

CHASING TAILS: ACTIVE ASTEROID, CENTAUR, AND
QUASI-HILDA DISCOVERY WITH ASTROINFORMATICS AND CITIZEN SCIENCE

By Colin Orion Chandler

A Dissertation
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Astronomy and Planetary Science

Northern Arizona University

August 2022

Approved:
Chadwick Aaron Trujillo, Ph.D., Chair
Jonathan G. Fortney, Ph.D.
Michael Gowanlock, Ph.D.
Henry H. Hsieh, Ph.D.
Tyler D. Robinson, Ph.D.
David E. Trilling, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

CHASING TAILS: ACTIVE ASTEROID, CENTAUR, AND QUASI-HILDA DISCOVERY WITH ASTROINFORMATICS AND CITIZEN SCIENCE

COLIN ORION CHANDLER

The discovery of activity emanating from asteroid (4015) Wilson-Harrington in 1950 (Harris, 1950) prompted astronomers to realize that comet-like activity, such as comae and tails, is not limited to comets. Fewer than 30 of these “active asteroids” have been discovered (Chandler et al., 2018) in the last 70 years, yet they promise to hold clues about fundamental physical and chemical processes at play in our solar system (Jewitt, 2012; Hsieh et al., 2015a). Activity is attributed to sublimation for roughly half of these objects, highlighting asteroids as a “volatile reservoir.” In this context a volatile reservoir is any dynamical group of bodies in the solar system that is known to harbor volatiles. Understanding the past and present volatile distribution in the solar system has broad implications ranging from informing future space exploration programs to helping us understand how planetary systems form with volatiles prerequisite to life as we know it, especially water. Notably, the origin of Earth’s water is essentially unknown, although it is now believed that asteroids account for at least some of the terrestrial volatile budget (Alexander, 2017).

A second volatile reservoir came to light following the 1977 discovery of Centaur (2060) Chiron (Kowal & Gehrels, 1977). Centaurs, found between the orbits of Jupiter and Neptune, are thought to be icy objects originating from the Kuiper Belt, a circumstellar region between the orbit of Neptune (30 au) and about 50 au from the Sun (Jewitt, 2009). The Kuiper Belt is roughly 200 times more massive than the Asteroid Belt. Nevertheless, active Centaurs are also rare, with fewer than 20 discovered to date (Chandler et al., 2020).

We set out to increase the number of known active objects in order to (1) enable the study of these active objects as populations, and (2) search for new volatile reservoirs. I proposed to the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program (GRFP) to create a Citizen Science project designed to carry out an outreach program while searching through millions of images of known asteroids in order to find previously unknown active objects. My proposal was selected for funding, and on 31 August 2022 we successfully launched *Active Asteroids* (<http://activeasteroids.net>), a NASA Partner, and discoveries have been abundant ever since.

In this dissertation I present (1) Hunting for Activity in Repositories with Vetting-Enhanced Search Techniques (HARVEST), a pipeline that extracts images of known solar system objects for presentation to Citizen Scientists, (2) our proof-of-concept demonstrating Dark Energy Camera (DECam) images are well-

suited for activity detection (Chandler et al., 2018), (3) how we discovered a potential new recurrent activity mechanism (Chandler et al., 2019), (4) a Centaur activity discovery plus a novel technique for estimating which species are sublimating (Chandler et al., 2020), (5) how our discovery of an additional activity epoch for an active asteroid enabled us to classify the object as a member of the Main-belt Comet (MBC) (Chandler et al., 2021b), a rare (< 10) active asteroid subset that orbits in the Asteroid Belt that is known for sublimation-driven activity, (6) a dynamical pathway that can explain the presence of some of the active asteroids, and (7) the Citizen Science project *Active Asteroids*, including initial results.

Copyright

1.1 Published Works

The following copyright statements apply to each respective published manuscript.

Chapter 4 – Manuscript I

Searching Asteroids for Activity Revealing Indicators (SAFARI) (Chandler et al., 2018):

This is the Accepted Manuscript version of an article accepted for publication in Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific. IOP Publishing Ltd is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it. The Version of Record is available online at <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1538-3873/aad03d>.

Chapter 5 – Manuscript II

Six Years of Sustained Activity from Active Asteroid (6478) Gault (Chandler et al., 2019)

This is the Accepted Manuscript version of an article accepted for publication in Astrophysical Journal Letters. IOP Publishing Ltd is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it. The Version of Record is available online at <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.3847/2041-8213/ab1aaa>.

Chapter 6 – Manuscript III

Cometary Activity Discovered on a Distant Centaur: A Nonaqueous Sublimation Mechanism (Chandler et al., 2020)

This is the Accepted Manuscript version of an article accepted for publication in Astrophysical Journal Letters. IOP Publishing Ltd is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it. The Version of Record is available online at <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.3847/2041-8213/ab7dc6>.

Chapter 7 – Manuscript IV

Recurrent Activity from Active Asteroid (248370) 2005 QN173: A Main-belt Comet (Chandler et al., 2021c)

This is the Accepted Manuscript version of an article accepted for publication in Astrophysical Journal Letters. IOP Publishing Ltd is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it. The Version of Record is available online at <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.3847/2041-8213/ac365b>.

1.2 Unpublished Works

The remaining chapters will be submitted to the American Astronomical Society journals for publication as soon as possible:

Chapter 8 – Manuscript V

Active Asteroid Origin Insights from Transition Object (323137) 2003 BM80

Acknowledgements

Note: Manuscript-specific acknowledgements are found at the end of each corresponding chapter.

1.3 In Memoriam

In memoriam Jean E. Buethe (Flagstaff, Arizona), Nadine G. Barlow (Northern Arizona University), Adam P. Showman (University of Arizona) and Kazuo Kinoshita (Japan), all of whom encouraged and influenced my work.

1.4 Indigenous Land Acknowledgement

Virtually all of the work described in this dissertation took place on lands important to indigenous cultures, but which has overwhelmingly been stolen from them. Here is an incomplete list of communities impacted in places where I have done work for this dissertation. **You can help by supporting organizations such as the Southwest Indian Relief Council** (<http://www.nativepartnership.org>) <https://www.yakama.com> (<https://engage.collegefund.org>).

The Northern Arizona University (NAU) Mountain Campus is in Flagstaff, Arizona at the base of the San Francisco Peaks. This area is home to many peoples, including the Havasupai Tribe¹, Hopi Tribe², Hualapai Tribe³, Kaibab Band of Paiutes⁴, the Navajo Nation⁵, the San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe⁶. I have traveled through areas of the Zuni Tribe⁷ and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe⁸. I have observed at Mount Graham International Observatory (MGIO), a mountain stolen from the San Carlos Apache⁹ and sacred to others, including the White Mountains Apache Tribe¹⁰. I have traveled through and/or attended conferences and workshops on land in Arizona taken from the Tohono O'Odham Nation¹¹, Gila River Indian

¹<https://theofficialhavasupaitribe.com>

²<https://www.hopi-nsn.gov>

³<https://hualapai-nsn.gov>

⁴<https://kaibabpaiute-nsn.gov>

⁵<https://www.navajo-nsn.gov>

⁶<https://www.sanjuanpaiute-nsn.gov>

⁷<https://www.ashiwi.org>

⁸<https://www.ypit.com>

⁹<http://www.sancarlosapache.com/home.htm>

¹⁰<http://www.wmat.us/>

¹¹<http://www.tonation-nsn.gov/>

Community¹² and undoubtedly many others. Agencies that have provided me with funding also benefit directly and indirectly from ceded lands, such as those of the Yakama Nation¹³.

1.5 Individuals and Groups

I thank my partner, Dr. Mark Jesus Mendoza Magbanua (University of California San Francisco), for his frequent feedback, critical insights, and constant encouragement. I thank my parents, Arthur and Jeanie Chandler, for their continued support that enabled my academic endeavors, and for having the foresight to give me “Orion” as a middle name. I also appreciate Corey and Atsuko, Charles and Van, and Julie and Praxis for their enthusiasm all along the way. Many thanks to my best friend, Robert Reich, for his continuous encouragement and compassion. Thanks also to Jerome, Rushmore and Ziggy Diaz for being great friends. Thanks to my former business partner and great friend Bill Bowker (Fog City Mac, LLC) for allowing me to move on and pursue my path in astronomy.

Many thanks to all of my committee members for guiding me through this entire process. A special thanks to Chad, David, and Ty, all of whom provided crucial guidance and support during my time at NAU. A special thank you to Prof. Cristina Thomas of NAU for including me in Double Asteroid Redirection Test (DART) work that helped me to become a better photometrist.

Many thanks to Dr. Annika L. Gustafsson of NAU, Lowell Observatory, and Southwestern Research Institute (SwRI), for countless hours together in classes, teaching, sharing world-class telescopes, attending conferences, and collaborating on research. Much appreciation goes to Aaron Weintraub of NAU for being the best of friends and a supportive colleague from start to finish of this work. Thanks to both for encouraging me to go “all in” on my National Science Foundation (NSF) GRFP. I am eternally grateful for James D. Windsor of NAU for great times, helping me balance my life again through cycling and, along with his wife Cheyann, for literally saving my life.

Many, many thanks to Will Oldroyd for collaborating on papers, proposals, observing, hosting workshops, attending conferences, cooking, praying, and catching mice. A very special thanks to Jay Kueny (Steward Observatory, University of Arizona) for his commitment to the Citizen Science project and all that you taught me along the way. Thanks also for stepping in to help observe at the last minute on more than one occasion and at more than one observatory. Thanks also to Will Burris of San Diego State University (SDSU) for your help with *Active Asteroids* classification analysis.

A special thank you to *Active Asteroids* forum Moderator Elisabeth Baeten (Belgium) who has greatly enhanced the success of our Citizen Science. Thank you also Cliff Johnson (Zooniverse) and Marc Kuchner

¹²<https://www.gilariver.org/>

¹³<https://www.yakama.com>

(NASA), both of whom provided invaluable insights into Citizen Science and encouraged this project to move forward.

Thank you to the Legacy Survey of Space and Time (LSST) community for welcoming me, especially Ranpall Gill (Rubin Observatory), Henry Hsieh (Planetary Science Institute), Meg Schwamb (Queen's University Belfast), Agata Rożek (University of Edinburgh), and Mario Jurić and Andrew Connolly of the Data Intensive Research in Astrophysics & Cosmology (DiRAC) Institute and University of Washington).

Thank you Nathan Smith and Lori Pigue for independently inspiring and fueling my interest in meteorites and minerals. Thank you Schuyler Borges (NAU) for helping me to become a better member of the community and inspiring me to continue advocating for diversity, equity and inclusivity. Thanks Tony and Catherine (NAU) for being great colleagues and for the fun times on the slopes and in the pool. Thank you Trevor Cotter (NAU, McGill University) for all the adventures and, especially, for introducing me to cross country skiing. Thanks to fellow NAU students Erin Aadland, Haylee Archer, Dan Avner, Lauren Biddle, Helen Eifert, Anna Engle, Oriel Humes, Joel Johnson, Ari Koeppel, David Kelly, Sarah Lamm, Audrey Martin, Lauren McGraw, Robyn Meier, Alissa Roegge, Raaman Nair, Kathryn Neugent, Garrett Thompson, and Mike Zeilinhofer for being supportive colleagues and classmates. A special thanks to Christian Joey Tai Udovicic for listening to my qualifying examination talk many times.

Thank you to my friends from the San Francisco State University (SFSU) Physics and Astronomy Club (PAC) for your encouragement, especially Daniel Steckhahn of University of Colorado Boulder (UCB), Ryan Rickards-Vaught of University of California San Diego (UCSD), Sarah Deveny of TTU, and Michelle Howard. Many thanks to SFSU faculty for their inspiration, especially Joseph Baranco, Adrienne Cool, Jeff Greensite, Ron Marzke, Weining Man, Chris McCarthy, and Barbara Neuhauser. Caroline Alcantra also helped me with all things administrative at SFSU and I am eternally grateful. Thank you Alan Fisk (SFSU) and the Disability Program Resource Center (DPRC) for your guidance and helping me succeed.

Thank you Phil Massey (Lowell Observatory) for teaching me to become a better astronomer. Thank you Will Grundy, Stephen Levine, Jenn Hanley, Michael West, Diedre Hunter, Jeff Hall, Nick Moskovitz, Audrey Thirouin, Joe Llama, Lisa Prato, Gerard van Belle, Amanda Bosch, and Dave Schleicher for welcoming me at Lowell and vastly improving my experience in astronomy.

Thank you to Guy Consolmagno, Rich Boyle, Paul Gabor, Gary Gray and Chris Johnson for all of your support at the Vatican Observatory. Many thanks to Jenny Power of MGIO for all the support with Large Binocular Telescope (LBT) observation planning and execution. Thanks to everyone at the LBT for accommodating us on-site on multiple occasions, especially Rick Hansen and David Huerta. A special thanks to all of the telescope operators at the Lowell Discovery Telescope (LDT) for all their help through the years. Thanks also to Matt Holman (Harvard) and Jerome Berthier (Institut de Mécanique Céleste et de Calcul des

Éphémérides (IMCCE)) for their support with the Minor Planet Center (MPC) and SkyBot, respectively.

Thank you to NAU Pres. Rita Cheng for supporting the Astronomy and Planetary Science Ph.D. program at NAU, the NAU–LDT partnership, and the Presidential Fellowship Program, all of which were essential to this work. Thank you Maribeth Watwood for overseeing this program and many others.

Thank you Ed Anderson (NAU), Lisa Chien (NAU), John Kistler (NAU), David Koerner (NAU), and Mark Salvatore (NAU) for helping me to become a better teacher. Thanks Anna Engle (NAU) for collaborating with teaching during the pandemic. Thanks to my many undergraduate teaching assistants, especially Anna Ross-Browning (University of Iowa) and Lisa Matrecito (NAU), for directly enabling me to be a better teacher. Thanks to all of my astronomy and physics students at NAU who all enriched my experience at NAU. Thanks to department administrators Elizabeth Massey, Judene McLane, and Alix Ford for all their help throughout my time at NAU. Thanks also to Lara Schmit (Merriam Powell Institute, NAU) for being a great neighbor during the pandemic and for all your advice in navigating NAU systems. The unparalleled support given by Monsoon high performance computing cluster administrator Christopher Coffey of NAU, as well as the High Performance Computing Support team, truly facilitate the scientific process throughout all of my work.

Thank you to Barry Lutz (NAU) for funding and supporting the Barry Lutz Telescope (BLT) which was part of my education as well as my teaching endeavors. Thank you Stephen Tegler (NAU) for your insights into Centaur colors and observational techniques, and Mark Loeffler (NAU) for encouraging me to question sources to their very beginnings and the value of astrochemistry. Thank you Christopher Edwards (NAU) for helping me better understand spectroscopy and advocating for me and my colleagues. Thanks also Chris Mann (NAU) for helping me better understand the optics behind the telescopes I rely upon. Thanks to Devon Burr and Josh Emery for all your encouragement and advocacy at NAU.

The Trilling Research Group at NAU has always been an invaluable resource for insights which substantially enhanced this work. A special thanks to members Annika Gustaffson (SwRI), Andy J López Oquendo (NAU), Ryder Sluss (NAU), Joey Chatelain of Los Cumbres Observatory (LCO), Samuel Navarro-Meza (University of Mexico, NAU), Daniel Kramer (NAU), Andrew McNeil (NAU), Maggie McAdam of Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy (SOFIA), Connor Auge (University of Hawaii), and Michael Mommert (NAU).

The HabLab research group (Ty Robinson) at NAU and University of Arizona (UA) is full of science and support. A special thanks to members Arnaud Salvadore, Amber Young, Megan Gialluca (University of Washington (UW)), Malik Bossett, Chris Wolfe, Patrick Tribbett, and Shih-Yun Tang.

Thank you Stephen Kane (University of California Riverside) for encouraging me to pursue my academic dreams and laying the foundation for successful research. Thank you Erik Mamajek (NASA Jet Propulsion

Laboratory (JPL))for invaluable advice that helps keep my focus on science goals. Thank you Michael Way (NASA Goddard), Brandon Cruickshank (NAU), Greg McGuffey, Kathy & John Eastwood, all of whom inspire balance between outdoor activity and other pursuits.

Thank you to Hannah Nuñez and Dr. Matt Wise of NAU for helping to keep me healthy during my time at NAU. Thanks also Fr. Matt Lowry and the NAU Catholic Jacks for providing a welcoming spiritual environment on campus.

1.6 Citizen Scientists

I wish to thank the following individuals for their efforts on the *Active Asteroids* project. These individuals represent our most active classifiers, classified thumbnail images included in this work, or both. A special thanks goes to our top classifier, Michele T. Mazzucato, FRAS (Sesto Fiorentino, Italy).

Thank you A. J. Raab (Seattle, USA), Alice Juzumas (São Paulo, Brazil), Angelina A. Reese (Sequim, USA), Arttu Sainio (Järvenpää, Finland), Bill Shaw (Fort William, Scotland), @Boeuz (Penzberg, Germany), Brenna Hamilton (DePere, USA), Brian K Bernal (Greeley, USA), Carl Groat (Okeechobee, USA), Clara Garza (West Covina, USA), C. J. A. Dukes (Oxford, United Kingdom), Dr. David Collinson (Mentone, Australia), Edmund Frank Perozzi (Glen Allen, USA), @EEZuidema (Driezum, Netherlands), Dr. Elisabeth Chaghafi (Tübingen, Germany), @graham_d (Hemel Hempstead, England), Ivan A. Terentev (Petrozavodsk, Russia), Juli Fowler (Albuquerque, USA), Leah Mulholland (Peoria, USA) M. M. Habram-Blanke (Heidelberg, Germany), Marvin W. Huddleston (Mesquite, USA), Michael Jason Pearson (Hattiesburg, USA), Milton K. D. Bosch, MD (Napa, USA), @mitch (Chilliwack, Canada), Patricia MacMillan (Fredericksburg, USA), Petyerák Jánosné (Fót, Hungary), R. Banfield (Bad Tölz, Germany), Scott Virtes (Escondido, USA), Sergey Y. Tumanov (Glazov, Russia), Stikhina Olga Sergeevna (Tyumen, Russia), Thorsten Eschweiler (Übach-Palenberg, Germany), Tiffany Shaw-Diaz (Dayton, USA), Timothy Scott (Baddeck, Canada), and Virgilio Gonano (Udine, Italy).

1.7 Funding

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under grant No. (2018258765). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. C.O.C., H.H.H. and C.A.T. also acknowledge support from the NASA Solar System Observations program (grant 80NSSC19K0869).

This work was supported in part by NSF awards 1461200, 1852478, and 1950901 (NAU REU program

in astronomy and planetary science).

1.8 General Acknowledgements

Computational analyses were run on Northern Arizona University’s Monsoon computing cluster, funded by Arizona’s Technology and Research Initiative Fund. This work was made possible in part through the State of Arizona Technology and Research Initiative Program. World Coordinate System (WCS) corrections facilitated by the *Astrometry.net* software suite (Lang et al., 2010).

This research has made use of data and/or services provided by the International Astronomical Union’s Minor Planet Center. This research has made use of NASA’s Astrophysics Data System. This research has made use of The Institut de Mécanique Céleste et de Calcul des Éphémérides (IMCCE) SkyBoT Virtual Observatory tool (Berthier et al., 2006). This work made use of the FTOOLS software package hosted by the NASA Goddard Flight Center High Energy Astrophysics Science Archive Research Center. This research has made use of SAOImageDS9, developed by Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (Joye, 2006). This work made use of the Lowell Observatory Asteroid Orbit Database *astorbDB* (Bowell et al., 1994; Moskovitz et al., 2021). This work made use of the *astropy* software package (Robitaille et al., 2013).

This project used data obtained with the Dark Energy Camera (DECam), which was constructed by the Dark Energy Survey (DES) collaboration. Funding for the DES Projects has been provided by the US Department of Energy, the US National Science Foundation, the Ministry of Science and Education of Spain, the Science and Technology Facilities Council of the United Kingdom, the Higher Education Funding Council for England, the National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics at the University of Chicago, Center for Cosmology and Astro-Particle Physics at the Ohio State University, the Mitchell Institute for Fundamental Physics and Astronomy at Texas A&M University, Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos, Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico and the Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Collaborating Institutions in the Dark Energy Survey. The Collaborating Institutions are Argonne National Laboratory, the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Cambridge, Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas, Medioambientales y Tecnológicas–Madrid, the University of Chicago, University College London, the DES-Brazil Consortium, the University of Edinburgh, the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH) Zürich, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Institut de Ciències de l’Espai (IEEC/CSIC), the Institut de Física d’Altes Energies, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München and the associated

Excellence Cluster Universe, the University of Michigan, NSF’s NOIRLab, the University of Nottingham, the Ohio State University, the OzDES Membership Consortium, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Portsmouth, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Stanford University, the University of Sussex, and Texas A&M University.

Based on observations at Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, NSF’s NOIRLab

(NOAO Prop. ID 2012B-0001, PI: Frieman; NOAO Prop. ID 2013A-0327, PI: Rest; NOAO Prop. ID 2013B-0453, PI: Sheppard; NOAO Prop. ID 2013B-0536, PI: Allen; NOAO Prop. ID 2014A-0303, PI: Sheppard; NOAO Prop. ID 2014A-0479; PI: Sheppard NOAO Prop. ID 2014B-0303, PI: Sheppard; NOAO Prop. ID 2014B-0404, PI: Schlegel; NOAO Prop. ID 2015A-0351, PI: Sheppard; NOAO Prop. ID 2015A-0620, PI: Bonaca; NOAO Prop. ID 2015B-0265, PI: Sheppard; NOAO Prop. ID 2016A-0190, PI: Dey; NOAO Prop. ID 2016A-0401, PI: Sheppard; NOAO Prop. ID 2016B-0288, PI: Sheppard; NOAO Prop. ID 2017A-0367, PI: Sheppard; NOAO Prop. ID 2017B-0307, PI: Sheppard; NOAO Prop. ID 2019A-0272, PI: Zenteno; NOAO Prop. ID 2019A-0305, PI: Drlica-Wagner; NOAO Prop. ID 2019A-0337, PI: Trilling; NOAO Prop. ID 2019B-0323, PI: Zenteno), which is managed by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA) under a cooperative agreement with the National Science Foundation.

This research has made use of the NASA/IPAC Infrared Science Archive, which is funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and operated by the California Institute of Technology.

