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/acdb68)
- Meisner, A. M., Caselden, D., Kirkpatrick, J. D., et al. 2020, *ApJ*, 889, 74, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab6215](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab6215)
- Morley, C. V., Marley, M. S., Fortney, J. J., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 787, 78, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/787/1/78](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/787/1/78)
- Morley, C. V., Mukherjee, S., Marley, M. S., et al. 2024, *ApJ*, 975, 59, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ad71d5](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ad71d5)
- Mukherjee, S., Fortney, J. J., Morley, C. V., et al. 2024, *ApJ*, 963, 73, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ad18c2](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ad18c2)

- Phillips, M. W., Tremblin, P., Baraffe, I., et al. 2020, *A&A*, 637, A38, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201937381](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201937381)
- Pinfield, D. J., Gromadzki, M., Leggett, S. K., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 444, 1931, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stu1540](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu1540)
- Rieke, M. J., Kelly, D. M., Misselt, K., et al. 2023, *PASP*, 135, 028001, doi: [10.1088/1538-3873/acac53](https://doi.org/10.1088/1538-3873/acac53)
- Schneider, A. C., Cushing, M. C., Kirkpatrick, J. D., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 804, 92, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/804/2/92](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/804/2/92)
- Showman, A. P., Tan, X., & Zhang, X. 2019, *ApJ*, 883, 4, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab384a](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab384a)
- Suárez, G., & Metchev, S. 2023, *MNRAS*, 523, 4739, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stad1711](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stad1711)
- Suárez, G., Vos, J. M., Metchev, S., Faherty, J. K., & Cruz, K. 2023, *ApJL*, 954, L6, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/acec4b](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/acec4b)
- Tinney, C. G., Faherty, J. K., Kirkpatrick, J. D., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 796, 39, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/796/1/39](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/796/1/39)
- Tu, Z., Wang, S., & Liu, J. 2024, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 976, 82, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ad815a](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ad815a)
- Vos, J. M., Allers, K. N., & Biller, B. A. 2017, *ApJ*, 842, 78, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa73cf](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa73cf)
- Zahnle, K. J., & Marley, M. S. 2014, *ApJ*, 797, 41, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/797/1/41](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/797/1/41)
- Zuckerman, B. 2018, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 870, 27, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aace66](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aace66)