The Legacy Surveys consist of three individual and complementary projects: the Dark Energy Camera Legacy Survey (DECaLS; Proposal ID #2014B-0404; PIs: David Schlegel and Arjun Dey), the Beijing-Arizona Sky Survey (BASS; NOAO Prop. ID #2015A-0801; PIs: Zhou Xu and Xiaohui Fan), and the Mayall z-band Legacy Survey (MzLS; Prop. ID #2016A-0453; PI: Arjun Dey). DECaLS, BASS and MzLS together include data obtained, respectively, at the Blanco telescope, Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, NSF’s NOIRLab; the Bok telescope, Steward Observatory, University of Arizona; and the Mayall telescope, Kitt Peak National Observatory, NOIRLab. The Legacy Surveys project is honored to be permitted to conduct astronomical research on Iolkam Du’ag (Kitt Peak), a mountain with particular significance to the Tohono O’odham Nation. BASS is a key project of the Telescope Access Program (TAP), which has been funded by the National Astronomical Observatories of China, the Chinese Academy of Sciences (the Strategic Priority Research Program “The Emergence of Cosmological Structures” Grant # XDB09000000), and the Special Fund for Astronomy from the Ministry of Finance. The BASS is also supported by the External Cooperation Program of Chinese Academy of Sciences (Grant # 114A11KYSB20160057), and Chinese National Natural Science Foundation (Grant # 11433005). The Legacy Survey team makes use of data products from the Near-Earth Object Wide-field Infrared Survey Explorer (NEOWISE), which is a project of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory/California Institute of Technology. NEOWISE is funded by the National Aeronautics and Space

Administration. The Legacy Surveys imaging of the DESI footprint is supported by the Director, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH1123, by the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center, a DOE Office of Science User Facility under the same contract; and by the U.S. National Science Foundation, Division of Astronomical Sciences under Contract No. AST-0950945 to NOAO.

These results made use of the Lowell Discovery Telescope (LDT) at Lowell Observatory. Lowell is a private, non-profit institution dedicated to astrophysical research and public appreciation of astronomy and operates the LDT in partnership with Boston University, the University of Maryland, the University of Toledo, Northern Arizona University and Yale University. The Large Monolithic Imager was built by Lowell Observatory using funds provided by the National Science Foundation (AST-1005313). NIHTS was funded by NASA award #NNX09AB54G through its Planetary Astronomy and Planetary Major Equipment programs.

Based in part on data collected at Subaru Telescope and obtained from the SMOKA, which is operated by the Astronomy Data Center, National Astronomical Observatory of Japan (Baba et al., 2002a).

Plots were primarily created using the Python tool `Matplotlib` (Hunter, 2007). Python mathematical and array operations were frequently executed using the Python `NumPy` tool (Harris et al., 2020). We made use of Pandas dataframes (McKinney, 2010; Reback et al., 2022). We made use of the `Rebound` dynamical simulator (Rein & Liu, 2012; Rein et al., 2019) with the `Mercury` (Chambers, 1999) and `IAS15` (Rein & Spiegel, 2015) integrators. We made use of the `SciPy` Python suite (Virtanen et al., 2020).

We used `TheLi3`¹⁴ (Schirmer, 2013) for some of our data reduction.

¹⁴<https://github.com/schirmermischa/THELI>

Contents

1	Abstract	ii
1.1	Published Works	v
1.2	Unpublished Works	v
1.3	In Memoriam	vii
1.4	Indigenous Land Acknowledgement	vii
1.5	Individuals and Groups	viii
1.6	Citizen Scientists	xi
1.7	Funding	xi
1.8	General Acknowledgements	xii
2	Introduction	1
2.1	Definitions	1
2.2	Background	1
2.3	Layout of the Solar System	3
2.4	Active Asteroids	5
2.5	Active Centaurs	7
2.6	Dynamical Evolution	7
2.7	Activity Detection Techniques	8
2.7.1	Visually Observed Activity	8
2.7.2	Brightness	10
2.7.3	Spectroscopic Indicators	10
2.7.4	Non-gravitational Acceleration	11
2.7.5	Meteor Showers	11
2.7.6	Magnetic Anomalies	12
2.8	Activity Mechanisms	12
2.8.1	Volatile Sublimation	12
2.8.2	Rotational Instability	13
2.8.3	Thermal Fracture	14
2.8.4	Impact	14
2.8.5	Cryovolcanism	15
2.8.6	Radiation Pressure Sweeping	15
2.8.7	Electrostatic Lofting	15
2.8.8	Phyllosilicate Dehydration	16
2.8.9	Binary Rubbing	16
2.9	Citizen Science Project	16
2.10	Manuscript Introduction	17
3	Comprehensive Discussion of Methods and Materials	23
3.1	HARVEST Pipeline	23
3.1.1	Pipeline Overview	23
3.1.1.1	Overarching Principles	25
3.1.2	HARVEST Step 1: Catalog Queries	27
3.1.2.1	Image Archives	27
3.1.2.2	Minor Planet Data	28

3.1.3	HARVEST Step 2: New Data Handling	29
3.1.3.1	Datafile-specific Operations	29
3.1.3.2	Object-Specific Data Handling	29
3.1.4	HARVEST Step 3: Assessing Fields	30
3.1.4.1	SkyBot	31
3.1.4.2	Delta Magnitudes	31
3.1.4.3	Trail Length	32
3.1.5	HARVEST Step 4: Thumbnail Preparations	32
3.1.5.1	Data Download	33
3.1.5.2	File Inspection	33
3.1.6	HARVEST Step 5: Thumbnail Extraction	34
3.1.6.1	FITS Thumbnails	34
3.1.6.2	PNG Thumbnails	34
3.1.7	HARVEST Step 6: Post Thumbnails	35
3.1.7.1	Source Analysis	35
3.1.7.2	Source Tallying	36
3.1.8	HARVEST Step 7: Reporting	36
3.1.9	HARVEST Step 8: Maintenance	36
3.1.9.1	Datafile Routines	36
3.1.10	Auxiliary Procedure: Comparison Images	37
3.2	Citizen Science Project	38
3.2.1	Project Components	39
3.2.2	Workflow	39
3.2.2.1	Tutorial	40
3.2.2.2	Field Guide	40
3.2.2.3	About	43
3.2.3	Talk	43
3.2.4	Subject Sets	44
3.2.4.1	Thumbnail Selection	44
3.2.4.2	Subject Set Preparation	46
3.2.4.3	Classification	46
3.2.5	Training Set	46
3.3	Follow-up Campaign	47
3.3.1	Archival Investigation	47
3.3.1.1	Step 1: Supplemental Searches	48
3.3.1.2	Step 2: Data Acquisition	49
3.3.1.3	Step 3: Astrometry	50
3.3.1.4	Step 4: Thumbnails	50
3.3.2	New Telescopic Observations	50
4	Searching Asteroids for Activity Revealing Indicators (SAFARI)	51
4.1	Introduction	51
4.2	Methods	58
4.2.1	Dark Energy Camera	58
4.2.2	High Performance Computing	60
4.2.3	photometrypipeline	60
4.2.4	Procedure	60
4.3	Results	63
4.4	Discussion	66
4.4.1	Population Traits	66
4.4.2	Occurrence Rates	67
4.4.3	False Positives	68
4.4.4	Limitations of By-eye Inspection	69
4.4.5	Asteroid Selection	69

4.4.6	Future Work	70
4.5	Summary	70
4.6	Acknowledgements	71
4.7	Appendix	73
4.7.1	Object-specific References	73
5	Manuscript II: Six Years of Sustained Activity from Active Asteroid (6478) Gault	79
5.1	Abstract	79
5.2	Introduction	79
5.3	Methods	82
5.4	Locating Candidate Images	82
5.5	Observability Assessment	82
5.6	Thumbnail Extraction	83
5.7	Image Analysis	83
5.8	Results	84
5.9	Discussion	84
5.10	Acknowledgements	85
5.11	Appendix	87
5.11.1	Gault Data	87
5.11.2	Thumbnail Gallery	88
6	Manuscript III: Cometary Activity Discovered on a Distant Centaur: A Nonaqueous Sublimation Mechanism	95
6.1	Abstract	95
6.2	Introduction	96
6.3	Mining Archival Data	98
6.4	Follow-up Observing	99
6.5	Simulating Dynamical Lifetime	101
6.6	Sublimation Modeling	101
6.7	Colors	104
6.8	Absolute Magnitude and Diameter Estimation	105
6.9	Coma Dust Analysis	106
6.10	Discussion	108
6.11	Acknowledgments	109
6.12	Appendix	111
6.12.1	Activity Observation details	111
6.12.2	Thumbnail Gallery	111
7	Manuscript IV: Recurrent Activity from Active Asteroid (248370) 2005 QN173: A Main-belt Comet	117
7.1	Abstract	117
7.2	Introduction	118
7.3	Second Activity Epoch	119
7.3.1	Data Acquisition	119
7.3.2	Image Assessment	122
7.3.3	Wedge Photometry Tail Tool	124
7.4	Main-belt Comet Classification	125
7.4.1	Prerequisites	125
7.4.2	Activity Mechanism	126
7.4.3	Temperature Estimation	126
7.4.4	Nondetection of Activity	128
7.4.5	Main-belt Comet Membership	129
7.5	Summary and Future Work	129
7.6	Acknowledgements	130

7.7	Appendix	132
7.7.1	Equipment and Archives	132
7.7.2	(248370) 2005 QN173 Data	132
8	Manuscript V: Migratory Outbursting Quasi-Hilda Object 282P/(323137) 2003 BM80	137
8.1	Abstract	137
8.2	Introduction	138
8.3	Citizen Science	140
8.4	Observations	141
8.4.1	Archival Data	141
8.4.2	Follow-up Telescope Observations	142
8.5	Dynamical Modeling	142
8.6	Dynamical Classifications: Past, Present and Future	144
8.7	Thermodynamical Modeling	146
8.8	Activity Mechanism	147
8.9	Summary and Future Work	148
8.10	Acknowledgements	150
8.10.1	Facilities	153
8.10.2	Software	153
8.11	Appendix	158
9	Overall Discussion	163
9.1	Project Status and Assessment	169
9.1.1	Volatile Distribution	169
9.1.1.1	Terrestrial Water Origins	169
9.1.2	Citizen Science Project	170
9.1.2.1	Thumbnail Classification Rate and Completeness	170
9.1.2.2	Active Asteroid Detection Rate and Completeness	174
9.1.2.3	Project Plans	174
9.1.2.4	Next Steps	175
10	Acronyms	177

List of Tables

2.1	Orbital elements for the major planets of the solar system: the semi-major axis a , orbital eccentricity e , and the mass of the body in Earth masses $M_{\oplus}$.	3
3.1	Composition of First Citizen Science Subject Set	44
3.2	Expert Activity Scoring Index	47
3.3	Telescopes Utilized	50
4.1	The Active Asteroids (1 of 2)	52
4.1	The Active Asteroids (2 of 2)	54
4.2	AA Mass-loss Mechanisms	55
4.3	Surveys which have discovered AAs.	57
4.4	Active Asteroid Hunting Surveys & Occurrence Rate Estimates	57
4.5	SAFARI Asteroid Populations	66
5.1	(6478) Gault Archival DECam Observations Examined	83
6.1	Active Centaurs	97
6.2	Solar Apparent Magnitude by Filter	107
6.3	Activity Observations	111
7.1	(248370) 2005 QN ₁₇₃ Observations	121
7.2	Equipment and Archives	133
7.3	(248370) 2005 QN ₁₇₃ Properties	135
8.1	Table of Observations	159
8.2	Equipment and Archives	160
8.3	282P/(323137) 2003 BM80 Data	161
9.1	Classification Rates and Potential Optimizations	172

List of Figures

- 2.1 Activity in the form of tails or a coma. Images credit: this work. **Left:** 2005 QN₁₇₃ imaged on Universal Time (UT) 2021 December 8 at the Vatican Advanced Technology Telescope (VATT) at the Mount Graham International Observatory (MGIO) in Arizona (Prop. ID S165, PI Chandler). This image reveals that the object has two tails: one pointing away from the Sun (yellow $-\odot$) and one pointing opposite of the object's apparent direction of motion (red $-v$). These are the two directions most commonly associated with tails. **Right:** Comet C/2007 F4 (McNaught) displays a prominent coma in this image captured on UT 2014 January 13 (Prop. ID 2012B-0001, PI Frieman). 2
- 2.2 The solar system seen from four different scales. The inner solar system (top-left) is shown with the orbit of Jupiter (red circle) as the outermost orbit. Zooming out (top-right) provides a view of the outer solar system, which includes the orbit of Pluto and the Kuiper Belt. Zooming out again (bottom-right) the orbit of (90377) Sedna can be seen, which gives context to the view of the inner Oort Cloud (bottom-left), the location from which most comets are thought to originate. Image credit: NASA/CalTech. 4
- 2.3 **Left:** This image, taken on 1949 November 19, shows the first asteroid activity discovered, emanating from (4015) Wilson Harrington (green dashed arrow) in the form of a tail (red arrows). Image Credit: ESO and Palomar Observatory (<https://www.eso.org/public/images/eso9212b/>). **Right:** The first active Centaur discovered (retroactively, following the 1977 discovery of the first identified Centaur, (2060) Chiron Kowal et al. 1977), 29P/Schwassmann-Wachmann 1 (Schwassmann & Wachmann, 1927), shown here in a 60 s *R*-band image acquired with the Palomar Transient Factory (PTF) Mosaic imager on UT 2011 February 9 at PTF (Prop. ID, PI Kulkarni). 29P was first identified as active in 1927 (Schwassmann & Wachmann, 1927), but the object was not considered a Centaur until after the discovery of Centaur (2060) Chiron in 1977. Image Credit: this work. 6

2.4	Activity discovered by fly-by and orbiter spacecraft missions may not be detectable from Earth. (a) Geysers of water reaching high above the surface of Enceladus were imaged by the Cassini spacecraft. Image Credit: NASA/JPL/Space Science Institute. (b) Gravel-sized particles (left) being ejected from the surface of (101955) Bennu were captured by the cameras aboard the OSIRIS-REx spacecraft. Image Credit: NASA/Goddard/University of Arizona/Lockheed Martin.	9
3.1	The Hunting for Activity in Repositories with Vetting-Enhanced Search Techniques (HARVEST) daily pipeline. The primary eight steps are sequential. Tasks within each step start from the top of the enclosing rectangle and finish at the bottom. Green shaded regions indicate processes that may be executed in parallel. Each step and the constituent tasks are described in text.	24
3.2	Examples of trails resulting from high rates of apparent motion on the sky. Images credit: this work. Left: Comet C/2014 QU ₂ (PANSTARRS) as observed by DECam on UT 2014 September 22 (Prop. ID 2014B-0303, PI Sheppard). Even with a trail length of about 100 pixels, activity is still clearly visible in the upward direction. Right: Apollo class near-Earth object (NEO) 2014 EH ₄₅ observed by DECam on UT 2014 March 27 (Prop. ID 2014A-0479, PI Sheppard) with an approximately 280 pixel length trail. The variable brightness seen along the length of the trail is diagnostic of fast rotation.	32
3.3	This mosaic shows the charge-coupled device (CCD) chip arrangement of the Dark Energy Camera (DECam) instrument. Image data is not recorded anywhere outside of the CCD chips (rectangles). Areas between chips are commonly referred to as “chip gaps.”	33
3.4	The three causes for excluding a thumbnail during the Source Analysis section of the Hunting for Activity in Repositories with Vetting-Enhanced Search Techniques (HARVEST) pipeline. (a) Empty center: there is no object at the center of the frame to inspect. (b) Crowded field: there are too many sources in the center 270×270 pixels, making identification of the target difficult. (c) Blended sources: multiple overlapping sources are seen here, making it difficult to identify which source (if any) is the target.	35

3.5	Comparison between two identical areas on sky, imaged with similar circumstances (e.g., instrument, exposure time, broadband filter), but taken at times far apart enough that the solar system object would not appear in the comparison image. Images credit: this work. Left: This thumbnail image of Jupiter Family Comet (JFC) 2015 TC ₁ was taken on UT 2015 December 19 (Prop. ID 2012B-0001, PI Frieman) and submitted for examination by <i>Active Asteroids</i> (http://activeasteroids.net) volunteers; all volunteers classified this image as showing activity, and several users also shared this image in the Talk forums as a potentially active object. Right: This image of the same field was captured UT 2016 January 1 (Prop. ID 2012B-0001, PI Frieman) probes somewhat fainter than the original image on the left. The comparison illustrates that there is no background galaxy or other phenomenon present at the exact coordinate where 2015 TC ₁ was seen.	37
3.6	Landing page for the <i>Active Asteroids</i> Citizen Science project hosted at Zooniverse. The logo we designed is at the top-left. The horizontal blue text box displays updates we provide to volunteers. The green box indicates the project status; as indicated, the project was complete, so uploading another Subject Set (collection of images) would be the next step in our workflow.	39
3.7	The <i>Active Asteroids</i> project workflow is simply to ask whether or not volunteers can see activity emanating from the object at the center of the screen, indicated by the green reticle. Citizen Scientists can also tag thumbnails for discussion in Talk forums or collect them in their own albums.	40
3.8	The <i>Active Asteroids</i> Tutorial. (1) “Welcome” provides a project overview. (2) “Hot or Not” describes the workflow. (3) “Tails” describes tails with an example. (4) “Comae” introduces volunteers to the less familiar coma morphology. (5) “Activity Look-a-Likes” describes common false positive scenarios. (6) “Feeling uncertain?” explains what to do if a classification is ambiguous. (7) “One last thing...” lets users know about the injected training images. (8) This panel, requested by volunteers, describes a common situation where the object cannot be conclusively identified.	41
3.9	Four examples from the Field Guide of the <i>Active Asteroids</i> project. (1) “Trails (artificial),” includes an example satellite trail and a a example of a telescope tracking problem that results in all sources in a field becoming trailed. (2) “Crowded Fields” shows an example of a situation we try to automatically screen out from the project, but which may occasionally make it through our filter. (3) “Donuts” discusses this optical issue and includes a donut with activity indicators. (4) “Partial Images (Edges and Corners)” explains what happens when an object falls near one or two chip edges and includes an example.	42

4.1	Active asteroid P2013/R3 was imaged in October 2013 while undergoing a breakup (into components A-D) likely caused by rotational instability. The antisolar and negative heliocentric velocity vector arrows are labeled $\odot$ and $-V$, respectively. Reprinted Figure 2 of Jewitt et al. (2017).	53
4.2	The SAFARI workflow.	59
4.3	Two asteroid thumbnail contrast selection approaches are shown in a and b . a) The <i>photometrypipeline</i> thumbnail shows increased dynamic range. b) Iterative Rejection sacrifices some dynamic range (notice especially the edges of the center galaxy and the spiral galaxy to its upper-right) in favor of recovering more objects, many of which are not visible in a that can be easily seen in b . c & d) Asteroid 2012 YU2 is shown in two frames comprising one animated Graphic Interchange Format (GIF) file.	61
4.4	a) Exposure time distribution in our data. b) Histogram of apparent magnitudes for known asteroids we identified in our dataset. c) Observations per object; the 15,600 asteroid thumbnails contained 11,703 unique objects, 3029 of which were observed more than once. d) Cumulative histogram showing the depth of magnitudes (stars and asteroids) found in our dataset. 50% of our images reached a magnitude of $m_R = 23.7$. Sources with a signal-to-noise ratio of $<5:1$ were not included. e) Asteroids encountered shown in geocentric ecliptic space, where λ and β are the ecliptic longitude and latitude, respectively. Distinct patches sum to $\sim 1000 \text{ deg}^2$, as described in the text. Milky Way coordinates were retrieved from the <i>D3-Celestial</i> (http://ofrohn.github.io) software suite.	63
4.5	Asteroid (62412) shown with the “hsv” colormap and Mitchell interpolation. The asteroid is at the center of the frame and the tail can be seen between the dashed lines.	64
4.6	Common potential false-positives encountered in an asteroid thumbnail. (a) This thumbnail includes 4 potential false-positive sources: (A) Asteroid (432345). (B) <i>Scattered light</i> from a bright star trails toward the lower-left corner. (C) An <i>extended source</i> , such as this edge-on galaxy, can present itself as coma if close to an asteroid. (D) <i>Cosmic rays</i> with variable morphology are common throughout our images; they can look like trails if they align with a star as in this case. (E) <i>Juxtaposed</i> objects can masquerade as active asteroids, especially when a bright object is near one or more progressively dimmer objects along the direction of apparent motion.	68

- 5.1 (6478) Gault (dashed green circle) displays a prominent tail (indicated by white arrows) during this 2013 September 28 apparition when (6478) Gault was halfway between perihelion and aphelion. This 90 s *g*-band exposure reached ~ 7 mag fainter than (6478) Gault. The anti-Solar direction ($-\odot$; yellow) and negative heliocentric velocity vector ($-\vec{v}$; red) are shown. 80
- 5.2 (6478) Gault activity timeline beginning with DECam operation commencement (2012 September) to present. Red stars show when we found visible activity; the blue pentagon represents the current apparition where prominent activity has been seen. Above the top axis are marked perihelion (q) and aphelion (Q) events. The solid green line indicates the apparent *V*-band magnitude of (6478) Gault as viewed from Earth. The dashed yellow line shows our “observability” metric, defined as the number of hours per UT observing date meeting both of the following conditions possible for DECam: (1) elevation $> 15^\circ$, and (2) the refracted solar upper-limb elevation was $< 0^\circ$ (i.e., nighttime). Peaks in apparent magnitude coinciding with peaks in observability indicate opposition events; conversely, secondary magnitude peaks aligned with observability troughs highlight solar conjunctions, i.e., when (6478) Gault was “behind” the Sun as viewed from Earth. All activity has been observed near opposition events. Also, activity was seen at every epoch in our data. The histogram (vertical blue bars) indicate the number of thumbnails that we extracted for a given observing month. 91
- 5.3 Positive detections of (6478) Gault activity with DECam as a function of heliocentric distance r (au) and surface temperature T (K). Our activity observations are indicated by red stars, whereas the current apparition is represented by the blue pentagon. Distance and temperature of (6478) Gault perihelion q (orange dashed line) and aphelion Q (blue dashed-dotted line) events are shown. During the course of one full orbit, (6478) Gault is exposed to temperatures greater than 165 K. As a result, (6478) Gault is consistently subjected to temperatures that are too high for water ice to form at the 5 au ice formation distance (Snodgrass et al., 2017b). 92
- 5.4 **(a)** A tail (indicated by white arrows) at ~ 8 o’clock is seen in this 107-second *g*-band exposure imaged June 10, 2016. The yellow arrow indicates anti-Solar ($-\odot$) direction and red the negative heliocentric velocity vector ($-\vec{v}$). **(b)** (6478) Gault top seen on November 12, 2017. The 111 second exposure in the *g*-band delivered a flux limit 6 magnitudes fainter than (6478) Gault, revealing a faint tail (~ 2 o’clock, indicated by white arrows) and coma. The yellow arrow indicates anti-Solar ($-\odot$) direction and the red arrow negative heliocentric velocity ($-\vec{v}$). Dashed green circles outline (6478) Gault and white arrows have been placed perpendicular to any observed activity. 93

6.1	2014 OG ₃₉₂ (dashed arrow) displays a coma (short arrows) during our 2019 August 30 observations. Stack of 4×250 s DECam exposures.	96
6.2	2014 OG ₃₉₂ activity timeline beginning 2012 September (DECam first light) to present. Red stars show when we found visible activity. The orbital period is ~ 42 yr so neither perihelion (2021 December 3) nor aphelion are visible on this plot. The solid green line (left vertical axis) shows the geocentric apparent <i>V</i> -band magnitude of 2014 OG ₃₉₂ . Dashed lines (right vertical axis) indicate the number of nighttime hours with elevation $> 15^\circ$ for the southern hemisphere DECam (blue; site code: 807) and for the northern hemisphere DCT (orange; site code: G37). The overlaid histogram (vertical blue bars and right axis) shows the number of thumbnail images captured during one calendar month. Note that in all instances when observability was high and many thumbnails were present, activity was observed.	100
6.3	Mass-loss rates for seven different astrophysically relevant ices on an isothermal ($\chi = 4$) body; water (H ₂ O) and methanol (CH ₃ OH) ices have been detected on Centaurs. Orbital distances of Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune are indicated about the top axis. The current 10.11 au heliocentric distance of 2014 OG ₃₉₂ is indicated by a vertical black bar, bracketed by perihelion (9.97 au) and aphelion (14.40 au) distances (leftmost and rightmost dashed vertical lines, respectively). Over the course of one orbit (between the vertical dashed lines), water and methanol never appreciably sublimate and carbon monoxide (CO), methane (CH ₄), and molecular nitrogen (N ₂) sublimate at high and relatively constant rates; we rule out all of these molecules as potential causes of activity. (The shallow slopes of CO, CH ₄ , and N ₂ extend beyond 50 au [not shown], which informs us the mass loss would have begun long before 2014 OG ₃₉₂ became a Centaur.) However, over the course of one orbit the sublimation rates for CO ₂ and NH ₃ vary substantially, presumably producing significant variation in visible activity. Order-of-magnitude estimates of mass-loss-rate upper limits for the dynamical lifetime of 2014 OG ₃₉₂ are shown as horizontal dotted lines. Only CO ₂ and NH ₃ have sublimation rates near these limits.	103
6.4	Surface brightness radial profiles of 2014 OG ₃₉₂ and a nearby SDSS-DR9 catalog solar-type star (J004840.66-022335.6) are plotted along with a model fit for each object. After subtracting the background flux from the two profiles we normalized the standard star profile to the peak of the 2014 OG ₃₉₂ profile. The coma flux tapers from 125 counts to background (0 counts) at $\rho \simeq 60$ pixels, or 4.3×10^5 km. We estimate there are $\sim 5.8 \times 10^{17}$ particles in the coma assuming a grain radius of 1 mm; for a density of 1 g cm^{-3} the total mass is 2.4×10^{15} g. Data from our 300 s <i>g</i> -band exposure taken on UT 2019 December 30 2:29 using the LMI on the Lowell Observatory 4.3 m DCT.	105

6.5	<i>DECam Archival Images.</i> Top left: UT 2017-Jul-18 09:27 – 137 s z -band. Top center: UT 2017-Jul-18 10:20 – 250 s z -band. Top right: UT 2017-Jul-22 05:37 – 79 s g -band. Bottom left: UT 2017-Jul-25 06:25 – 60 s r -band. Bottom center: UT 2017-Jul-25 06:32 – 52 s r -band. Bottom right: UT 2017-Aug-20 04:48 – 67 s r -band. All Images: The coma (green arrows) was exceptionally faint in all of these DECam archival images of 2014 OG ₃₉₂ (indicated by dashed red arrows) but nevertheless they prompted us to obtain follow-up observations. . . .	112
6.6	<i>New DECam Observations Gallery.</i> Top left: UT 9:54. Top right: UT 9:58. Bottom left: UT 10:03; Bottom right: UT 10:08. All images: (1) dashed red arrow points to 2014 OG ₃₉₂ , (2) green arrows highlight the comae if visible, (3) observing date was UT 2019 August 30, (4) filter was VR , (5) exposure time was 250 s. The apparent decrease in coma prominence was the result of increasing background noise as images were taken into twilight.	113
6.7	<i>Isophotal Contours.</i> Isophotal contours indicate the extent and irregularity of the coma emanating from 2014 OG ₃₉₂ (dashed arrows), especially when contrasted with background objects (yellow arrows) presenting relatively symmetric radial profiles. These two 250 s VR -band exposures were taken at 9:54 (left) and 9:58 (right) during our 2019 August 30 follow-up campaign.	114
6.8	2014 OG ₃₉₂ imaged December 27, 2019 via the Magellan 6.5m Baade Telescope using the WB4800-7800 filter on the Inamori-Magellan Areal Camera & Spectrograph (IMACS) at Las Campanas Observatory on Cerro Manqui, Chile. The three images reveal an apparent coma (green arrows) emerging from the object (red dashed arrow) and were taken at 300 s (left, center) exposures and one 600 s exposure (right).	114
6.9	<i>New DCT Observations Gallery.</i> 2014 OG ₃₉₂ imaged December 30, 2019, via the Lowell Observatory 4.3 m Discovery Channel Telescope (Arizona, USA) using the Large Monolithic Imager (LMI). Green arrows trace out a diffuse coma and a dashed red arrow points to the nucleus in each of the six images. Each exposure in the two $g-r-i$ sequences (top and bottom rows) was 300 s long.	115
7.1	The $126'' \times 126''$ thumbnail image (left) shows (248370) 2005 QN ₁₇₃ (green dashed arrow) at center with a tail (white arrows) oriented towards 5 o'clock. This 89 s z -band exposure captured with the DECam is the only image in which we could unambiguously identify activity. We conducted wedge photometry (right) that shows the tail orientation is $251.3^\circ \pm 1.4^\circ$ (blue star), in close agreement with the 251.6° antisolar angle (yellow $\odot$) and the 251.7° antmotion vector (red v) as computed by JPL Horizons. The plot shows counts radially outward from the the object center at (0,0).	118

7.2 Archival images of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ with the best activity detection potential (i.e., sufficient depth and observing conditions) for (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃. For all images, north is up, east is left, the FOV is $30'' \times 30''$, the antisolar (yellow $\odot$) and antmotion (red $-v$) directions are shown with the origin at image center. See Appendix 7.7.1 for instrument and archive details. Panel (s) is from the only thumbnail in which we could identify activity unambiguously (Figure 7.1). (a) 2004 July 8 MegaPrime 3×180 s i band. (b) 2005 June 8 SuprimeCam 3×60 s $W\text{-}J\text{-}VR$ band. (c) 2010 June 14 PS1 2×60 s z band. (d) 2010 August 2 PS1 1×45 s i band. (e) 2010 August 5 PS1 1×40 s r band. (f) 2010 August 6 PS1 1×43 s g band. (g) 2010 August 28 PTF 2×60 s r band. (h) 2010 August 31 PS1 1×45 s i band. (i) 2010 September 1 PTF 2×60 s r band. (j) 2010 September 6 PS1 2×43 s g band. (k) 2010 September 12 PS1 2×40 s r band + 2×43 s g band. (l) 2010 September 15 PTF 2×60 s r band. (m) 2010 October 30 PS1 2×30 s z band. (n) 2011 July 14 PS1 1×40 s r band. (o) 2011 November 24 PS1 2×40 s r band + 2×43 s g band. (p) 2011 November 30 PS1 2×45 s i band. (q) 2011 December 1 PS1 2×43 s g band. (r) 2014 January 31 OmegaCAM 5×360 s r band. (s) 2016 July 22 1×89 s z band. (t) 2019 July 3 DECam 9×40 s VR band. (u) 2020 February 4 DECam 1×38 s r band. (v) 2020 February 10 DECam 1×199 s z band. (w) 2020 April 25 ZTF 1×30 s g band + 1×30 s r band. (x) 2020 May 18, 27 + 2020 June 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, & 26 ZTF 9×30 s r band + 12×30 s g band. 123

7.3 (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ heliocentric distance (top plot), observability timeline (middle plot) and temperature (bottom plot), beginning the year of our first archival data (2004) through 2022. Top: triangles represent positive (filled red) and negative (unfilled blue) activity detections. Markers indicate when the object was inbound (downward pointing triangles) or outbound (upward pointing triangles). Table 7.1 lists observation details. Middle: apparent V -band magnitude (solid green line) and our “observability” metric (yellow dashed line) that represents hours during a given UT observing date the object is above $> 15^\circ$ elevation while the Sun is below the horizon. Peaks in apparent magnitude coinciding with observability occur during opposition events, and observability troughs indicate solar conjunctions when (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ was only above the horizon during daylight. Perihelion (orange q) and aphelion (blue Q) events are indicated. Bottom: temperature T (K) by date for different χ values, where $\chi = 1$ (top line) represents a “flat slab” and $\chi = 4$ (bottom line) an isothermal body. 134

- 8.1 Top row: four images, spanning 15 months, showing 282P/(323137) 2003 BM₈₀ activity during the recent 2021–2022 activity epoch. **(a)** Epoch II thumbnail image of 282P was classified as “active” by 14 of 15 volunteers of our Citizen Science project *Active Asteroids*, a NASA Partner program. This 90 s *i* band image was taken with the Dark Energy Camera on UT 2021 March 14, Prop. ID 2019A-0305 (PI Drlica-Wagner). **(b)** Epoch II, 12×300 s co-added exposures imaged by Michael Jäger with a QHY600 camera on a 14” Newtonian telescope in Weißenkirchen, Austria. Image reproduced with permission of Michael Jäger. **(c)** Epoch II 5×300 s co-added images captured by Roland Fichtl using a CDS cooled Canon 5D Mark III camera on a 16” Newtonian telescope in Engelhardsberg, Germany. Image reproduced with permission of Roland Fichtl. **(d)** For this most recent Epoch II image we co-added six 120 s *g'* band images of 282P (green dashed arrow) we acquired on UT 7 June 2022 with the Gemini Multi-Object Spectrograph (GMOS) imager on the 8.1 m Gemini South telescope (Prop. ID GS-2022A-DD-103, PI Chandler); a tail is clearly visible (orange arrows). Bottom row: Archival images of 282P that show clear evidence of activity. For each 126'×126' thumbnail image, north is up and east is left. With the center of each image as the origin, the antisolar (yellow $-\odot$) and antimotion (red $-v$) directions (often correlated with tail appearance) are indicated. 282P is indicated by the green dashed arrow, and visible activity is marked by the white arrows. **(e)** Epoch I image from UT 2012 March 28 MegaPrime 120 s *r* band, Prop. ID 12AH16 (PI Wainscoat). **(f)** Epoch I image from UT 2013 May 5 DECam 150 s *r* band, Prop. ID 2013A-0327 (PI Rest). **(g)** Epoch I image from UT 2013 June 13 MegaPrime 120 s *r* band, Prop. ID 13AH09 (PI Wainscoat). **(h)** Epoch II image from UT 2021 March 17 DECam 90 s *i* band, Prop. ID 2019A-0305 (PI Drlica-Wagner). 139
- 8.2 282P heliocentric distance (top), observability (middle) and temperature (bottom), from 2012 through 2024. **Top:** activity detections (triangles) are marked as positive (filled red) and negative (unfilled blue) detections and as either inbound ($\blacktriangledown$) or outbound ($\blacktriangle$). Observations are cataloged in Table 8.1. **Middle:** Our observability metric for Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory (CTIO), site code 807 (yellow dashed line) and the Lowell Discovery Telescope (LDT), site code G37 (blue dashed line), depicting the number of hours 282P was observable ($> 15^\circ$ between sunset and sunrise) during a given UT observing date. Opposition events and conjunctions result in concurrent maxima and minima, respectively. Also indicated are perihelion (orange *q*) and aphelion (blue *Q*) passages. **Bottom:** Modeled temperature by date for the thermophysical extremes: a “flat slab” ($\chi = 1$, top line), and an isothermal body ($\chi = 4$, bottom line). 154

8.3	Results from dynamical integration of 282P orbital clones. For all plots, time $t = 0$ corresponds to UT 2022 January 21. Jovian and Saturnian close encounters prevent accurate orbital parameter determination outside $-180 \lesssim t \lesssim 300$ yrs, given known orbital uncertainties. (a) Orbital diagram for 282P and nearby planets. (b) Semi-major axis a evolution. (c) Eccentricity e evolution. (d) Inclination i evolution.	155
8.4	Additional results from dynamical integration of 282P orbital clones. For each plot, time $t = 0$ is UT 2022 January 21. Close encounters with Jupiter and Saturn are so significant that orbital elements cannot be accurately determined before/after $-180 \lesssim t \lesssim 300$ yrs, given orbital uncertainties. (a) Distance between Jupiter and 282P as a function of time. Indicated Hill radii provide references for the degree of orbit alteration imparted by a close encounter. For reference, the semi-major axes of two Jovian moons are shown: Callisto, the outermost Galilean satellite, and Sinope (Nicholson, 1914), a likely captured (Grav et al., 2003) distant irregular and retrograde Jovian moon. (b) Distance between Saturn and 282P as a function of time. The semi-major axis of the irregular Saturnian moon Phoebe, believed to be captured through close encounter (Johnson & Lunine, 2005; Jewitt & Haghighipour, 2007), is given for reference. (c) Heliocentric distance r evolution. (d) Tisserand parameter with respect to Jupiter T_J (Equation 8.2), where the horizontal orange line representing $T_J = 3$ indicates the widely-adopted boundary between comet-like and asteroid-like orbits.	156
8.5	The orbital motion of minor planets (blue lines) as seen in the reference frame corotating with Jupiter (orange lines at right edge of plots). (a) MBC (7968) Elst-Pizarro (133P). (b) JFC 67P/Churyumov-Gerasimenko (previously visited by the European Space Agency (ESA) Rosetta Spacecraft). (c) Centaur (2060) Chiron (95P). (d) (153) Hilda, the namesake of the Hilda dynamical class, in the 3:2 interior mean-motion resonance with Jupiter. (e) Quasi-Hilda 246P/NEAT, also designated 2010 V ₂ and 2004 F ₃ . (f) Our object of study, 282P, in its Quasi-Hilda orbit.	157
9.1	The distribution in each square degree on sky of the roughly 18 million automatically vetted thumbnail images HARVEST produced.	164

9.2	Left: This image of JFC 2017 QN ₈₄ (green dashed arrow), originally taken 2017 December 23 (Prop. ID 2017B-0307, PI Sheppard), was flagged as active by 14 of 15 <i>Active Asteroids</i> (http://activeasteroids.net) volunteers. Right: this comparison image, from an image captured on 2017 December 24 (Prop. ID 2017B-0307, PI Sheppard), shows that there is no comparable object or extended feature (e.g., a galaxy) that could be mistaken for the activity visible in the image on the left (orange arrows).	166
9.3	Agreement between the percentage of Citizen Scientists that identified a thumbnail as showing activity, and my own measure of how active an object appears in an image. Zero represents complete agreement, negative numbers indicates a high fraction of volunteers identified a thumbnail as active as compared to my score, and positive numbers indicate that my activity score was higher than the fraction of volunteers who classified the image as showing activity.	167
9.4	The two components (green dashed and solid orange arrows) of Trans-Neptunian object (TNO) 2012 KU ₅₀ are fully resolved in this 600 s <i>VR</i> filter DECam image from UT 2014 March 27 (Prop. ID 2014A-0479, PI Sheppard).	168

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my partner, Mark Jesus Mendoza Magbanua, and to my parents, Arthur and Jeanie Chandler; this work would not have been possible without their encouragement and support.

Preface

The included manuscript chapters have been written to appear in peer-reviewed scientific journals. Redundancy in text is a result of reformatting to conform to University formatting requirements. References have been consolidated into a unified bibliography that appears at the end of this dissertation.

The following chapters have already been published:

Chapter 4 – Manuscript I: “Searching Asteroids for Activity Revealing Indicators (SAFARI)” (Chandler et al., 2018)

Chapter 5 – Manuscript II: “Six Years of Sustained Activity from Active Asteroid (6478) Gault” (Chandler et al., 2019)

Chapter 6 – Manuscript III: “Cometary Activity Discovered on a Distant Centaur: A Nonaqueous Sublimation Mechanism” (Chandler et al., 2020)

Chapter 7 – Manuscript IV: “Recurrent Activity from Active Asteroid (248370) 2005 QN173: A Main-belt Comet” (Chandler et al., 2021c)

The remaining chapters have been submitted to the American Astronomical Society journals for publication as soon as possible:

Chapter 8 – Manuscript V: “Migratory Outbursting Quasi-Hilda Object 282P/(323137) 2003 BM80”

Chapter 2

Introduction

2.1 Definitions

It is important to define some terms that will be used throughout this work. “Comet” as a class of object is very loosely defined, with many individuals adopting essentially personal definitions of the term. For example, some people will consider anything seen with a tail as being a comet. Other people will only require that an object have an orbit typical of a comet class, such as Jupiter Family Comet (JFC), and the object will be called a comet even if activity has never been seen. It is not uncommon to mix visual and dynamical elements to define a type of comet, for example the Manx comets (Meech et al., 2014), defined as on a comet-like orbit but displaying little to no tail. For this work I define comets as objects that (1) exhibit activity and (2) are on orbits typically associated with dynamical classes with the word “comet” in them, including comet, long-period comet, short-period comet, JFC, and Quasi-Hilda Comet (QHC).

As my adopted definition of comet is not based purely on orbital properties, I use the terms “class” or “group” to refer to collections of minor planets with common traits, most commonly orbital properties, but not necessarily limited to these attributes. I refer to volatile reservoirs as object classes with two or more objects known to harbor volatiles. These are a reservoir in the sense that comets and asteroids are two reservoirs thought to have supplied water to Earth in the past. Classes of so-called “transition objects” (defined in this work as objects only temporarily belonging to a particular class of objects) – for example Centaurs (defined in Section 2.5) – can still be viable reservoirs because these regions are being continually replenished with new objects (Centaurs in this example).

2.2 Background

Volatiles, such as water, are essential for life as we know it, yet fundamental knowledge about these materials, such as their present-day location within our solar system, and even what they are, is incomplete. This information is crucial for future space exploration and to help answer outstanding fundamental questions




Figure 2.1: Activity in the form of tails or a coma. Images credit: this work. **Left:** 2005 QN₁₇₃ imaged on UT 2021 December 8 at the Vatican Advanced Technology Telescope (VATT) at the Mount Graham International Observatory (MGIO) in Arizona (Prop. ID S165, PI Chandler). This image reveals that the object has two tails: one pointing away from the Sun (yellow $-\odot$) and one pointing opposite of the object’s apparent direction of motion (red $-v$). These are the two directions most commonly associated with tails. **Right:** Comet C/2007 F4 (McNaught) displays a prominent coma in this image captured on UT 2014 January 13 (Prop. ID 2012B-0001, PI Frieman).

about the solar system, including Earth. For example, where did Earth’s water originate? It is generally accepted that some water was already present when Earth formed, and that some additional quantity was delivered later, but not even a rough ratio is known. Comets were thought to be the only objects that delivered water post-formation, but the consensus today is that comets alone cannot account for the volume of water we find on Earth (see review, Alexander 2017). One explanation is that comets represent just one of multiple “volatile reservoirs,” classes of solar system bodies that harbor volatiles on or below their surfaces. Today, asteroids are considered likely contributors to the volatile budget on Earth.

Comets are known for their remarkable displays of *cometary activity* (Figure 2.1), like a tail or a shroud of material known as a coma (plural: comae). This activity is typically associated with volatile sublimation, the direct phase transition of a material from solid to gas (e.g., when dry ice turns into carbon dioxide gas) at conditions typical on Earth. However, mechanisms other than sublimation can result in mass loss that takes the form of tails or comae. Here we use the term “activity” to describe any situation where a body loses material to space.

Surprisingly, comets are not the only objects known to display comet-like activity. (See review by Jewitt & Hsieh (2022) for a comprehensive discussion on the increasingly blurred lines between comets and asteroids.) As a result, other groups of objects, such as active asteroids and active Centaurs (discussed below), may

represent viable volatile reservoirs in their own right. However, in sum fewer than 50 members of these active object groups have been discovered since the first active asteroid was identified in 1949 (Harris, 1950) and, as a result, it is virtually impossible to draw robust conclusions about the amount and type of volatiles held by these groups. In order to enable the study of potential volatile reservoirs as populations we set out to create a platform that facilitates discovering many additional active bodies, with a long-term goal to increase the numbers of known active minor planets by a factor of two or more. Here I describe the platform we created, as well as several discoveries we made along the way, including five that resulted in peer-reviewed publications (Chandler et al., 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021b). We also include a link¹ to the online component of the platform, thereby enabling *you* to participate in this exciting scientific endeavor.

2.3 Layout of the Solar System

Symbol	Name	a [au]	e	Mass [$M_{\oplus}$]
☿	Mercury	0.5	0.21	0.06
♀	Venus	0.7	0.01	0.81
♁	Earth	1.0	0.02	1.00
♂	Mars	1.5	0.09	0.11
♃	Jupiter	5.2	0.05	318
♄	Saturn	9.5	0.05	95
♅	Uranus	19.2	0.05	15
♆	Neptune	30.1	0.01	17

Table 2.1: Orbital elements for the major planets of the solar system: the semi-major axis a , orbital eccentricity e , and the mass of the body in Earth masses $M_{\oplus}$.

Kepler’s First Law states that the planets orbit in ellipses (ovals). The average distance from the Sun to an object over one complete orbit is equal to the semi-major axis (a), the distance between the center of an ellipse and the farthest point from the center. Astronomers typically measure distances of planets and small solar system bodies in terms of *astronomical units* (au), defined as the average distance between the centers of Earth and the Sun. Eccentricity e describes how elongated an orbit is, with $e = 0$ being a perfect circle, and $e = 1$ a parabola and thus not a closed loop. The planets typically have low eccentricity (Table 2.1), with a median of $e = 0.05$, while comets typically have high eccentricity, on average $e = 0.9$.

Other objects also orbit the Sun, and these are collectively referred to as minor planets (or small solar system bodies), or dwarf planets (e.g., Sedna). As of 1 July 2022 there are roughly 1.2 million known minor planets, of which fewer than 4,000 are comets. There are two circumstellar “belts” containing large numbers of minor planets. The Asteroid Belt (Figure 2.2) is found between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter, roughly between 2 au and 4 au. The Asteroid Belt has a mass of less than one thousandth of Earth’s mass

¹<http://activeasteroids.net>




Figure 2.2: The solar system seen from four different scales. The inner solar system (top-left) is shown with the orbit of Jupiter (red circle) as the outermost orbit. Zooming out (top-right) provides a view of the outer solar system, which includes the orbit of Pluto and the Kuiper Belt. Zooming out again (bottom-right) the orbit of (90377) Sedna can be seen, which gives context to the view of the inner Oort Cloud (bottom-left), the location from which most comets are thought to originate. Image credit: NASA/CalTech.

(e.g., Krasinsky et al. 2002). The Kuiper Belt (sometimes referred to as the Edgeworth-Kuiper Belt or the Trans-Neptunian Belt) extends from the orbit of Neptune (30 au) to around 50 au. Notably, the Kuiper belt is some 20 times wider in radial extent than the Asteroid Belt, and at one tenth the mass of Earth the Kuiper Belt is 200 times more massive than the Asteroid Belt (Gladman et al., 2001; Pitjeva & Pitjev, 2018; Di Ruscio et al., 2020).

To date four active minor planet classes (other than comet classes) have members known to display comet-like activity. These are (1) comets, (2) main-belt asteroids, (3) Centaurs (icy bodies orbiting between 5 au and 30 au), (3) near-Earth objects (NEOs), also known as near-Earth asteroids (NEAs), (4) Quasi-Hilda Objects (QHOs), a type of asteroid with orbits similar to the Hildas (which are in 3:2 orbital resonance with Jupiter), and (4) one interstellar object, designated 2I/Borisov (Borisov, 2019).

Comets are thought to originate from two sources: (1) the Kuiper Belt, and (2) the Oort cloud, a spherical cloud of objects orbiting between 2,000 au to 200,000 au from the Sun (Oort, 1950). Comets are classified by two different means. The first is by recognizing their activity, an approach dating back thousands of years (see catalog by Kronk 1999), a technique still valid today. Notably, this definition is not based on orbital characteristics at all, and thus the class “comet” is not necessarily dynamically derived. Comets are also identified based on properties of their orbits through essentially two systems of dynamical classification.

(1) The period-based comet classifications are: (i) Hyperbolic comets, which may be interstellar in origin. These have enough momentum to leave the solar system, and so they do not have a period. (ii) Long-period comets have orbits longer than 200 years. (iii) Halley-type comets, named after the famed Halley’s Comet, have periods ranging between 20 and 200 years. (4) Short-period comets have periods less than 20 years. These are also sometimes referred to as Jupiter Family Comets (JFCs).

(2) The other system for classifying comets makes use of an orbital metric that describes a body’s close approach speed to Jupiter, and can be considered a descriptor of how strongly an orbit is influenced by Jupiter. The metric is known as Tisserand’s Parameter with respect to Jupiter (T_J), and is described in detail in Chapter 4.1. Orbits constrained by T_J include JFCs (the T_J definition), having orbits that are strongly influenced by Jupiter.

2.4 Active Asteroids

For a more in-depth discussion of Active Asteroids, see Chapter 4.1.

The first asteroid observed with cometary features was NEO (4015) Wilson-Harrington (Cunningham, 1950). Astronomers identified a clear tail in images taken in 1949 (Figure 2.3). However, when astronomers were able to observe the object again, no activity was seen. Since then no conclusive evidence of further




Figure 2.3: **Left:** This image, taken on 1949 November 19, shows the first asteroid activity discovered, emanating from (4015) Wilson Harrington (green dashed arrow) in the form of a tail (red arrows). Image Credit: ESO and Palomar Observatory (<https://www.eso.org/public/images/eso9212b/>). **Right:** The first active Centaur discovered (retroactively, following the 1977 discovery of the first identified Centaur, (2060) Chiron Kowal et al. 1977), 29P/Schwassmann-Wachmann 1 (Schwassmann & Wachmann, 1927), shown here in a 60 s *R*-band image acquired with the PTF Mosaic imager on UT 2011 February 9 at PTF (Prop. ID, PI Kulkarni). 29P was first identified as active in 1927 (Schwassmann & Wachmann, 1927), but the object was not considered a Centaur until after the discovery of Centaur (2060) Chiron in 1977. Image Credit: this work.

activity has been detected, despite considerable efforts (Degewij et al., 1980; Chamberlin et al., 1996; Licandro et al., 2009; Ishiguro et al., 2011a; Urakawa et al., 2011).

In 1996, nearly five decades later, the modern era of active asteroids was ushered in with the discovery of an active object orbiting within the asteroid belt, 133P/Elst-Pizarro (Elst et al., 1996). This object has been observed to be repeatedly active, especially near perihelion (Hsieh et al., 2010) – the point in an object’s orbit when it is closest to the sun. Repeated periodic activity when an object is near to the Sun, the warmest period of an object’s orbit, is strong evidence that the activity is sublimation-driven, and this object became the first to be designated a Main-belt Comet (MBC). The MBCs are a subset of active asteroids that orbit within the Asteroid Belt and exhibit sublimation-driven activity (Hsieh & Jewitt, 2006a). As of this writing, sublimation is inferred – activity has been too weak to confirm the presence of volatiles spectroscopically, despite efforts to do so (e.g., Hsieh et al. 2012b). Fewer than ten MBCs have been found, although there are additional candidates suspected of being MBC members.

2.5 Active Centaurs

Centaurs are cold bodies that originate from the Kuiper Belt (see review Morbidelli 2008). Confusingly, there are multiple discrepant definitions of Centaur. In this work we adopt the definition of Jewitt (2009) that defines Centaurs as (1) objects with semi-major axes and perihelion distances that both fall between the orbits of Jupiter (5.2 au) and Neptune (30 au), and (2) the object must not be in a resonant orbit with a giant planet. A *resonant orbit* is defined as any situation when two bodies orbiting a parent body (the Sun in this case) share a similar orbit (1:1 ratio) or have mean orbital periods that are in integer ratios of each other (e.g., 3:2). For example, Jupiter Trojans (Figure 2.2) are co-orbital with Jupiter, leading and following Jupiter in its orbit by 60° , so these are not classified as Centaurs.

Centaurs, being significantly more distant than main-belt asteroids and NEOs, are much fainter and, consequently, harder to detect. Unlike active asteroids, active Centaurs were first identified belatedly from objects previously classified as comets. The first known active Centaur is often cited as being 29P/Schwassmann-Wachmann 1 (Figure 2.3), discovered in 1927 (Schwassmann & Wachmann, 1927) and, at the time, considered a comet. Notably, Centaur 2020 MK₄, an object which has an orbit very similar to that of 29P, was recently found to be active (de la Fuente Marcos et al., 2021). In 1977 the prototype Centaur (2060) Chiron was discovered (Kowal & Gehrels, 1977), an object that was itself later found to be active (Meech & Belton, 1990).

2.6 Dynamical Evolution

Orbits of all bodies in the solar system change continuously because of the influence of gravity imparted by other objects. Minor planets may experience gravitational perturbations that result in their orbit classification changing entirely, for example from Centaur to JFC. We define bodies that are in the process of migrating from one dynamical class to another as *transition objects*.

My favorite transition object, 39P/Oterma, was discovered by Liisi Oterma at Turku (Finland) in 1943 (Oterma, 1942). At the time of discovery, 39P/Oterma had a perihelion distance of 3.4 au and a semi-major axis of 4.0 au, placing it interior to the Centaur region. At the time, 39P/Oterma was either a QHC or JFC. However, on UT 1963 April 12, 39P/Oterma had a close encounter (0.095 au) with Jupiter that dramatically altered its orbit. Ever since, 39P/Oterma has had a perihelion distance and semi-major axis exterior to 5.4 au, placing this object firmly within the Centaurian orbital regime.

A recent example is P/2019 LD₂ (ATLAS), an object in an orbit similar to a Jupiter Trojan. Jupiter Trojans lead and trail Jupiter by 60° in orbit, however P/2019 LD₂ is not presently in either of those locations. P/2019 LD₂ (ATLAS) was most likely a Centaur before it arrived in its current orbit, and will

return to a Centaurian orbit in 2028, followed by a JFC orbit in 2063 (Hsieh et al., 2021a).

In Chapter 8 we present a study of 282P/(323137) 2003 BM₈₀, and object we classified as a QHO. Prior to 180 years ago 282P was likely a Centaur or possibly a JFC. After numerous close encounters with Jupiter, 282P migrated inward and was captured in a Quasi-Hilda orbit, which is an orbit with properties similar to the Hilda group that is in 3:2 resonance with Jupiter. Over the next 300 years or so 282P will undergo more encounters with Jupiter before it probably migrates to a JFC orbit.

2.7 Activity Detection Techniques

Prior to the invention of the telescope, cometary activity was discovered with the naked eye. Documented discoveries date back thousands of years, with written records of lost comets beginning with comet D/-674, and comets still familiar today starting with 1P/Halley, first recorded in -239 B.C. (Kronk, 1999). Here I discuss different modalities of activity detection, limiting the discussion to active asteroids and active Centaurs. Two important notes to bear in mind: (1) not all techniques have yielded new active body discoveries, and (2) some techniques have yet to validate activity claims through empirical visible activity identification (i.e., see a tail or coma), though some (but not all) disclaim that the objects highlighted should be considered candidates. These considerations are addressed as appropriate below.

2.7.1 Visually Observed Activity

Visual identification of a tail and/or coma remains the gold standard of activity detection. The Minor Planet Center (MPC) adds additional requirements for comet discovery, namely that the activity must be visible in at least two images taken during one observing night, and that two sets of images, preferably from adjacent observing dates, be submitted.

There can be a great deal of uncertainty when searching for activity indicators like coma(e) and/or tail(s). For example, background galaxies and image artifacts can masquerade as activity, especially when looking at just one image instead of a sequence where the solar system object moves against the sky. To account for ambiguity I created an informal system to describe the level of apparent activity in an image, ranging from 0 (unable to locate the object at all) to 9 (any individual shown a single image would have no doubt whatsoever that they are looking at cometary activity), described in Section 3.2.5.

Myriad techniques have been used to enhance images to bring out additional detail in the tails. In the same way modern image or photo editing tools can minimize shadows or enhance contrast, images of activity can be enhanced to bring out more detail. Another common technique is to add multiple images together (co-addition), sometimes referred to as stacking, thereby strengthening the overall image signal.




Figure 2.4: Activity discovered by fly-by and orbiter spacecraft missions may not be detectable from Earth. (a) Geysers of water reaching high above the surface of Enceladus were imaged by the Cassini spacecraft. Image Credit: NASA/JPL/Space Science Institute. (b) Gravel-sized particles (left) being ejected from the surface of (101955) Bennu were captured by the cameras aboard the OSIRIS-REx spacecraft. Image Credit: NASA/Goddard/University of Arizona/Lockheed Martin.

Activity detection is strongly influenced by measurement sensitivity. I normally think of activity detection as roughly falling into two categories: remote sensing and *in situ*. This dissertation focuses primarily on the study of activity detected from Earth, however several objects have been found to be active once visited by spacecraft. For example, (101955) Bennu had not been suspected of being active, but upon arrival of the Origins, Spectral Interpretation, Resource Identification, Security, Regolith Explorer (OSIRIS-REx) mission spacecraft in 2018, unexpected activity was documented by the cameras aboard the spacecraft (Figure 2.4). Thus Bennu is definitely active, but that activity has never been observed from Earth. Similarly, some planetary moons have been found to be active by spacecraft, for example Enceladus (Spencer et al., 2006), as shown in Figure 2.4. Pluto and Ceres represent special cases where an atmosphere (or exosphere) was detected remotely first, then by spacecraft later. In the case of Pluto, an atmosphere was detected remotely in 1989 (Elliot et al., 1989), then later studied up close by the New Horizons spacecraft flyby in 2015 (Stern et al., 2015). In the case of Ceres, the first asteroid discovered (Piazzi, 1801), water vapor was discovered by Küppers et al. (2014) with Herschel telescope observations. Following the arrival of the Dawn spacecraft at Ceres, activity in the form of water vapor was detected (Nathues et al., 2015; Thangjam et al., 2016), although a later study by Schröder et al. (2017) did not find any evidence of sublimation.

2.7.2 Brightness

Approaches connected with measuring the brightness of an object are often used in conjunction with other evidence to support a claim of activity, to allow for additional analyses, or both. There are three primary techniques involving brightness that have been used to find potentially active asteroids, two of which have yielded proven results.

Discrepant Brightness This method involves looking for unexpected brightening of objects which could be caused by activity reflecting additional light (see Cikota et al. 2014 for an example of a broad application). This is achievable by measuring how much light the asteroid reflects, and then comparing this result with an expected value. Note, however, that the source for expected values must provide precision photometry for a source with a well-measured phase function, ideally whilst inactive; sources such as Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) Horizons, while highly convenient, are widely considered only accurate to within a couple of magnitudes. Objects with activity should reflect more light, and thus should appear brighter than expected.

Point Spread Function Analysis The shape and size of points in an image is called a point spread function (PSF). By comparing the PSF of an object in an image to a comparably bright star in the same image can reveal if the width of a source is wider than expected, indicating that the source is extended (i.e., elongated). Finding asteroids that have unexpected broadening can be used for detecting activity (e.g., Hsieh et al. 2015a). The measurement of excess breadth is often used as direct evidence of activity, and measurements of the excess flux can reveal important information about the activity, such as the amount of material in a coma (this can also be considered image analysis, with the source of data being photons). See Figure 6.4 for an example.

2.7.3 Spectroscopic Indicators

Spectroscopy is the technique that measures markers in refracted light, as with a prism. The general idea is to identify features in spectra that reveal an object is active, whether the material be composed of volatiles or dust. However, to date spectroscopy has yet to identify an active asteroid that has a tail or coma visible from Earth.

This technique has been used successfully before to identify an asteroid as active. A notable example is the case of (1) Ceres (e.g., Küppers et al. 2014), albeit confirmation (Nathues et al., 2015; Thangjam et al., 2016) from the visiting Dawn mission spacecraft is disputed (Schröder et al., 2017). Moreover, spectroscopic study of minor planets has successfully identified surface ices in the past, including on bodies known to be

active (e.g., (2060) Chiron; see review, Peixinho et al. 2020). However, sublimation from MBCs has never been spectroscopically confirmed; see review by Snodgrass et al. (2017a).

Recently a group has applied a spectroscopic technique to attempt to identify active asteroids, most recently (24) Themis and (449) Hamburga (Busarev et al., 2021). Alas, to date none have been observed to display a visibly identifiable tail or coma, despite archival and observational efforts by astronomers, including archival and observational efforts by our team. In 2018 (162173) Ryugu, one of the objects identified as active by this technique (Busarev et al., 2018), was visited by the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA) spacecraft Hayabusa2 (Watanabe et al., 2017) for a sample return mission. No activity was reported, though there was evidence that the predominately dehydrated Ryugu (Sugita et al., 2019) had spun rapidly in the past (Watanabe et al., 2019) which could have resulted in mass shedding.

2.7.4 Non-gravitational Acceleration

All objects in the solar system experience acceleration due to the force of gravity. Unexplained acceleration can be caused by the gravity of an unknown body, such as the perturbations that resulted in the discovery of Neptune (see account by Standage 2000) or, more recently, the hypothesized Planet 9 (Trujillo & Sheppard, 2014; Batygin et al., 2019). However, not all unexplained acceleration is caused by gravity.

Sources of non-gravitational acceleration include the Yarkovsky effect (first measured on (6489) Golevka, Chesley et al. 2003), a force resulting from imparted solar radiation received by a body being reemitted later as thermal radiation. These types of forces are negligible over short timescales, yet some objects have demonstrably experienced changes in their orbits that could not be readily explained. For example, interstellar object 1I/‘Oumuamua evidently experienced non-gravitational acceleration (Micheli et al., 2018), possibly attributable to unseen activity (Seligman et al., 2019).

Activity can provide one potential source of non-gravitational acceleration, for example jets of gas. Thus, in principle, it should be possible to search for activity by scrutinizing the orbits of small solar system bodies and looking for unexplained changes. A recent example tries to link two bodies, 2019 PR₂ and 2019 QR₆, to cometary activity (Fatka et al., 2022), though no visible activity has been conclusively observed as of this writing.

2.7.5 Meteor Showers

This technique has yet to identify a new active asteroid, but active asteroid (3200) Phaethon has been identified as the apparent parent of the Geminid meteor showers (Whipple, 1983). In addition to the Geminid Meteor Stream, Phaethon shares an orbit with 2005 UD (Ohtsuka et al., 2006) and 1999 YC (Ohtsuka et al.,

2008), which suggests all co-orbital elements may have originated from the breakup of a single parent body. The case of Phaethon implies that it may be possible to connect other meteor streams back to parent bodies (e.g., Dumitru et al. 2017) that may themselves be active. See also reviews by Babadzhanov et al. (2015); Ye (2018).

2.7.6 Magnetic Anomalies

This approach has only been used once, to claim activity coming from (2201) Oljato or an outgassing debris trail in its orbit (Russell et al., 1984; Kerr, 1985). A series of interplanetary magnetic field enhancements were measured by the Pioneer spacecraft that was orbiting Venus. These events were correlated with the passage of Oljato during 7 of the 11 magnetic anomalies, with the likelihood the anomalies were coincidental given as 4 in 10^4 . However, despite some further evidence supporting Oljato activity (Cochran et al., 1986; McFadden et al., 1993; Chamberlin et al., 1996), all activity associated with Oljato to date has been inferred, rather than directly observed in the form of a coma or tail. The event may have been transient as Oljato’s orbit is considered chaotic (Milani et al., 1989).

2.8 Activity Mechanisms

Volatile sublimation is not the only cause of activity we observe. Moreover, the myriad mechanisms potentially responsible for observed activity are not mutually exclusive, and one activity mechanism may trigger another or occur simultaneously. Some events are stochastic (one-off), while other mechanisms are recurrent by nature. Consequently, recurrent activity is an important diagnostic indicator when ascertaining an underlying activity mechanism.

Below is a listing of mechanisms that may result in the kind of activity we observe associated with active asteroids and active Centaurs. See also the reviews of Jewitt et al. (2015c) and Jewitt (2009), as well as Table 4.1.

2.8.1 Volatile Sublimation

In the same way that dry ice goes directly from a solid to a gas on Earth’s surface, ices can sublimate in space to great effect, releasing volatiles and ejecting dust and rocky material. The primary activity mechanism of comets is volatile sublimation, and these bodies have been studied at length from Earth and *in situ* with spacecraft visits (e.g., Rosetta mission to 67P/Churyumov–Gerasimenko, Glassmeier et al. 2007; Sierks et al. 2015). In addition to water ice, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, ammonia, methane, nitrogen and other molecules have been detected on asteroids and Centaurs (see Chapter 6.2).

To be clear, volatiles need not be on the surface in order to sublimate, however remote detection of ices on inactive bodies requires ice to be present on the surface. These bodies may have reservoirs just under their surfaces or buried far below. Any group of bodies that harbors ice, no matter where that material is located on or within a body, represents a volatile reservoir. However, some bodies may not have any ices at all – especially silica-rich asteroids known as S-type asteroids. Silica, on Earth commonly associated with desiccant and sand, is typically dehydrated and thus not expected to contain volatiles.

Sublimation requires some form of energy change to take place, with energy imparted directly by the Sun being the most ubiquitous. The closer a body gets to the Sun, the more energy it receives and, as a result, activity becomes more likely if ice is present. Many recurrently active objects, especially comets, are observed to be preferentially active as they get closer to the Sun. Energy may also come from other sources, such as tidal heating (e.g., Europa, Greenberg et al. 1998) or ice phase transitions (see review, Jewitt 2009).

Different substances sublimate at different temperatures. Water ice, for example, will not appreciably sublimate at the orbital distances where Centaurs are found, but it can readily sublimate on bodies found in the asteroid belt. As a consequence the lifetime of ices varies by orbital distance so that, for example, it could be expected that water ice could survive on a body orbiting at 5 au but carbon monoxide and methane would have been depleted long ago (Schorghofer, 2008a; Snodgrass et al., 2017b). As described in Chapter 6.6, this knowledge can be leveraged to help identify which material(s) are most likely responsible for observed sublimation-driven activity.

2.8.2 Rotational Instability

All minor planets in our solar system rotate to some extent. Bodies that rotate rapidly can actually break apart or lose loose surface material to space. Small solar system bodies are susceptible to being “spun up” over time by the Sun by a process known as the Yarkovsky–O’Keefe–Radzievskii–Paddack (YORP) effect (see e.g., Bottke et al. 2006; Lowry et al. 2007 for details about YORP forces). Consequently, it is possible that rotational instability can lead to recurrent activity that is unrelated to sublimation (Jewitt et al., 2015b; Chandler et al., 2019). Even if activity is recurrent, the onsets of activity would be uncorrelated with perihelion distance.

Rotational instability can lead to sublimation involvement if, for example, a breakup or landslide exposes previously buried volatiles that subsequently sublimate. Activity may cease again if the volatiles become smothered by settling material that was previously ejected.

2.8.3 Thermal Fracture

Heating solid materials can cause fracture. On Earth we see this happen, for example, when pouring boiling water on a frozen car windshield. Fracture is caused when stress induced by temperature change (e.g., expansion of heated material) overcomes the tensile strength of adjoining material (Jewitt et al., 2015c). Depending on the orbit of an object, this could take place repeatedly, especially when the object is close to the Sun. This action alone may eject material into space and result in the appearance of cometary activity. Moreover, these fractures may expose sequestered volatiles that subsequently sublimate.

In the case of (3200) Phaethon, an active asteroid that is thought to be responsible for the Geminid meteor stream (Whipple, 1983), the body’s temperatures reaches roughly 1100 K (1520° F) at its 0.14 U perihelion (Ohtsuka et al., 2009), temperatures that can cause thermal fracture (Licandro et al., 2007; Kasuga & Jewitt, 2008) and in turn may result in mass loss (Li & Jewitt, 2013; Hui & Li, 2017). The JAXA mission Demonstration and Experiment of Space Technology for INterplanetary voYage with Phaethon fLyby and dUst Science (DESTINY+), scheduled to launch in 2024, is designed to provide more insights into Phaethon and its activity (Ozaki et al., 2022).

2.8.4 Impact

I divide impact events into two categories: significant events involving one or more large impactors (meter to kilometer scale), and micrometeorite impacts that involve multiple impacts by very small impactors typically of order 1 cm and smaller.

Two important cases of impact are worth mentioning here. (1) (596) Scheila is widely considered the seminal example of an impact-driven asteroid activity event (Bodewits et al., 2011; Ishiguro et al., 2011b; Moreno et al., 2011b). (2) The first active asteroid discovered, (4015) Wilson-Harrington (Figure 2.3) is thought to have undergone a significant impact event because the object was never observed to be active again, despite searches spanning over seventy years (e.g., Chamberlin et al. 1996).

Recently the OSIRIS-REx spacecraft arrived at asteroid (101955) Bennu for a sample return mission. Cameras aboard the spacecraft recorded what appeared to be gravel and other particulate leaving and returning to the surface (Figure 2.4). Micrometeorite impacts have been suggested as a potential cause (Lauretta et al., 2019; Bottke et al., 2020; Hergenrother et al., 2020), though thermal fracture and other mechanisms are still being investigated.

Gardening describes a process by which micrometeorite impacts overturn the outermost layer of a body. First described on the Moon (e.g., Chapman et al. 1970 and references therein), gardening theory can be used to place limits on the amount of mass shed by myriad processes, including electrostatic lofting (see below),

micrometeorite impacts (impact gardening) and photons (e.g., solar gardening; Grundy & Stansberry 2000). Although impact gardening has been correlated with absolute ages only on the Moon (Gault et al., 1974), impact gardening serves an important function of bringing ices closer to a body’s surface (Schorghofer, 2016), thus increasing the availability of material for sublimation.

2.8.5 Cryovolcanism

Just as volcanoes can eject molten material, cryovolcanoes can eject liquid and/or gaseous material from a cold body. Saturn’s moon Enceladus is also thought to undergo cryovolcanism (Figure 2.4) resulting from tidal heating (Nimmo et al., 2007), first observed as plumes by the Cassini spacecraft in 2005 (e.g., Spencer et al. 2006). Asteroid (1) Ceres is thought to undergo cryovolcanic activity (e.g., Sori et al. 2017; Nathues et al. 2020), most likely driven by radioactive heating (McCord et al., 2011), but evidence of cryovolcanic activity was only confirmed after the arrival of the Dawn spacecraft. To date it is unclear whether or not any activity on active asteroids or active Centaurs is primarily due to cryovolcanism, though cryovolcanism has been reported as responsible for the activity of 29P/Schwassmann-Wachmann 1 (Miles, 2016).

2.8.6 Radiation Pressure Sweeping

Solar wind exerts a force that can, in principle, sweep particles off of the surface of an airless body, especially one with a small gravitational field (Jewitt et al., 2015c). This effect may play an important role as a secondary action, carrying away material ejected via other means that would have otherwise settled back on the surface. This is thought to play an important role for (3200) Phaethon given its close (0.14) perihelion passage where radiation pressure is significant (Jewitt & Li, 2010). To date this effect has not been directly measured at an active asteroid, though the DESTINY+ mission may help us better understand the mechanisms at play on Phaethon.

2.8.7 Electrostatic Lofting

This mechanism was first observed by Apollo astronauts in the 1960 as a “lunar horizon glow” (Rennilson & Criswell, 1974; Wang et al., 2016). The electrostatic forces behind this mechanism may be powerful enough to eject material from the surface of small airless bodies such as asteroids. Should the material be lofted without sufficient energy for escape, a second activity mechanism (e.g., radiation pressure sweeping) could help carry the material away. Electrostatic lofting is a weak phenomenon, so it is unclear if this mechanism could result in activity detectable at distances farther than spacecraft orbit. However, Sonnett et al. (2011a) suggest very low-level activity on a broad scale ($\sim 5\%$ of main-belt asteroids, based on a study of ~ 1000

asteroids from Masiero et al. 2009) which may involve electrostatic lofting (Jewitt et al., 2015c).

2.8.8 Phyllosilicate Dehydration

Phyllosilicates are a class of minerals that are characterized by layering, such as mica or smectite clays. Hydrated phyllosilicates have volatiles like water trapped between layers. Laboratory studies of meteorites rich in hydrated phyllosilicates reveal that these volatiles can be released with significant energy when heated sufficiently (e.g., Gibson 1974). On large scales this modality may be the underlying cause of thermal fracture, but on small scales this release of energy has the potential to eject material from the surface of an airless body. This mechanism may be at play on asteroid (101955) Bennu (Lauretta et al., 2019) because the surface has an abundance of hydrated phyllosilicates (Hamilton et al., 2019).

2.8.9 Binary Rubbing

The two bodies of a binary asteroid may eventually spiral in and become a contact binary. The physical interaction between the rubbing binaries could cause material to be shed from the surfaces, resulting in a coma or tail. However, this mechanism has yet to be conclusively identified as the cause behind the activity of any known active asteroid, though it has been proposed as one possible explanation for the activity of active asteroid P/2013 P5 (Hainaut et al., 2014).

2.9 Citizen Science Project

Note: For completeness, this section provides a cursory introduction only. The project is described at length in Chapter 3.2.

Citizen Science is a paradigm that aims to accomplish scientific goals while simultaneously engaging the public by seeking assistance from volunteers to accomplish tasks that are too numerous for individuals or small groups to complete, and which are also too complex for computers to handle. As described in Chapter 3.2.2, our root method is to ask volunteers whether or not they see a tail or coma in images of known minor planets (e.g., asteroids, Centaurs) extracted from publicly available Dark Energy Camera (DECam) data. Once images are examined we can conduct follow-up investigation and study, as described in Chapter 3.3.1.

Zooniverse² is an online Citizen Science platform, known for its highly successful inaugural project *Galaxy Zoo* (Lintott et al., 2008) that launched in 2007. We selected Zooniverse to host our project because of their proven ability to host and support Citizen Science projects. Our Citizen Science project *Active Asteroids*, a National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Partner, launched on 31 August 2021. The project

²<https://zooniverse.org>

immediately began yielding results, and volunteers exhausted our original pool of data in just a few days. Since launch, over six thousand volunteers have completed roughly 2.5 million classifications of some two hundred thousand images.

2.10 Manuscript Introduction

We published numerous discoveries during preparations for the project. Here I chronologically introduce the manuscripts included in this dissertation, provide a brief synopsis of each, and describe how they relate to the overall dissertation theme of detecting and characterizing active minor planets via astrophysics and/or Citizen Science. Key points are indicated by **bold** typeface.

As discussed at the start of this chapter, I identified a need to identify additional active minor planets in order to facilitate their study. From the start we considered launching a Citizen Science project to assist with this task, however it seemed logical to first carry out a proof-of-concept to ensure we could, in fact, supply images of known solar system objects to Citizen Scientists who would check for activity like tails and comae. Searching Asteroids For Activity Revealing Indicators (SAFARI) was the title for our proof-of-concept (Chandler et al., 2018), provided in Chapter 4. We began by creating a software **pipeline** that produces thumbnail images (small cutouts from a larger image) from DECam data, each displaying a known minor planet at the center. This pipeline became the foundation of our Hunting for Activity in Repositories with Vetting-Enhanced Search Techniques (HARVEST) pipeline, discussed at length in Chapter 3.1.

From 594 DECam images we extracted a total of 35,640 thumbnail images that contained 11,703 unique solar system objects. We examined all of these thumbnails visually (by eye) and identified activity emanating from what turned out to be one already known active asteroid: (62412) 2000 SY₁₇₈. Identifying an active object in our data served as our **proof-of-concept**, demonstrating that DECam, with its wide ($2.2^\circ \times 2.2^\circ$) field of view and large 4 m aperture that probes very faintly, is well-suited for finding active bodies. We estimated an **activity occurrence rate** of 1 in 11,000 objects is active, in rough agreement with past studies that found a rate of roughly 1 in 10,000 (Jewitt et al., 2015c; Hsieh et al., 2015a). As part of our included background review we constructed a **comprehensive table** listing all active asteroids, along with details such as orbital distance, number of activity epochs, and diagnosed or suspected activity mechanism(s).

With the proof-of-concept a success we set out to improve upon the HARVEST pipeline, for example to query the DECam public archive to provide us with a plentitude of data, and to query the archive daily in order to keep our library of minor planet thumbnails up-to-date. Another capability we added to HARVEST was the ability to quickly provide us with thumbnail images from our repository of a single solar system object. An opportunity arose for us to make use of this feature after a telegram announced asteroid (6478) Gault

was active (Smith et al., 2019). For the work we would publish, *Six Years of Sustained Activity from Active Asteroid (6478) Gault* (Chandler et al., 2019), provided in Chapter 5), we produced thumbnails using this HARVEST feature and found evidence that Gault had been active during at least two prior orbits, thus Gault experienced **recurrent activity**. We also introduced *observability*, a metric describing how many hours per night an object is observable from a given location (Figure 5.2). This metric highlights observational biases (e.g., observer location) that can influence analyses such as activity mechanism diagnosis, as well as allowing us to assess how many images of a given object we have in our archive.

The onset of sublimation-driven activity typically occurs preferentially near perihelion, but we showed that Gault’s activity was not correlation with heliocentric distance. We carried out simple **thermal modeling** to estimate the temperatures experienced by Gault over the course of its orbit, and found it consistently too warm for water ice to have survived. In sum, we found activity unlikely to be sublimation-driven because (a) Gault is from a desiccated asteroid family (Phocaea), and (b) we found activity was unrelated to heliocentric distance. We proposed Gault may represent a **new type of active object**: recurrently active due to rotational spin-up.

Following the aforementioned expansion of the HARVEST pipeline to work with all publicly available DECam data we set out to examine large collections of thumbnails, on the order of 10,000 or more. The purpose of this exercise was to identify potential problems that would manifest in the thumbnails, such as handling chip gaps (Section 3.1) and enhancing contrast (Section 3.1.6). While examining a thumbnail collection composed of Centaurs we noticed visible evidence of activity in images of Centaur 2014 OG₃₉₂, an object not yet known to be active. Our **discovery of an active Centaur** would become the foundation for our work which culminated in the publication of *Cometary Activity Discovered on a Distant Centaur: A Nonaqueous Sublimation Mechanism* (Chandler et al., 2020), Chapter 6 of this dissertation.

Our discovery represented a milestone for our project as our first active object discovery, but first we needed to confirm the activity was real and not an image artifact. To this end, we first acquired follow-up observations with the DECam instrument on the Blanco 4 m telescope at Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory (CTIO) in Chile, the same instrument from which our archival images originated. Co-adding the four 250 s exposures revealed evidence of a coma. We next employed the Inamori-Magellan Areal Camera and Spectrograph (IMACS) instrument on the 6.5 m Walter Baade Telescope atop the Las Campanas Observatory in Chile, and these images provided strong evidence of activity. Finally we made use of the Large Monolithic Imager (LMI) on the 4.3 m Lowell Observatory Discovery Channel Telescope (DCT), now called the Lowell Discovery Telescope (LDT). Here we were able to measure colors of 2014 OG₃₉₂ that revealed it is optically red.

With the images we acquired we were able to detect a coma composed of $\sim 2.4 \times 10^{12}$ kg extending to at

least a distance of 400,000 km from 2014 OG₃₉₂. We introduced **a novel approach for estimating which molecular species are most likely responsible for observed activity**. We found carbon dioxide ice and/or ammonia ice the most likely to be sublimating, yet these two materials are optically grey. Thus an as yet unknown reddening agent must be present to account for the red color of 2014 OG₃₉₂. Upon publication of our work, the MPC gave this object the new designation of C/2014 OG392 (PANSTARRS). (Note: although provisional names like 2014 OG₃₉₂ are retained as part of comet designation (except for short-period comets), the numeric portion at the end of the designation is no longer represented with subscript text.)

Just prior to launching our Citizen Science project, a telegram announced the discovery of a new active asteroid, (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ (Fitzsimmons et al., 2021). We carried out an archival investigation into (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ that ultimately led to our publication *Recurrent Activity from Active Asteroid (248370) 2005 QN173: A Main-belt Comet* (Chandler et al., 2021c), dissertation Chapter 7. We found a single DECam image from 2016 July 22 (Figure 7.1) that unambiguously showed a tail emanating from (248370) 2005 QN173. Here **we introduced Wedge Photometry**, a tool that measures tail angle for (a) comparison with anti-Solar and anti-motion angles computed by JPL Horizons (Figure 2.1), and (b) activity detection techniques. Our Wedge Photometry tool found the tail orientation to be $251.3 \pm 1.3^\circ$, in close agreement with the 251.6° and 251.7° orientations computed by the JPL Horizons service.

The archival image showing activity we uncovered provided proof that the object had been active during at least one prior orbit. Thus **(248370) is recurrently active**, having undergone activity during at least two separate orbits. Moreover, we found (248370) was preferentially active near perihelion, only the 8th such main-belt asteroid known to exhibit this behavior. Recurrent activity near perihelion is a strong diagnostic indicator of volatile sublimation as the underlying activity mechanism. This combination of recurrent sublimation-driven activity of a main-belt asteroid is evidence that **(248370) is most likely a member of the MBCs**. After we announced our discovery via electronic telegram (Chandler et al., 2021b), (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ was assigned an additional designation: comet 433P.

At this point in time (31 August 2022) we successfully launched our National Science Foundation (NSF) funded NASA Partner Citizen Science project *Active Asteroids* (Section 3.2) and we started to identify candidate active objects and make discoveries. For example, **volunteers overwhelming classified two DECam images of 282P/(323137) 2003 BM₈₀ from 2021 as active**. Additionally, Citizen Scientists classified an image of 282P from 2013, then the only published activity epoch, as active. As described in *Migratory Outbursting Quasi-Hilda Object 282P/(323137) 2003 BM80* (Chapter 8, paper submitted to Astrophysical Journal Letters), we carried out a multifaceted study of 282P, also designated 2003 FV₁₁₂, consisting of an archival investigation, telescope follow-up observations, dynamical modeling, and thermody-

namical modeling. Notably, this work represents the first peer-reviewed publication to stem from our *Active Asteroids* Citizen Science project.

Our archival investigation yielded additional images of the object that showed evidence of activity. The last images of 282P activity we identified were over a year prior to the Citizen Science project discovery, so we set out to conduct an observational campaign with the goals of (1) determining whether or not 282P was still active and, if so, (2) evaluating ongoing activity for changes in morphology (e.g., shape, extent). Unfortunately, 282P was transiting the Milky Way, which meant there were too many stars to effectively identify activity indicators. We were awarded a Gemini Director’s Discretionary Time (DDT) observation at Gemini South that we timed to take place during an 11 day window when 282P was passing in front of a less dense region of the Galaxy. The program was successfully executed, yielding 18 images of 282P, and we saw an unmistakable tail (Figure 8.1). These images, in combination with our archival evidence of activity starting in March 2021, indicated that **282P had been active for at least 15 months**. Furthermore, we found 282P activity preferentially occurs near perihelion passage, typical of sublimation-driven activity, although additional study is needed to confirm this hypothesis.

Our orbital simulations (dynamical modeling) revealed that 282P only recently (< 200 yr ago) arrived at its present orbit. **We determined that 282P is a member of the rare (< 15) active Quasi-Hilda class** (e.g., Toth 2006a; Gil-Hutton & Garcia-Migani 2016), also referred to as Quasi-Hilda Objects (QHOs), Quasi-Hilda Comets (QHCs) or Quasi-Hilda Asteroids (QHAs). While Hilda asteroids orbit with a 3:2 resonance with Jupiter, QHCs are only loosely bound to the same region, and not necessarily in 3:2 resonance with Jupiter, as discussed at length in Chapter 8. Active Quasi-Hildas like 282P are rare with fewer than 15 active Quasi-Hildas have been found to date. 282P experienced strong interactions with Jupiter and Saturn that dramatically altered its orbit. Of special note, our simulations revealed that 282P used to orbit primarily beyond Jupiter, but now it orbits predominantly interior to Jupiter’s orbit. Moreover, 282P will undergo a Jovian interactions in roughly 300 years that will again substantially change its orbit. Giant planet perturbations are so strong, in fact, that dynamical chaos prior to 200 years ago and 300 years in the future prevent exact determination of 282P’s origin and future orbital regime. However, when evaluating the possible outcomes of the forward and backward simulations, we identified JFCs and Centaurs as potential origins of 282P, and that 282P will likely become a JFC in the future, though there is also a chance it may become an active asteroid. Thus **282P reveals a potential pathway that informs us about the origins of some active asteroids**.

Although outside the scope of this dissertation, we mention here that we are actively working on additional discoveries stemming from the *Active Asteroids* project. These include newfound active asteroids, active Centaurs, QHCs, JFCs, and companions to objects such as Trans-Neptunian objects (TNOs). Anyone

interested can partake in this exciting scientific journey by participating in *Active Asteroids*³.

³<http://activeasteroids.net>

Chapter 3

Comprehensive Discussion of Methods and Materials

Each individual manuscript included in this dissertation includes descriptions of the methods utilized for the work therein. Here I provide updates, additional depth, and unified descriptions.

3.1 HARVEST Pipeline

The pipeline that ultimately produces thumbnails for examination by Citizen Scientists, myself, and my science team, is called Hunting for Activity in Repositories with Vetting-Enhanced Search Techniques (HARVEST). The pipeline was first described in the Searching Asteroids For Activity Revealing Indicators (SAFARI) proof-of-concept (Chandler et al. 2018, Chapter 4). HARVEST has evolved substantially since then into the pipeline described here.

3.1.1 Pipeline Overview

As shown in Figure 3.1, the HARVEST pipeline runs in a series of steps, from Step 1 to Step 8 (described in detail below). In Step 1 we query public astronomical image archives for metadata that describes observations (e.g., UT observing date, sky coordinates, exposure time). Concurrently we query external services, such as the Minor Planet Center (MPC), for new and updated information about minor planets, such as designations, orbital parameters (e.g., semi-major axis, eccentricity). In Step 2 we estimate the depth (faintness reached) for each image, exclude duplicate datafiles that stemmed from the same observation, assign dynamical classes to objects, and compute parameters such as Tisserand’s parameter with respect to Jupiter. In Step 3 we query **SkyBot** to determine which minor planets may be in each field discovered in Step 1; here we also estimate the detection viability for each object identified by SkyBot. In Step 4 we begin downloading data from the astronomical archives, then determine the sky coordinates for all charge-coupled device (CCD) chips. In Step 5 we extract thumbnail images of the desired minor planets from the archival data. During Step 6 we examine the thumbnail images, excluding those that we deem unlikely to yield results via our Citizen Science project. In Step 7 we run automated reporting code that describe, for example, how many thumbnail




Figure 3.1: The Hunting for Activity in Repositories with Vetting-Enhanced Search Techniques (HARVEST) daily pipeline. The primary eight steps are sequential. Tasks within each step start from the top of the enclosing rectangle and finish at the bottom. Green shaded regions indicate processes that may be executed in parallel. Each step and the constituent tasks are described in text.

images per square degree on sky we have in HARVEST. Finally, in Step 8, we conduct maintenance tasks such as purging datafiles that have completed all stages of the pipeline.

The HARVEST pipeline is run daily and is a blend of serial and parallel processes, visually depicted in Figure 3.1. All steps are carried out on Monsoon, the Northern Arizona University (NAU) High Performance Computing cluster. All parallel tasks and most serial tasks are executed using the Slurm scheduler (Yoo et al., 2003).

HARVEST is primarily written in Python (v3.x) with parent shell scripts executing code via Slurm scripts. Binary components are entirely supplied by the Anaconda¹ environment and thus require no manual compilation. Most operations involve a MySQL² relational database of my own design, which I describe in the next section.

3.1.1.1 Overarching Principles

Three critical overarching principles apply throughout the entire HARVEST pipeline:

A. Task Counting An optimization that applies to virtually every element of the pipeline is task counting. This determines how much work is necessary in order to (a) evaluate whether or not Slurm is necessary and, if so, (b) assess how many Slurm jobs are needed for each task. Task counting is also used in reporting to ensure the daily pipeline is not falling behind in any area (e.g., catalog queries). The number of jobs launched depends on factors such as the amount of memory needed and the intensity of disk access required. We arrived at these values through trial and error during the development of the HARVEST pipeline.

B. Exclusion Nearly every database table and most tasks involve either excluding data we determine is unfit for use, or ignoring previously excluded data. Exclusion is discussed in in Sections 3.1.2.1, 3.1.7.1, and 3.1.9.1.

C. Self-awareness of Elapsed Computing Time To account for the finite time allotted for each process, all tasks executed through the HARVEST pipeline keep track of elapsed time and periodically compute how much time is remaining. This is primarily accomplished through environment variables, but a secondary layer of signaling via the operating system and/or Slurm allows tasks to be systematically warned they are almost out of time. This awareness enables (a) tasks to safely wrap up whatever they are doing (e.g., write data to disk), (b) the pipeline to understand the underlying tasks were not finished, and (c) Slurm scheduler optimization, especially back-fill (making use of leftover compute time on the compute cluster).

¹<https://www.anaconda.com/>

²<https://www.mysql.com/>

D. Self-limiting Service Calls Tasks that call external services (e.g., Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), MPC) may unduly tax host servers. Services typically determine the origin of queries by one or two methods: the originating Internet Protocol (IP) address and/or (if supported) an identifier (e.g., email address) embedded in an Application Programming Interface (API) call. Some external services may “blacklist” (block) queries, usually from a specific IP address. To address this, we limit the number of queries per minute based on rates we ascertained via documentation and communicate with external service providers as needed.

E. Logging Extensive logging is crucial for diagnosing problems and, importantly, easily assessing what (if any) tasks need to be repeated. Thus we output information such as how far a task has progressed and what item or objects are being processed.

F. Notifications Mobile device notifications allow me to monitor the pipeline and attend to problems promptly. For example, a program will monitor jobs submitted for execution and send one of the science team that the jobs are complete.

G. Dynamically Interactive Code Interactive elements are eliminated from the automated pipeline, but interactive elements play a crucial role in parts of the system that are executed outside of the pipeline, such as choosing a replacement for a bad datafile. We designed and implemented a system that enables tasks to “know” whether or not they are being executed in a supervised mode amenable to interaction. Otherwise, tasks running on compute nodes would ask for user input which is impossible to acquire.

H. Permanence A completely dynamic system can be flexible and change information, for example updating a minor planet’s designation. This is possible internally in HARVEST, but some properties must remain fixed once set because of Citizen Science involvement. For example, a thumbnail name cannot change once assigned, because the thumbnail name is the identifying feature that allows linkage between the Citizen Science project and HARVEST.

I. Minor Planet Identity Management Managing names, identifications, and designations has proven to be one of the most difficult aspects of the pipeline. Requesting a specific solar system object occurs during the vast majority of pipeline tasks. Challenges include handling identity when an object breaks apart (e.g., P/2016 J1-A and P/2016 J1-B, Hui et al. 2017) or, more commonly, deciding how to handle objects that become consolidated (linked, e.g., P/2022 C₄ = P/2010 LK₃₆ = P/2016 MD = P/2016 PM₁ WISE-PANSTARRS, Fitzsimmons & Weryk 2022) or retracted (e.g., 2011 UH₄₁₃ and 2013 QQ₉₅, Deen & Weryk 2020).

3.1.2 HARVEST Step 1: Catalog Queries

The first step of my pipeline is to query catalog services that provide details about telescopic observations and information about solar system objects.

3.1.2.1 Image Archives

We query astronomical image archives for metadata, especially Universal Time (UT) observation date/time, sky coordinates, broadband filter, and the release date when the data becomes publicly available. At this stage we perform several initial checks and exclude images that do not meet specific criteria:

1. **Airmass:** Pointings must be below 3 airmasses.
2. **Moon Separation:** Observations with Moon separations $< 4^\circ$ are excluded; we compute the Moon separation ourselves, with the distance computed between the Moon's center and the center of the telescope pointing provided in the image archive metadata.
3. **Invalid Coordinates:** We exclude observations with illegal coordinates (e.g., Right Ascension (RA) above 360° , e.g., Dark Energy Camera (DECam) archive filename c4d_201123_040730_ooi_i_v1.fits.fz).
4. **Processing Type:** We exclude raw data, stacked (co-added) images, and non-image data (e.g., data quality masks). We exclude RAW data because (a) activity is harder to detect, and (b) the embedded World Coordinate System (WCS) are insufficient for our thumbnail purposes (i.e., the object may not appear near the center of a thumbnail image). Stacked data are excluded because they often produce images that eliminate the object or introduce image artifacts likely to complicate activity detection.
5. **Broadband Filter:** We keep broadband filters (e.g., Sloan) and exclude others (e.g., $H\alpha$) that are unlikely to show faint activity. The retained filters are U, B, V, R, I, u, g, r, i, z, Y, J, H, K, M, VR, V+R, g+r+i, g+i, and variants therein (e.g., i variants include DECam-i, SDSS-i, and MegaPrime-i).

We note that it is not uncommon in big data applications, such as with the HARVEST processing astronomical image archive metadata, to encounter rare but problematic peculiarities such as sky coordinates outside of the defined range (e.g., $RA > 360^\circ$) or representing an impossible elevation for a telescope to reach. Hence we implement safeguards to screen for these data which would otherwise cause problems for software not designed to handle these situations.

NSF's NOIRLab AstroArchive The National Science Foundation (NSF) National Optical and Infrared Laboratory (NOIRLab) AstroArchive³ is the primary source for data submitted for volunteer examination,

³<https://astroarchive.noirlab.edu>

DECam image data from the Blanco 4 m telescope at the Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory (CTIO) in Chile. We also incorporate the Kitt Peak National Observatory (KPNO) 4 m telescope archival data that AstroArchive hosts. Note: DECam images and metadata were hosted at the National Optical Astronomy Observatory (NOAO) prior to their consolidation into NOIRLab.

CADC The Canadian Astronomy Data Centre (CADC)⁴ hosts archival data and provides search tools for many astronomical instruments. At present we query the CADC for Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope (CFHT) MegaPrime and Wide-field Infrared Camera (WIRCam) metadata.

3.1.2.2 Minor Planet Data

These tasks query external services for minor planet data including orbital parameters, designations, and rotation periods.

Minor Planet Center The MPC provides tabular data describing objects (asteroids and comets) and their orbits. The MPC also serves as our first line of inquiry for object numbers, names, and provisional designations.

Kinoshita Comet Pages The late Kazuo Kinoshita was an amateur astronomer in Japan who computed comet orbits and maintained a website⁵ of comets. These pages included some orbital elements (e.g., perihelion distance) and name permutations we were unable to locate anywhere else. Kazuo Kinoshita passed away in 2021 July.

Ondřejov Discoveries This website, hosted at Arizona State University (ASU)⁶, contains a list of discoveries made at Ondřejov Observatory (site code 557). These names may not be present in MPC or JPL Horizons data, either because the object has a slightly different spelling or the object has a name completely unknown to the MPC and Horizons. Importantly, the Institut de Mécanique Céleste et de Calcul des Éphémérides (IMCCE) Quaero Service⁷, which serves the names returned by IMCCE SkyBot (described below in Section 3.1.4.1), may return names that are found at this website but not necessarily at the MPC or JPL Horizons (Section 3.1.3.2).

Astorb The Lowell Observatory Asteroid Orbital Elements Database (AstOrb)⁸ (Bowell et al., 1994; Moskovitz et al., 2021) contains object designations, orbital classifications, and related orbital elements

⁴<http://www.cadc-ccda.hia-ihp.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca>

⁵<https://jcometobs.web.fc2.com>

⁶<http://www.asu.cas.cz/~asteroid/news/numbered.htm>

⁷<https://ssp.imcce.fr/webservices/ssodnet/api/quaero/>

⁸<https://asteroid.lowell.edu/main/astorb/>

(e.g., semi-major axis). This dataset is primarily used to provide orbital elements we were unable to attain elsewhere, and as an additional source for minor planet designations.

3.1.3 HARVEST Step 2: New Data Handling

3.1.3.1 Datafile-specific Operations

Magnitude Estimates For computationally expedient and consistent estimation of depth we first compute a rough estimated magnitude depth for a given combination of exposure time, telescope/instrument, and broadband filter. The method we use is telescope-specific because whenever possible we use the observatory-supplied exposure time calculator (ETC), sometimes referred to as an integration time calculator (ITC). In cases where we are unable to use an observatory-supplied ETC we make use of the DECam ETC⁹, replacing the default mirror effective surface as needed. We compute an estimated magnitude reachable with a signal to noise ratio (SNR) of 10. For filters that are not already *V* band we offset the filter-specific depth to a generic *V*-band depth by applying an offset from known solar apparent Vega magnitudes¹⁰ (Willmer, 2018). The purpose of this step is to match the *V*-band magnitudes supplied by ephemeris services (e.g., JPL Horizons) for later use in determining the viability of activity detection (Delta Magnitude, Section 3.1.4). To be clear, we only need a very rough estimate of depth for the purpose of gauging activity detection viability for each exposure.

Version Selection involves choosing a single datafile for thumbnail extraction (Section 3.1.6). All others are excluded as they are essentially duplicates. This process is necessary for two reasons: (1) some images have multiple versions of a specific processing application, or (2) multiple viable image processing techniques are available for a single observation.

3.1.3.2 Object-Specific Data Handling

Object Class A solar system object can qualify as a member of more than one dynamical class. For example, all Apollo asteroids are types of near-Earth objects (NEOs) and some (but not all) Mars-crossing asteroids are NEOs. At present we assign a primary class to each solar system object. Classes in HARVEST are Comet, Amor, Apollo, Aten, Mars-crosser, inner Main-belt (IMB), middle Main-belt (MMB), outer Main-belt (OMB), Cybele, Hungaria, Jupiter Family Comet (JFC), Hilda, Trojan, Centaur, Damocloid, Trans-Neptunian object (TNO)/Kuiper Belt object (KBO), or Interstellar Object. The MPC and JPL Small Body Database (SBDB) do not contain all of these dynamical classes (e.g., Damocloid) so we take additional

⁹<https://noirlab.edu/science/documents/scidoc0494>

¹⁰<http://mips.as.arizona.edu/~cnaw/sun.html>

steps to reclassify objects. For example, we perform a check to reclassify objects labeled as Centaurs with a $T_J < 2$ as Damocloids, and $2 < T_J < 3$ as JFCs. These distinctions help us to collect thumbnail images from our library and organize them by dynamical class for efficient examination. The default position is to assume the class provided with the IMCCE SkyBot results. We generally do not reclassify an object once a thumbnail image is produced because the object class is contained (as a code) in the thumbnail name for convenience, and the thumbnail names cannot be changed once submitted to *Active Asteroids* for Citizen Scientist classification.

NASA JPL Object Data In order to optimize calculations and reduce query calls to JPL we maintain our own internal database of NASA JPL provided solar system object-specific parameters, such as rotation period (used for observation planning) and semi-major axis a . Our queries to JPL come in two forms: the JPL Horizons ephemeris service¹¹ and the JPL Small Body Database Lookup service¹², both of which return object-specific information.

Solar System Object Parameters During this phase we attempt to collect a unified set of object-specific dynamical properties, namely semi-major axis a , inclination i , eccentricity e , perihelion distance q , and aphelion distance Q . At this stage we compute the Tisserand parameter (Tisserand, 1896) with respect to Jupiter, T_J , commonly used as a metric to quantify the gravitational interaction between Jupiter and a small body given their respective orbits (Kresák, 1972). The parameter is given by

$$T_J = \frac{a_J}{a} + 2\sqrt{(1 - e^2) \frac{a}{a_J}} \cos(i), \quad (3.1)$$

where e represents osculating eccentricity, i orbital inclination, a the semi-major axis of the body, and a_J is Jupiter’s semi-major axis.

3.1.4 HARVEST Step 3: Assessing Fields

These tasks are specific to a Field record, defined as a unique combination of an observing date/time and sky coordinates. Multiple field records may exist for a single observation as sky coordinates are adjusted during the astrometry phase of the pipelines used with, for example, DECam data.

¹¹<https://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/horizons/>

¹²https://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/tools/sbdb_lookup.html

3.1.4.1 SkyBot

Query The IMCCE SkyBot service¹³ (Berthier et al., 2006) allows a user to determine which solar system objects (if any) may be present in an astronomical image given (1) the UT date/time, (2) RA and Declination (Dec) sky coordinates, and (3) an angular shape that specifies the size of the area to search. The shape chosen ideally minimizes area not covered by an imaging detector. Given the roughly circular shape of the DECam chip arrangement, we primary use the radius (1.1°) of the 2.2° field of view (FOV) to conduct a *cone search*. We also use rectangular queries for instruments more suitable to this configuration, for example CFHT MegaCam. Queries are carried out using the online SkyBot API.

Resubmitting Fields For each query submitted, SkyBot returns a unique ticket ID. Along with the date of the query we keep track of the age of each SkyBot Ticket record. We limit the number of SkyBot queries per day, however we try not to allow Ticket dates to exceed 90 days of age. We institute these policies to accommodate new object discovery as well as improvements to object orbital elements. We wrote a program that will flag specific Ticket records for resubmitting to SkyBot based on orbital parameters, however the 90 day age limit has proven far more computationally efficient and fewer overall queries to the SkyBot servers.

3.1.4.2 Delta Magnitudes

During the SkyBot step we compute a simple metric that describes how much brighter (or fainter) an object will appear as compared to the depth of the exposure we computed during Magnitude Estimates (Section 3.1.3. The metric is

$$\Delta_{\text{mag}} = V_{\text{JPL}} - V_{\text{ITC}}, \quad (3.2)$$

where V_{JPL} is the Horizons provided apparent V -band magnitude computed for the object at the time of exposure, and V_{ITC} is the V -band magnitude depth we computed for this exposure, as described in Section 3.1.3. $\Delta_{\text{mag}} < 0$ indicates the object will likely appear bright enough in the image to be detected, whereas $\Delta_{\text{mag}} > 0$ would not. We set a maximum Δ_{mag} of -1 for all detections. Note: the apparent magnitude is computed by Horizons, however the object may appear brighter or fainter, for example, in cases of activity outburst or prior mass loss, respectively. At the time of this writing, roughly 57% (~ 21 million) of all potential minor planet detections in HARVEST were excluded because of the Δ_{mag} threshold.




Figure 3.2: Examples of trails resulting from high rates of apparent motion on the sky. Images credit: this work. **Left:** Comet C/2014 QU₂ (PANSTARRS) as observed by DECam on UT 2014 September 22 (Prop. ID 2014B-0303, PI Sheppard). Even with a trail length of about 100 pixels, activity is still clearly visible in the upward direction. **Right:** Apollo class NEO 2014 EH₄₅ observed by DECam on UT 2014 March 27 (Prop. ID 2014A-0479, PI Sheppard) with an approximately 280 pixel length trail. The variable brightness seen along the length of the trail is diagnostic of fast rotation.

3.1.4.3 Trail Length

Delta pixels is a metric we compute that describes the number of pixels an object appears to travel across the FOV (Figure 3.2), given the pixel scale of the instrument and the object’s apparent rate of motion on the sky. We use this value to screen, for example, images for use in Citizen Science training and the Field Guide, described in Section 3.2.

This value may be used in the future to exclude thumbnails with long (e.g., > 15 pixel) trails that may be confusing to volunteers and lead to activity detection false positives. Alternatively, in response to *Active Asteroid* volunteer comments, we may use this value to help search for fast-rotating asteroids known as fast-rotators (Figure 3.2). These trails may appear to have variable width, or even appear dashed, depending on the physical geometry of the object and its rotation speed.

3.1.5 HARVEST Step 4: Thumbnail Preparations

The thumbnail preparation tasks in this section are conducted in parallel because we do not wait for datafiles to download. Instead, we work with the datafiles already on disk, and return to incomplete or missing datafiles during a subsequent pipeline execution. This avoids long delays induced if we wait for large quantities of

¹³<https://ssp.imcce.fr/webservices/skybot/>




Figure 3.3: This mosaic shows the CCD chip arrangement of the Dark Energy Camera (DECam) instrument. Image data is not recorded anywhere outside of the CCD chips (rectangles). Areas between chips are commonly referred to as “chip gaps.”

data to finish downloading from archives.

3.1.5.1 Data Download

During this phase we perform several tasks: (1) check datafiles flagged as “on disk” to ensure they are actually present and, if not, flag the datafile as “to download.” We generate bash scripts for daemons (persistent tasks) dedicated to downloading data. Datafiles are typically flagged for download for three reasons: (1) new data was added to an astronomical archive that does not have a proprietary period, (2) datafiles known by HARVEST with proprietary periods that have since ended, and (3) a new solar system object was found in a datafile we previously had finished processing and purged from disk.

3.1.5.2 File Inspection

Chip Corners Here we examine in parallel downloaded image data and populate a database table with the sky coordinates (RA, Dec) of each corner of each camera chip. This step provides an order-of-magnitude speed increase (as compared with manually reading the bounds from an image file) when determining which solar system objects do not fall on a chip, either because they are on a chip gap, or on a chip that is not functional at the time of observation (as is the case for some DECam images). Moreover, with the corner coordinates recorded, we do not need to download a datafile previously processed and purged to check chip

corners because the coordinates are already cached in our database. Chips gaps are the spaces between the CCD chips of cameras that use multiple detectors; these gaps do not record any image data.

Header Archiving As part of Chip Corners we also write a compressed text file to disk containing all (primary and chip-specific) header information for each archival image file. This allow us to make use of data held in headers even after the parent datafile has been purged.

3.1.6 HARVEST Step 5: Thumbnail Extraction

This stage consists of two steps executed in parallel. We process up to 50 datafiles simultaneously, which stays below our estimated High Performance Computing (HPC) cluster file system throughput limit.

3.1.6.1 FITS Thumbnails

We extract Flexible Image Transport System (FITS) format “cutouts” (extracted region of image data) of each unexcluded SkyBot result (Section 3.1.4.1). We first execute a Structured Query Language (SQL) query of our internal database table that stores records of chip corners (Section 3.1.5.2) to determine which chip should contain the image of the object. If the object does not fall within the bounds of any chip, the thumbnail and associated SkyBot records are excluded, so (1) we do not attempt to extract the thumbnail image again, and (2) our database queries remain optimized, and (3) statistical reports reflect current state of HARVEST (e.g., number of thumbnail images processed). If the object is located within the bounds of a camera chip then we perform an image cutout that produces a 480×480 pixel thumbnail image in FITS format. We handle boundary conditions (e.g., the object falls near a chip edge) by filling empty pixels coordinates with NULL values.

Crucial for future analyses, our Thumbnail Extraction Tool adjusts the WCS to match the cutout image prior to writing the FITS file to disk. WCS in FITS headers provide a reference that effectively translates pixel coordinates to sky coordinates. For convenience and record completeness we also copy global header values (e.g., observation date and time) and the headers associated with the corresponding chip to the resulting FITS format thumbnail image file.

3.1.6.2 PNG Thumbnails

We convert the FITS format thumbnail to a Portable Network Graphics (PNG) image file. In order to maximize the likelihood of activity detection, we carry out an iterative rejection technique to determine the best contrast range for the image (see Chapter 4.2.4 for details).




Figure 3.4: The three causes for excluding a thumbnail during the Source Analysis section of the Hunting for Activity in Repositories with Vetting-Enhanced Search Techniques (HARVEST) pipeline. (a) Empty center: there is no object at the center of the frame to inspect. (b) Crowded field: there are too many sources in the center 270×270 pixels, making identification of the target difficult. (c) Blended sources: multiple overlapping sources are seen here, making it difficult to identify which source (if any) is the target.

3.1.7 HARVEST Step 6: Post Thumbnails

Source Analysis, which is carried out in parallel, must conclude prior to the Counting steps, which may all be performed in parallel.

3.1.7.1 Source Analysis

We make use of **SExtractor** (Bertin & Arnouts, 2010) to determine the pixel coordinates of each point source within each thumbnail image. At this stage we exclude thumbnail images for cases which would be confusing to volunteers or unlikely to lead to an activity detection. The three exclusion causes are given with numbers current as of 10 July 2022, when HARVEST had a total of 22,004,739 unexcluded thumbnail images, spanning all instruments. An example from each scenario is provided in Figure 3.4.

(1) No source was detected within the center 20×20 pixels of the thumbnail image (Figure 3.4a). This resulted in 16% of thumbnails being excluded, 4,248,133 in total. **SExtractor** detects even faint sources, so if it cannot identify an object at the center of the frame we do not expect volunteers to be able to either. This may be due to poor observing conditions or cases where the object did not appear directly in the center of the frame because, for example, there was a high positional uncertainty.

(2) Too many (> 150) sources were in the center 270×270 pixels of the thumbnail image (Figure 3.4b). The 952,289 thumbnails excluded for this reason represents another 4% reduction in the total number of viable thumbnails. This situation makes identifying which object is the target confusing for volunteers.

(3) When there are too many (> 5) overlapping (blended) sources at the center of the frame (Figure 3.4c)

it can be very difficult to determine which source is the object of interest. This is the least common cause for thumbnail exclusion, with just 84,697 (0.4%) thumbnails excluded. We exclude these images because it can be exceptionally difficult to identify the object of interest in the image.

3.1.7.2 Source Tallying

Objects per Field At this point all exclusion routines have finished executing. We tally how many unexcluded solar system objects are present in each field. This step optimizes our analysis of the distribution of on-sky of solar system objects (see Chapter 9).

SkyBot Source Density We tally unexcluded SkyBot results associated with each SkyBot Ticket record. Tickets include a unique identification for the query performed, and this metric is used for later internal reporting. Tracking tickets is also crucial for troubleshooting with, for example, the IMCCE.

Observation Source Tally Consolidation We consolidate the above tallies into the parent Observation records in our database to optimize analysis tasks. For example, this optimization reduces the compute time for plotting the sky distribution of minor planets in our database (Figure 9.1) by orders of magnitude.

3.1.8 HARVEST Step 7: Reporting

SkyBot Reports Here we determine the age of SkyBot tickets and create an overview of the status of all fields. This provides a status of SkyBot queries within HARVEST and can be diagnostic of problems (e.g., if many tickets are much older than 90 days). These reports are periodically reviewed by our science team.

Objects per Field Plot This plot (Figure 9.1) shows how many solar system objects are present for each telescope pointing in our database. These data derive from the tallies executed in Step 6 (Section 3.1.7.2). The Objects per Field Plot has many uses, including revealing gaps in sky coverage which, in turn, result in observational biases. For example, this plot shows how far north and to what degree our sky coverage extends from our predominately southern hemisphere originating observations.

3.1.9 HARVEST Step 8: Maintenance

3.1.9.1 Datafile Routines

Datafile Checks We inspect downloaded datafiles to ensure datafile integrity; this additional check is a secondary stage, prompted by flags set during HARVEST Step 4: Thumbnail Preparations (Section 3.1.5). Here we check FITS standards for each image data and header extension of the file, as well as a basic file size

check. Datafiles that we determine are corrupt we attempt to download a second time. Should the second datafile also be corrupt, we flag the datafile as “bad” in our database and attempt to find a replacement, either a different version or another acceptable image processing type.

Datafile Exclusion by Property This task excludes datafile records based on specific properties. At present the only task is excluding datafiles with exposure times < 1 s, including NULL, 0 s, and negative exposure time values.

Purge Datafiles As we do not have the storage space to keep a copy of all data we download from astronomical data archives we must delete files once we have finished carrying out all steps of the HARVEST pipeline.

3.1.10 Auxiliary Procedure: Comparison Images




Figure 3.5: Comparison between two identical areas on sky, imaged with similar circumstances (e.g., instrument, exposure time, broadband filter), but taken at times far apart enough that the solar system object would not appear in the comparison image. Images credit: this work. **Left:** This thumbnail image of Jupiter Family Comet (JFC) 2015 TC₁ was taken on UT 2015 December 19 (Prop. ID 2012B-0001, PI Frieman) and submitted for examination by *Active Asteroids* (<http://activeasteroids.net>) volunteers; all volunteers classified this image as showing activity, and several users also shared this image in the Talk forums as a potentially active object. **Right:** This image of the same field was captured UT 2016 January 1 (Prop. ID 2012B-0001, PI Frieman) probes somewhat fainter than the original image on the left. The comparison illustrates that there is no background galaxy or other phenomenon present at the exact coordinate where 2015 TC₁ was seen.

A common situation arises where a thumbnail shows what appears to be activity, but the activity is ambiguous. For example, Citizen Scientists highlighted a thumbnail image (Figure 3.5) as having activity,

through discussion forums as well as classification. To ascertain whether or not suspected activity is actually a background source (e.g., galaxy), a comparable image (e.g., same area on sky, similar depth) could be useful, so long as enough time has elapsed such that the solar system object is no longer in the field; this could be from minutes to days later, depending on the object’s apparent rate of motion.

I created a tool, which we employ on a case-by-case basis, to address this scenario by finding *comparison images* to accompany the image with potential activity. My tool employs a systematic approach to find the closest match as possible, prioritizing (in approximate order) (1) enough time has elapsed to ensure the object is not in the FOV based on the object’s apparent rate of motion, (2) instrument, (3) delta magnitude limit (Section 3.1.4), (4) broadband filter, and (5) processing type. (Processing types vary by instrument. For DECam we make use of InstCal and Resampled images. The latter incorporates more processing but is not available for all images in the archive.) Crucially, the tool relies on our internal database of chip corner coordinates (Section 3.1.5.2). Once potential comparison image sources have been identified (I set the default to be five comparison images) then the datafiles are flagged for download and download scripts generated. Once downloads have finished we then run a separate tool that produces the thumbnail cutout images.

3.2 Citizen Science Project

We chose the Citizen Science platform *Zooniverse*¹⁴ for our project, named *Active Asteroids*¹⁵. Zooniverse has a proven track record of success and, importantly, they provided customization and support that facilitates any hosted project’s success.

The overall process, from inception to launch, is as follows:

1. Prepare project on Zooniverse (see sections below)
2. Conduct an initial “Beta Release” to test project viability
3. Formally launch the project (i.e. open to the public)
4. In a cyclic fashion we continue to
 - a. Interact with volunteers via online forums and Zooniverse messages, the internal Zooniverse inter-user communication system similar to email
 - b. Download and analyze results
 - c. Prepare and upload the next set of images

¹⁴<https://www.zooniverse.org>

¹⁵<http://activeasteroids.net>




Figure 3.6: Landing page for the *Active Asteroids* Citizen Science project hosted at Zooniverse. The logo we designed is at the top-left. The horizontal blue text box displays updates we provide to volunteers. The green box indicates the project status; as indicated, the project was complete, so uploading another Subject Set (collection of images) would be the next step in our workflow.

- d. Notify volunteers that additional work is available via Twitter and an email newsletter sent by Zooniverse
- e. Conduct scientific investigation (Section 3.3) into the resulting candidates as they become available

3.2.1 Project Components

Zooniverse provides a standard framework for each project. All users start at the project landing page, shown in Figure 3.6. From there Citizen Scientists can begin classifying (working) immediately or navigate to one of the other pages, described below.

3.2.2 Workflow

The *Workflow* describes the task we are asking the Citizen Scientists to perform. The *Active Asteroids* workflow is concise: we ask volunteers whether or not they see activity emanating from the object at the




Figure 3.7: The *Active Asteroids* project workflow is simply to ask whether or not volunteers can see activity emanating from the object at the center of the screen, indicated by the green reticle. Citizen Scientists can also tag thumbnails for discussion in Talk forums or collect them in their own albums.

center of a thumbnail image, such as the one shown in Figure 3.7.

3.2.2.1 Tutorial

Figure 3.8 shows the eight panels of the project tutorial which is shown to volunteers the first time they participate in the project. The tutorial is also available at all times in a panel of the classification workflow window.

3.2.2.2 Field Guide

The Field Guide is available at all times during the project classification workflow, and can be left open at the side of the window. The guide provides example images and discussion concerning myriad scenarios volunteers may encounter. As of this writing, the topics covered are

- **Asteroids (object of interest)** explains the object should be at center, as a point source or trailed.
- **Trails (natural)** discusses trailing and fast-rotators.
- **Tails (object of interest)** describes possible tail morphology, including multiple tails.
- **Comae** explains how comae are diffuse (as compared to a tail) and provides an example.
- **Missing Object** acknowledges this situation arises and describes how these can make it past our vetting process.




Welcome!

Solar system bodies like asteroids or comets are considered *active* when they display a tail or *coma* – a cloud of dust and gas. Active objects tell us where ices are found throughout the solar system and even provide clues about the origin of water here on Earth.

Fewer than 30 active asteroids have been discovered since 1949. As a result, these elusive objects are poorly understood. In order to unlock the mysteries they hold we must find enough of these enigmatic objects to study them as a population. We need your help to find Active Asteroids!

(1)




Hot or Not?

Each image shows one *object of interest* which should be in the very center of the frame. We classify images as either **hot** (the object has a tail or cloud of dust) or **not**.

Left: This object has a tail (pointing to 7 o'clock) so we classify this image as **hot**.

Right: We cannot see the object – let alone activity – so we classify this as **not** active.

(2)




Tails

Here is a classic comet tail. The blinking arrows show where the tail is seen.

Asteroid tails can vary in shape, length, and intensity. They may even have multiple tails extending in different directions!


(3)



Comae

The dust and gas cloud known as a coma is indicated by the blinking arrows in this picture. Comae (plural of coma) are often described as fuzzy shells or smudges. They may be vaguely directional, and there can be multiple shells.

(4)



Activity Look-A-Likes

Activity may be mimicked by several phenomena. In all of these cases you should classify these as "not active" when there is no obvious "real" activity.

1. All tails – the telescope moved.
2. Fuzzy, "wooly" images – poor observing conditions such as clouds.
3. Scattered light – like Sun rays seen in photos.
4. Juxtaposed objects – here a galaxy, star, and asteroid.
5. Cosmic rays – particles from the Sun appear as uniformly thin, dark lines.

(5)

Feeling uncertain?

The Field Guide describes many types of phenomena that you may encounter. You can consult the Field Guide at any time by clicking the Field Guide button on the right of the screen.

Sometimes objects and features in the images are easier seen in an inverted color scheme. To toggle this, click the half moon symbol near the bottom right corner of the image.

If you want to see more examples of asteroid tails and what to ignore, either click "Need some help with this task?" or access the Field Guide via the tab at the right hand side of the screen at any time.


(6)

One last thing...

We have included images of confirmed "active" asteroids and they will show up periodically to give you some feedback on your classifications after you click **Done**.

Please be sure to use the message boards, or **Talk**, to highlight and discuss anything funny or strange!

(7)



There is no object in the center of this image. This can happen because the object is too faint or because the orbit is not well known. We classify these as not active. If you see something else interesting you want to share – like that fuzzy blob perhaps – you can always bring these up in Talk!

(8)

Figure 3.8: The *Active Asteroids* Tutorial. (1) "Welcome" provides a project overview. (2) "Hot or Not" describes the workflow. (3) "Tails" describes tails with an example. (4) "Comae" introduces volunteers to the less familiar coma morphology. (5) "Activity Look-a-Likes" describes common false positive scenarios. (6) "Feeling uncertain?" explains what to do if a classification is ambiguous. (7) "One last thing..." lets users know about the injected training images. (8) This panel, requested by volunteers, describes a common situation where the object cannot be conclusively identified.




Figure 3.9: Four examples from the Field Guide of the *Active Asteroids* project. (1) “Trails (artificial),” includes an example satellite trail and a a example of a telescope tracking problem that results in all sources in a field becoming trailed. (2) “Crowded Fields” shows an example of a situation we try to automatically screen out from the project, but which may occasionally make it through our filter. (3) “Donuts” discusses this optical issue and includes a donut with activity indicators. (4) “Partial Images (Edges and Corners)” explains what happens when an object falls near one or two chip edges and includes an example.

- **Crowded Fields** shows examples of fields with many sources, with and without an active object.
- **Blurry images** states that these low quality images should probably be skipped.
- **Galaxies** shows several galaxy examples, include some juxtaposed with active objects.
- **Cosmic Rays** defines the phenomenon and gives examples of thumbnails with cosmic rays.
- **Trails (artificial)** briefly discusses satellite trails and telescope tracking issues.
- **Saturation and Scattered Light** explains how scattered light could be misinterpreted as activity.
- **Background Object of Note (and size!)** gives examples of interesting clusters and dust clouds that are large in size given the angular size of the thumbnail.
- **Donuts** are displayed, including one showing activity, and we discuss the donut phenomenon.
- **Dead Columns** gives examples of columnar artifacts intersecting with the object at the center of the thumbnail.
- **Partial Images (Edges and Corners)** supplies examples of chip edge and chip corner cases that may be confusing.

- **Object width (object of interest)** discusses why point sources appear to have different widths.

3.2.2.3 About

Research This page provides further discussion of the science justification, a description of the thumbnail production pipeline, explains some of the common challenges for the project, justifies why Citizen Science is needed, and provides a proof-of-concept statement along with links to papers that have resulted from the project and preparations.

The Team Provides pictures and brief biographical sketches describing team members. At the time of this writing, the *Core Research Team* is made up of (1) this author (Colin Orion Chandler) of NAU, (2) Co-founder Chad Trujillo of NAU, (3) Co-founder Jay Kueny of Lowell Observatory and University of Arizona (UA), Project Scientist Will Oldroyd of NAU, and Project Scientists Will Burris of San Diego State University (SDSU). *Contributors* is comprised of Annika Gustaffson of Southwestern Research Institute (SwRI). The *Science Advisory Board* includes Henry Hsieh of the Planetary Science Institute (PSI), Mark Jesus Mendoza Magbanua of University of California San Francisco (UCSF), Michael Gowanlock of NAU, David Trilling of NAU, and Ty Robinson of UA and NAU. Our **Moderator** is Elisabeth Baeten (Belgium).

Results The Results page currently lists the SAFARI proof-of-concept (Chapter 4, Chandler et al. 2018), the (6478) Gault recurrent activity finding (Chapter 5, Chandler et al. 2019), and our 2014 OG₃₉₂ active Centaur discovery (Chapter 6, Chandler et al. 2020). Additional discoveries will be posted on the Results page as they are published and/or announced.

FAQ The Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) page answers some of the many questions we encountered during project preparations and after project launch.

3.2.3 Talk

A facility common to all Zooniverse projects are online forums, known as *Talk*. Here volunteers can, for example, discuss thumbnail images they find interesting, or ask questions. Talk also provides a space where volunteers can build relationships with each other and the scientists. Crucial to the success of Talk are forum Moderators. These individuals help mediate interactions between individuals and answer questions. Our lead forum Moderator is Elisabeth Baeten (see Acknowledgements).

Surprisingly, volunteers posting on Talk became one of two primary paths which facilitate identifying candidate active objects, the other path being our analysis of classification data. Examples include 2017 QN₈₄

Table 3.1: Composition of First Citizen Science Subject Set

Kind	Number	Percentage
Damocloid	343	3.2%
Centaur	433	4.1%
JFC	600	5.6%
KBO/TNO	564	5.3%
Hungaria	750	7.0%
Main-belt Inner	1500	14.1%
Main-belt Middle	1500	14.1%
Main-belt Outer	1500	14.1%
Main-belt Cybele	750	7.0%
NEO	600	5.6%
Mars-crosser	500	4.7%
Trojan	1000	9.4%
Hilda	600	5.6%
Total	10640	100.0%

(Figure 9.2) and 2015 TC₁ (Figure 3.5). Typically an image that is brought to our attention via Talk are also classified as “active” by the majority of volunteers who classified the image.

3.2.4 Subject Sets

A Subject Set is a Zooniverse element that contains both data (images in our case) and associated metadata for use in the Citizen Science project. By project launch we had uploaded one *Training* subject set (Section 3.2.5) and one *Test* subject set (comprised of images needing classification) containing roughly 10,000 thumbnail images. Since launch we have submitted an additional 7 Test subject sets. Zooniverse limits the number of subjects a project can contain using a quota system. Quotas are automatically increased with, for example, successful classification of subjects.

3.2.4.1 Thumbnail Selection

I wrote a Thumbnail Selection Tool to associate thumbnail records in our database with a numbered subject set. The tool allows selection by object class (e.g., outer main-belt asteroid) and delta magnitude (see Section 3.1.4). There are options to limit the number of thumbnail images per object class, by unique solar system object, or both. These options allow us to provide a variety of objects for Citizen Scientists to look at. Otherwise the thumbnail images would favor bright objects over fainter (and thus more rare) farther objects such as Centaurs.

Subject Set Composition In general we limit the number of images per object to one, with the exception of object classes of which we have few observations (e.g., Centaur) which would quickly diminish to zero thumbnails in a batch because of their relative paucity. For the majority of object classes the limit of one

image per object stems from my own experience examining thumbnails that indicates the likelihood of a single thumbnail showing activity, and another thumbnail from approximately the same observing UT date does not, is very low. Moreover, we limit bias by showing each unique solar system object once, especially main-belt asteroids, prior to showing the same object to volunteers a second time. The ideal scenario would involve all images being examined by volunteers, however this may take years at the current rate of examination (12,000 to 120,000 classifications per day) and the continued DECam thumbnail output of $\sim 5,000$ thumbnails per day.

I have kept the ratio of object classes roughly the same for each batch, though the exact numbers necessarily varies as certain object classes (e.g., Centaurs) are limited in number because they are, for example, distant and faint. Table 3.1 shows the composition of the first test subject set provided for the 2021 August 31 project launch.

Delta Magnitude Limit We (the science team) considered prioritizing thumbnails showing objects computed to appear especially bright in the image as computed by our Delta Magnitude metric (Section 3.1.4.2). However, this would lead to an observational bias favoring objects that appear brighter because of any combination of larger size, closer distance, higher albedo, or favorable phase angle. Additionally, we hoped to avoid volunteer fatigue that could result if we favored the most promising images early in the project, then later only provided images with a lower probability of activity detection. Concern that there may not be enough volunteer interest if the activity occurrence rate was too low was evidently unwarranted, in part because (a) we provide a training set that injects known active images, and (b) there is a significant fraction of images that indeed appear to show activity, be it real or perceived.

Subject Set Size A factor that has a significant impact on the overall flow and timeline of the project is the quantity of subjects contained within a given subject set. Because volunteers are shown subjects at random, it takes exponentially longer (in calendar time) for each subject (image) to be *retired* – the state when an image has been examined by the preset number of volunteers (15) – for a subject size of 100,000 thumbnails than 10,000 thumbnails. However, even though a smaller subject set will be completed in less time, there is added overhead in preparing subject sets, uploading batches of images, sending out volunteer calls to action, and analyzing the results. At the time of this writing we prefer subject sets containing between 17,000 and 25,000 images.

3.2.4.2 Subject Set Preparation

I created a HARVEST Subject Set Preparation tool to (1) locate images that were flagged as part of a given Citizen Science batch (subject set), (2) copy the thumbnail images to a directory dedicated to permanently storing images uploaded to *Active Asteroids*, and (3) add a green reticle, as shown in Figure 3.7.

This tool also creates the required manifest that must accompany the images when they are uploaded to Zooniverse. The manifest holds information we later use to identify the thumbnail image in our database, linking it to a specific thumbnail record that represents a unique combination of a SkyBot result and datafile from an astronomical image archive.

3.2.4.3 Classification

Once a subject set has been uploaded to Zooniverse the subject set can be assigned to our active Workflow (Section 3.2.2). At this point, the project status will change to reflect the overall completion status. Following Zooniverse advice, we leave all subject sets marked as active; thus when we add additional subjects, the overall completion percentage does not start over at 0%. Thus far we have not added an additional subject set until all objects have been fully classified (“retired”), so are not amending any subject set that is in the process of being examined.

The general workflow to notify Citizen Scientists that new work is ready is to (1) adjust the announcement banner on the landing page (Figure 3.6), (2) tweet the event from the project Twitter account (@ActiveAsteroids), and (3) send out an email “newsletter” to all past volunteers of the project via the Zooniverse platform. In practice, we have yet to send an email as of this writing. The first two actions have thus far sufficed to accomplish our goals promptly. One other modality, (4) press releases, coincided with project launch¹⁶ and seemed effective at drawing new participants to *Active Asteroids*. We note that effectiveness of publicity is impossible to measure as these engagements occurred prior to, during, and following project launch. We intend to issue press releases in the future with new publications and/or announcements in conjunction with our host institutions and NASA.

3.2.5 Training Set

I manually examined over 10,000 images of comets and other active bodies output by the HARVEST pipeline. For each image we ranked apparent activity on an integer scale from 0 – 9, following my own rough classification scheme (Table 3.2). We imported these scores into the HARVEST database, then prepared a subject set consisting only objects with scores of five or higher (meaning these images definitely showed activity;

¹⁶<http://activeasteroids.net>

Table 3.2: Expert Activity Scoring Index	
Score	Description
0	missing from center or unidentifiable
1	visible as a point-source
2	vaguely fuzzy
3	fuzzy, but likely not activity-related
4	suggestive of activity but inconclusive
5	likely active, but some ambiguity remains
6	likely activity, not very ambiguous
7	definitely active, medium-strength indicators
8	definitely active, strong signs of activity
9	activity so obvious that a single image suffices

Section 2.7.1). These became the Training Subject Set for the *Active Asteroids* project.

The primary purpose of the training set is to help teach Citizen Scientists how to recognize activity. As volunteers classify thumbnails in the primary workflow, training images are shown at an interval that is inversely proportional to how many images a volunteer has classified, as determined by Zooniverse. The decaying rate is necessary for (and was requested by) volunteers that become highly proficient and no longer need (or wish) to see training images. The probability a user is shown a training image, P_T , is given by

$$P_T(N) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 50\% & 1 \leq N \leq 10 \\ 20\% & 10 < N \leq 50 \\ 10\% & 50 < N \leq 100 \\ 5\% & 100 < N < \infty \end{array} \right\} \quad (3.3)$$

where N is the number of classifications a user has carried out in *Active Asteroids*. The training set also serves to validate that the project is working as intended. It was clear during our project’s Beta Review that volunteers were adept at identifying activity.

3.3 Follow-up Campaign

Once we have identified activity candidates we conduct follow-up study, first in the form of an archival investigation. Then, if warranted, we may pursue observations at telescope facilities to further study the object.

3.3.1 Archival Investigation

This process is documented extensively in Chapter 7.3 (Chandler et al., 2021c). Here, I provide a brief synopsis of the overall process and discuss additional methods and sources we use that were not part of the

aforementioned work.

3.3.1.1 Step 1: Supplemental Searches

I carry out searches independent of the HARVEST pipeline to find additional archival data for a given solar system object, through (1) three automated supplemental pipelines we wrote and (2) manual query of two sources. This auxiliary pipeline is especially useful for the study of specific objects, where we consider it worth spending extra time to find the maximum amount of data available for an object of interest. However there are many drawbacks when compared with the HARVEST pipeline. For example, the overwhelming majority (roughly 90%, depending on circumstances such as dynamical class) of data are unusable, either not probing faint enough to see the object, or the object is not on a camera chip. Moreover, accessing myriad archives with data from myriad instruments requires us to manually intervene in the pipeline to, for example, address errors generated by FITS files that do not conform to the FITS standard, or to conduct astrometry in order to embed a valid WCS that we need to extract a thumbnail image of the target object. All of these added steps also require additional administrative overhead, from managing downloading data to keeping a separate directory structure organized with results.

CADC SSOIS This pipeline queries the CADCA Solar System Object Information Search (SSOIS)¹⁷. Results include some overlap with HARVEST (i.e., DECam, MegaPrime, KPNO instruments), which are useful for validating HARVEST results. Additional instrument archives searched include Southern Astrophysical Research Telescope (SOAR), European Space Organization (ESO) instruments (e.g., Very Large Telescope (VLT) Survey Telescope (VST) OMEGACam, Visible and Infrared Survey Telescope for Astronomy (VISTA) VIRCAM), Near-Earth Asteroid Tracking (NEAT) Ground-Based Electro-Optical Deep Space Surveillance (GEODSS), Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS), Subaru SuprimeCam and Hyper SuprimeCam (HSC), and Wide-field Infrared Survey Explorer (WISE).

IRSA This pipeline queries the NASA/CalTech Infrared Science Archive (IRSA)¹⁸ archive, which searches both Zwicky Transient Facility (ZTF) and Palomar Transient Factory (PTF) data for moving objects via their Moving Object Search Tool (MOST).

ZTF Alert Stream This pipeline downloads all ZTF alert stream (Patterson et al., 2018) data then prunes out all data unrelated to solar system objects. Alert packets have already been matched to known

¹⁷<https://www.cadc-ccda.hia-ihp.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/en/ssois/>

¹⁸<https://irsa.ipac.caltech.edu>

solar system objects, making these data simple to search. The alerts include image data as well as metadata such as apparent magnitude.

Manual Queries We manually query the Keck Observatory Archive (KOA)¹⁹ via their MOST. We also initiate queries via the Comet Asteroid Telescopic Catalog Hub (CATCH) tool²⁰ which provides quick search and image delivery from multiple archives, including NEAT (Pravdo et al., 1999) and SkyMapper (Keller et al., 2007).

3.3.1.2 Step 2: Data Acquisition

During the aforementioned pipeline processes we automatically generate download scripts that are added to the same queue that executes downloads for the HARVEST pipeline. However, several sources require additional steps to download archival image data.

ESO ESO results, including VST OMEGACam and VISTA InfraRed Camera (VIRCam), can be downloaded in an automated fashion. We generate a separate set of bash scripts we designed to handle downloading, sorting, and preprocessing of ESO data.

SMOKA The Subaru Mitaka Okayama Kiso Archive (SMOKA)²¹ archive (Baba et al., 2002b) that serves SuprimeCam and HSC data requires an account to request data and carry out downloads. The system is queue-based, with email notifications upon data retrieval readiness. We optimize the process by constructing a custom URL that requests all specific datafiles we need at once. After the request is processed, SMOKA sends an email that includes a one-line bash script for downloading the data. Once the data are downloaded, we have separate scripts that prepare the data for analysis. We do not reduce (e.g., flatten) the data, though this is a step we are considering for future work.

CASU Data hosted at the Cambridge Astronomy Survey Unit (CASU) Astronomical Data Centre²², especially Isaac Newton Telescopes (INT) Wide Field Camera (WFC), require data be requested from their queue-based service. Once the data are available an email notice is sent. From this point we produce shell scripts to download the data, conduct astrometry, and prepare the data for additional analysis.

¹⁹<https://koa.ipac.caltech.edu/cgi-bin/KOA/nph-KOAlogin>

²⁰<https://catch.astro.umd.edu/>

²¹<https://smoka.nao.ac.jp>

²²<http://casu.ast.cam.ac.uk/casuadc/>

Table 3.3: Telescopes Utilized

Instrument	Telescope	Diameter [m]	Observatory	Location	Country	Site Code
AltaU-47	BLT	0.5	ARO	Flagstaff, Arizona	USA	687
DECam	Blanco	4.0	CTIO	Cerro Tololo	Chile	807
GMOS-S	Gemini South	8.1	Gemini	Cerro Pachon	Chile	I11
IMACS	Baade	6.5	Magellan	Las Campanas	Chile	304
LBCB, LBCR	LBT	8.5×2	MGIO	Mt. Graham, Arizona	USA	G83
LMI, NIHTS	LDT	4.3	Lowell Observatory	Happy Jack, Arizona	USA	G37
VATT4K	VATT	1.8	MGIO	Mt. Graham, Arizona	USA	290

Definitions: Barry Lutz Telescope (BLT), Atmospheric Research Observatory (ARO), Dark Energy Camera (DECam), Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory (CTIO), Gemini Multi-Object Spectrograph (GMOS), Inamori-Magellan Areal Camera and Spectrograph (IMACS), Large Binocular Camera Blue (LBCB), Large Binocular Camera Red (LBCR), Large Binocular Telescope (LBT), Mount Graham International Observatory (MGIO), Large Monolithic Imager (LMI), Near-Infrared High-Throughput Spectrograph (NIHTS), Lowell Discovery Telescope (LDT), Vatican Advanced Technology Telescope (VATT).

3.3.1.3 Step 3: Astrometry

My thumbnail extraction code requires embedded WCS of sufficient quality to allow for the target object to appear at or near the center of the thumbnail images we extract. Many archive/instrument combinations (e.g., Panoramic Survey Telescope and Rapid Response System 1 (PS1), ZTF) provide data with excellent astrometry via embedded WCS, however some archives either provide no WCS at all, or WCS with insufficient or unreliable precision. We perform astrometry as needed via Astrometry.net (Lang et al., 2010) on the NAU Monsoon computing cluster. Astrometry.net makes use of source catalogs, including the Gaia Data Release 2 catalog (Collaboration et al., 2018a), and SDSS (Ahn et al., 2012).

3.3.1.4 Step 4: Thumbnails

This tool extracts FITS and PNG thumbnails with a uniform FOV that we specify, the default being $126'' \times 126''$. We maintain a database of instrument and telescope parameters so that we can extract thumbnail images (via HARVEST-derived code) with North pointing up and East pointing left, standard astronomical orientation. We query JPL Horizons and plot symbols indicating the anti-Solar and anti-motion vectors commonly associated with tail direction, such as those shown in Figure 2.4. An additional optional step co-adds FITS format thumbnails to help enhance signal for activity searches.

3.3.2 New Telescopic Observations

Over the course of the work contained in this dissertation our team made use of telescopes for activity searches and follow-up study. Table 3.3 lists the instruments and associated facilities used for this work.

Chapter 4

Searching Asteroids for Activity Revealing Indicators (SAFARI)

Colin Orion Chandler¹, Anthony M. Curtis², Michael Mommert¹, Scott S. Sheppard³, Chadwick A. Trujillo¹

This is the Accepted Manuscript version of an article accepted for publication in Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific. IOP Publishing Ltd is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it. The Version of Record is available online at <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1538-3873/aad03d>.

Abstract

Active asteroids behave dynamically like asteroids but display comet-like comae. These objects are poorly understood, with only about 30 identified to date. We have conducted one of the deepest systematic searches for asteroid activity by making use of deep images from the Dark Energy Camera (DECam) ideally suited to the task. We looked for activity indicators amongst 11,703 unique asteroids extracted from 35,640 images. We detected three previously-identified active asteroids ((62412), (1) Ceres and (779) Nina), though only (62412) showed signs of activity. Our activity occurrence rate of 1 in 11,703 is consistent with the prevailing 1 in 10,000 activity occurrence rate estimate. Our proof of concept demonstrates 1) our novel informatics approach can locate active asteroids and 2) DECam data are well-suited to the search for active asteroids.

Keywords: minor planets, asteroids: general – methods: analytical – techniques – image processing

4.1 Introduction

¹Department of Physics & Astronomy, Northern Arizona University, PO Box 6010, Flagstaff, AZ 86011, USA

²Department of Physics, University of South Florida ISA 2019, Tampa, FL 33620, USA

³Department of Terrestrial Magnetism, Carnegie Institution for Science, 5241 Broad Branch Road. NW, Washington, DC 20015, USA

Table 4.1: The Active Asteroids (1 of 2)

Asteroid Name	a (au)	e	i ($^{\circ}$)	Orbit	T_J	P (years)	q (au)	R (au)	f ($^{\circ}$)	% _{peri} (%)	Act. (N)	Cause
(1) Ceres	2.77	0.08	10.6	MB	3.310	4.6	2.60	2.72	279.3	62	3+	$\mathcal{M}, \wedge$
(145) Adeona	2.67	0.14	12.6	MB	3.331	2.28	2.29	2.69	258.8	47	2	$\mathcal{M}$
(315) Constantia	2.24	0.17	2.4	MB	3.614	3.36	1.86	1.94	315.9	92	0 [†]	(?)
(493) Griseldis	3.12	0.18	15.2	OMB	3.140	5.5	2.57	3.34	122.4	31	1	$\rightsquigarrow$
(596) Scheila	2.93	0.16	14.7	OMB	3.209	5.01	2.45	3.11	239.2	90	1	$\rightsquigarrow$
(704) Interamnia	3.06	0.15	17.3	MB	3.148	5.35	2.59	2.62	19.6	97	1	$\mathcal{M}$
(779) Nina	2.66	0.23	14.6	MB	3.302	4.35	2.06	2.15	36.9	93	1	$\mathcal{M}$
(1026) Ingrid	2.25	0.18	5.4	MB	3.597	3.38	1.85	2.23	97.5	16	0 [†]	(?)
(1474) Beira	2.73	0.49	26.7	Mars	3.033	4.52	1.39	1.57	310.9	93	1	$\mathcal{M}$
(2201) Oljato	2.17	0.71	2.5	Apollo	3.298	3.21	0.62	0.88	73.1	92	1	(?)
(3200) Phaethon	1.27	0.89	22.2	Apollo	4.510	1.43	0.14	0.14	5.1	87	3	$\odot$
(3552) Don Quixote	4.26	0.71	31.1	Amor	2.315	8.78	1.24	1.23	343.6	100	2	$\mathcal{M}, (?)$
(3646) Aduatiques	2.75	0.11	0.6	MB	3.336	4.57	2.46	2.56	309.0	90	0 [†]	(?)
(4015) Wil.-Har.	2.63	0.63	2.8	Apollo	3.082	4.26	0.97	1.17	51.0	95	2 [‡]	$\mathcal{M}, (?)$
(24684) 1990 EU4	2.32	0.08	3.9	MB	3.572	3.53	2.13	2.28	277.9	77	0 [†]	(?)
(35101) 1991 PL16	2.60	0.18	12.3	MB	3.365	4.17	2.12	2.86	227.0	21	0 [†]	(?)
(62412)	3.15	0.08	4.7	OMB	3.197	5.6	2.90	3.06	74.5	68	1	$\odot$
(162173) Ryugu	1.19	0.19	5.9	Apollo	5.308	1.3	0.96	1.08	288.4	8	1	$\mathcal{M}$
(457175)	3.96	0.28	15.6	OMB	2.926	7.89	2.85	3.28	66.0	81	1	(?)
133P/Elst-Pizarro	3.16	0.16	1.4	OMB	3.184	5.63	2.66	2.65	21.7	100	4	$\mathcal{M}$
176P/LINEAR	3.20	0.19	0.2	OMB	3.166	5.71	2.58	2.59	10.1	1	1	(?)
233P/La Sagra	3.04	0.41	11.3	Encke	3.081	5.28	1.78	2.01	309.1	91	1	(?)
238P/Read	3.16	0.25	1.3	OMB	3.154	5.64	2.37	2.42	26.5	97	3	$\mathcal{M}$
259P/Garradd	2.73	0.34	15.9	MMB	3.217	4.51	1.81	1.85	27.6	99	2	$\mathcal{M}$
288P (300163)	3.05	0.20	3.2	OMB	3.204	5.32	2.44	2.45	12.2	99	2	$\mathcal{M}$
311P/PS	2.19	0.12	5.0	IMB	3.661	3.24	1.94	2.15	272.8	58	2	$\odot, :$
313P/Gibbs	3.16	0.24	11.0	Encke	3.132	5.62	2.42	2.40	8.0	100	2	$\mathcal{M}$
324P/La Sagra	3.10	0.15	21.4	OMB	3.100	5.45	2.62	2.64	20.0	98	2	$\mathcal{M}$
331P/Gibbs	3.00	0.04	9.7	OMB	3.229	5.21	2.88	3.10	140.4	11	2	$\rightsquigarrow, \odot$
348P/PS	3.17	0.30	17.6	OMB	3.062	5.63	2.18	2.51	60.8	83	1	(?)
354P/LINEAR	2.29	0.12	5.3	OMB	3.583	3.47	2.00	2.01	12.2	99	1	$\odot, \otimes$
358P	3.15	0.24	11.1	Encke	3.135	5.59	2.39	2.42	7.5	99	2	$\mathcal{M}, (?)$
P/2013 R3	3.03	0.27	0.9	OMB	3.184	5.28	2.20	2.22	14.0	99	1	$\odot, \mathcal{M}$
P/2015 X6	2.75	0.17	4.6	MMB	3.318	4.57	2.28	2.64	274.5	62	1	$\odot$
P/2016 G1	2.58	0.21	11.0	MMB	3.367	4.15	2.04	2.52	264.7	56	1	$\rightsquigarrow$
P/2016 J1	3.17	0.23	14.3	OMB	3.113	5.65	2.45	2.46	345.9	99	1	$\odot, \mathcal{M}$

Orbital parameters retrieved from the Minor Planet Center and Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) Horizons.

a : semimajor axis; e : eccentricity; i : inclination; Orbit: Inner, Mid, Outer, & Main Belt (IMB, MMB, OMB, MB); T_J : Tisserand parameter with respect to Jupiter; P : Orbital Period; q : Perihelion distance; R : Heliocentric discovery distance. f : True anomaly. %_{peri}: Percentage towards perihelion. Act.: Number of times object reported active. [†]Authors declare object a candidate (activity not yet confirmed). [‡]Ferrín et al. (2012) argue (4015) was also active in 1992, 1996, 2008, and 2009-2010. $\mathcal{M}$ Sublimation; $\odot$ Rotational Breakup; $\rightsquigarrow$ Impact; $\wedge$ Cryovolcanism; $:$ Binary; $\odot$ Thermal Fracture; $\otimes$ Dust Model; (?) Unknown




Figure 4.1: Active asteroid P2013/R3 was imaged in October 2013 while undergoing a breakup (into components A-D) likely caused by rotational instability. The antisolar and negative heliocentric velocity vector arrows are labeled $\odot$ and $-V$, respectively. Reprinted Figure 2 of Jewitt et al. (2017).

Table 4.1: The Active Asteroids (2 of 2)

Asteroid Name	Family	1 st Act (years)	Facility	Method	Last (years)	Visit	Refs
(1) Ceres	None	2014	Herschel	Spec.	2017	Yes	[1]
(145) Adeona	Adeona	2017	Terkol	Spec.	2016	No	[2]
(315) Constantia	Flora	2013	MPCAT	Phot.	2013	No	[3]
(493) Griseldis	Eunomia	2015	Subaru	Visual	2015	No	[4]
(596) Scheila	None	2010	CSS	Visual	2010	No	[5]
(704) Interamnia	None	2017	Terkol	Spec.	2012	No	[6]
(779) Nina	...	2017	Terkol	Spec.	2012	No	[7]
(1026) Ingrid	Flora	2013	MPCAT	Phot.	2013	No	[8]
(1474) Beira	...	2017	Terkol	Spec.	2012	No	[9]
(2201) Oljato	...	1984	Pioneer	Mag.	1984	No	[10]
(3200) Phaethon	Pallas	2009	STEREO	Visual	2017	Yes	[11]
(3552) Don Quixote	...	2009	Spitzer	Visual	2018	No	[12]
(3646) Aduatiques	...	2013	MPCAT	Phot.	2013	No	[13]
(4015) Wil.-Har.	...	1949	Palomar	Visual	1979 [‡]	No	[14]
(24684) 1990 EU4	...	2013	MPCAT	Phot.	2013	No	[15]
(35101) 1991 PL16	Eunomia	2013	MPCAT	Phot.	2013	No	[16]
(62412)	Hygiea	2015	DECam	Visual	2014	No	[17]
(162173) Ryugu	Clarissa	2017	MMT	Spec.	2017	Yes	[18]
(457175)	Hilda	2017	CSS	Visual	2017	No	[19]
133P/Elst-Pizarro	Themis	1996	ESO	Visual	2014	No	[20]
176P/LINEAR	Themis	2009	HTP	Visual	2011	No	[21]
233P/La Sagra	...	2009	LSSS	Visual	2009	No	[22]
238P/Read	Gorchakov	2005	SW	Visual	2016	No	[23]
259P/Garradd	...	2008	SS	Visual	2017	No	[24]
288P (300163)	Themis	2011	PS	Visual	2017	No	[25]
311P/PS	Behrens	2013	PS	Visual	2014	No	[26]
313P/Gibbs	Lixiaohua	2014	CSS	Visual	2015	No	[27]
324P/La Sagra	Alauda	2011	LSSS	Visual	2015	No	[28]
331P/Gibbs	Gibbs	2012	CSS	Visual	2014	No	[29]
348P/PS	...	2017	PS	Visual	2017	No	[30]
354P/LINEAR	Baptistina	2010	LINEAR	Visual	2017	No	[31]
358P	Lixiaohua	2012	PS	Visual	2017	No	[32]
P/2013 R3	Mandragora	2013	PS	Visual	2013	No	[33]
P/2015 X6	Aeolia	2015	PS	Visual	2015	No	[34]
P/2016 G1	Adeona	2016	PS	Visual	2016	No	[35]
P/2016 J1	Theobalda	2016	PS	Visual	2016	No	[36]

1st Act: Year activity discovered. Facility: Facility originally reporting activity. Last: As of January 2018 submission. Refs: Object-specific references in Appendix 4.7.1. CSS:Catalina Sky Survey; ESO:European Space Observatory 1-metre Schmidt HTP:Hawaii Trails Project; LINEAR:Lincoln Near-Earth Asteroid pRogram; LSSS:La Sagra Sky Survey; MPCAT:Minor Planet Catalog PS:Pan-STARRS; SS:Siding Spring; SW:Spacewatch

Table 4.2: AA Mass-loss Mechanisms

Suspected Mechanism	N*	%
Sublimation	15	44
Rotational Breakup	7	21
Impact / Collision	4	12
Thermal Fracturing	1	3
Cryovolcanism	1	3
Binary Interaction	1	3
Unknown	5	15

* Objects with multiple mechanism are counted more than once; objects listed in Table 4.1 as candidates were not included in this computation.

Active asteroids appear to have tails like comets (Figure 4.1) but follow orbits predominately within the main asteroid belt. Although the first active asteroid (Wilson–Harrington) was discovered in 1949 (Cunningham, 1950), 27 of the 31 objects (87%) were identified as active in the last decade (Table 4.1). Asteroid activity is thought to be caused by several different mechanisms, combinations of which are undoubtedly at work (e.g., an impact event exposing subsurface ice to sublimation). The number of times (i.e., orbits) an object has displayed activity (Table 1: Act.) is especially diagnostic of the mechanism (Table 1: Cause). A singular (non-recurring) event likely originates from an impact event, e.g., (596) Scheila. Rotational breakup, as in P/2013 R3 of Figure 4.1, may be a one-time catastrophic event, or a potentially repeating event if, for example, only a small piece breaks free but the parent body remains near the spin breakup limit. Ongoing or recurrent activity has been observed ~ 15 times, e.g., 133P/Elst–Pizarro, and is suggestive of sublimation or, in the case of (3200) Phaethon, thermal fracture. These last two mechanism (sublimation and thermal fracture) should be more likely to occur when an object is closer to the Sun, i.e. perihelion (Table 1: q). The Sun-object distance (Table 1: R) indicates the absolute distance, but it is can be simpler to consider how close (Table 1: $\%_{\text{peri}}$) to perihelion the object was when activity was first observed (Table 1: 1st Act), where 100% represents perihelion (q) and 0% indicates aphelion:

$$\%_{\text{peri}} = \left[1 - \left(\frac{d_{\text{disc}} - d_{\text{peri}}}{d_{\text{ap}} - d_{\text{peri}}} \right) \right] \cdot 100\% \quad (4.1)$$

where d_{disc} is the heliocentric object distance at the activity discovery epoch, d_{peri} the perihelion distance, and d_{ap} the aphelion distance.

While the term “Main-belt Comet (MBC)” often refers to this sublimation-driven subset of active asteroids, we use the more inclusive “active asteroid” term throughout this paper. We aimed to include all objects termed “active asteroids” in the literature for completeness, but we only include objects which have provided observable signs of activity. Objects known to host surface water ice but which have yet to shown signs of activity, such as (24) Themis (Rivkin & Emery, 2010; Campins et al., 2010), are outside the scope

of this paper.

Orbital characteristics also provide insight into the dynamical evolution and even the composition of an object. Objects with conspicuously similar orbital properties may have originated from a catastrophic disruption event that created a family (Table 1:Family) of asteroids (Hirayama, 1918). More generally, asteroids can be categorized (Table 1:Orb.) as interior to the Main Asteroid Belt, within the Main Asteroid Belt (and further subdivided into inner, mid, and outer main belt as IMB, MMB, and OMB respectively), or exterior to the Main Asteroid Belt (e.g., Kuiper belt). Objects interior to the Main Asteroid Belt, including Near Earth Objects (NEOs), include Earth-crossing (Apollo), Earth-orbit nearing (Amor), and Mars-crossing asteroids. Objects whose orbits are similar to Comet 2P/Encke are said to be Encke-type.

The Tisserand parameter T_J (Table 4.1 T_J) describes the degree to which an object’s orbit is influenced by Jupiter:

$$T_J = \frac{a_J}{a} + 2\sqrt{(1 - e^2) \frac{a}{a_J}} \cos(i). \quad (4.2)$$

The orbital elements are given by a_J the orbital distance of Jupiter (5.2 AU), plus the semi-major axis a , eccentricity e , i the inclination (Table 1). For the case where $a = a_J$ you can see $T_J = 3$. Asteroids in the main-belt are typically inside the orbit of Jupiter (i.e. $a < a_J$) and usually have $T_J > 3$ (Jewitt, 2014); however, as Equation 4.2 indicates, it is the combination of all three free parameters (a , e , i) which describes the magnitude of Jovian influence on the object’s orbit. One active asteroid definition also constrains membership to objects whose orbits are interior to Jupiter but whose Tisserand parameters are > 3.08 (Jewitt, 2014).

Objects not identified in the literature as active asteroids, yet still appear orbitally asteroidal (e.g., Comet 2P/Encke), are not included in this paper, but objects with $T_J < 3$ which are identified in the literature as active asteroids (e.g., (3552) Don Quixote), are included; see e.g., Hsieh & Jewitt (2006a); Tancredi (2014) for further discussion on distinguishing objects within this regime.

We would like to understand active asteroids in part because they may hold clues about solar system formation and the origin of water delivered to the terrestrial planets. The recent discovery of interstellar asteroid ‘Oumuamua (Bacci et al., 2017b) intensifies interest in understanding our own indigenous asteroid population in order to better understand and characterize ejectoids we encounter in the future, an estimated decadal occurrence (Trilling et al., 2017). There has also long been an interest mining asteroids for their metals, and water could prove an invaluable resource providing, for example: energy, rocket fuel, breathable oxygen, and sustenance for plant and animal life (O’Leary, 1977; Dickson, 1978; Kargel, 1994; Forgan & Elvis, 2011; Hasnain et al., 2012; Lewicki et al., 2013; Andrews et al., 2015).

Table 4.3: Surveys which have discovered AAs.

AA Discovered by (survey name)	AAs (N)	Limit (mag)	Operation (years)
Catalina Sky Survey	5	22 ^a	1998 ^f –
La Sagra Survey	2	17 ^b	2008 ^g –
LINEAR	1	19.6 ^c	1997 ^h –
Pan-STARRS	8	22.7 ^d	2008 ⁱ –
Spacewatch	2	21.7 ^e	1981 ^j –
Total	18	...	98

^aDrake et al. (2009); ^bestimated from aperture; ^cSesar et al. (2011); Stokes et al. (2000); ^dChambers et al. (2016); ^eLarsen et al. (2007); ^fLarson et al. (1998); ^gStoss (2011); ^hStokes et al. (2000); ⁱJedicke (2008); ^jGehrels (1981)

Table 4.4: Active Asteroid Hunting Surveys & Occurrence Rate Estimates

Survey	Source	Zone	Activity (N per 10^6)	$N^\dagger$ (mag)	Limit	Objects	Method
Cikota et al. (2014)	MPC	MBA	...	1	16.7	330K	Photometric Excess
Gilbert & Wiegert (2010)	CFHT	MBA	40 ± 18	3	22.5 ^a	25K	By-Eye
Hsieh (2009)	HTP	OMB	...	1	26	600	By-Eye
Hsieh et al. (2015a)	Pan-STARRS	OMB	96	4	22.6	300K	PSF
SAFARI (this work)	DECam	MBA	80	1	24.3	11K	By-Eye
Sonnett et al. (2011a)	TALCS	MBA	< 2500	0	24.3	1K	Excess Sky Flux
Waszczak et al. (2013)	PTF	MBA	< 30	0	20.5	220K	Extendedness

CFTS: Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope; DECam: Dark Energy Camera; HTP: Hawaii Trails Project; MPC: Minor Planet Center; PTF: Palomar Transient Factory; Pan-STARRS: Panoramic-Survey Telescope And Rapid Response System; TALCS: Thousand Asteroid Light Curve Survey; MBA: Main Belt Asteroids; OMB: Outer Main Belt; [†]Includes known AAs; ^aGilbert & Wiegert (2009); PSF: Point Spread Function

Our knowledge of active asteroids has been limited due to small sample size: only ~ 20 active asteroids have been discovered to date (Jewitt et al., 2015c). As such, the statistics presented in Table 4.2 are poorly constrained (e.g., the thermal fracturing rate is based upon a single object: (3200) Phaethon). Spacecraft visits have been carried out or planned to a number of the active asteroids (Table 1: Visit), and while we may learn a great deal from these individual objects, spacecraft visits will not substantially increase the number of known active asteroids. While spectroscopy has recently shown potential for discovering activity, the overwhelming majority of activity detections have been made by visual examination (Table 1: Method). One notable exception was the 1984 (2201) Oljato outburst first detected by magnetic field disturbances (2201) Oljato outburst (Russell et al., 1984).

We chose to visually examine (“by-eye”) images of active asteroids because this technique has so far produced the greatest yield. Other methods have been applied (Table 4.3) but with varied degrees of success. Cikota et al. (2014) examined a large number of objects and searched for unexpected deviations in object brightness; this technique positively identified one known active asteroid, but (so far) the other candidates (4.1) have not been observed to be active. Sonnett et al. (2011a) examined the regions immediately surrounding asteroids, searching for photometric excess (i.e., a photon count above the sky background level). Waszczak et al. (2013) formulated a way to quantify “extendedness” of Palomar Transient Factory objects, with a 66% comet detection rate and a 100% Main Belt Comet detection efficiency. Hsieh et al. (2015a)

compared point spread function (PSF) widths between background stars and other objects and flagged exceptionally large PSF radii for further follow-up. All of the aforementioned techniques rely upon visual inspection for confirmation of activity. Spectroscopic detection of activity has also been carried out (Table 4.1), but so far only (1) Ceres has been observed to be visually active in follow-up, and, in that case, in situ by the Rosetta spacecraft orbiting it. Hayabusa 2 recently arrived at (162173) Ryugu but as of yet no tail or coma has been observed.

Conservative activity occurrence rates of >1 in 10,000 are constrained by the magnitude limits of prior surveys (Jewitt et al., 2015c). We reached past the 17-22.7 magnitude limits of previous large-sky surveys (Table 4.3) by making use of existing Dark Energy Camera (DECam) data (Sheppard & Trujillo, 2016) probing a magnitude fainter than other large-sky active asteroid survey. Note that while we are sensitive to more distant populations (e.g., Centaurs, Trans-Neptunian Objects), 99.7% of our population is from the main asteroid belt.

We set out to determine the viability of DECam data for locating active asteroids. We aimed to create a novel, streamlined pipeline for locating known asteroids within our dataset. We planned to examine our new library of asteroid thumbnails to find active asteroids and to test published asteroid activity occurrence rates (Table 4.4). We applied our technique to 35,640 DECam images (~ 5 Tb) to produce 15,600 thumbnail images comprising 11,703 unique objects. We examined the asteroid thumbnails by-eye to identify signs of activity. We show our technique can be applied to an orders-of-magnitude larger publicly-available dataset to elevate active asteroids to a regime where they can be studied as a population.

4.2 Methods

4.2.1 Dark Energy Camera

We made use of data taken by the DECam instrument on the 4-meter Blanco telescope at the Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory in Chile. The instrument has a ~ 3 square degree field of view, capturing data via a mosaic of 62 charge-coupled device (CCD) chips, each 2048×4096 with a pixel scale of $0''.263/\text{pixel}$ (Collaboration et al., 2016). Our data consisted of 594×2.2 Gb frames in the VR filter (500 ± 10 nm to 760 ± 10 nm), each containing 62×33 Mb subsets of data, one per CCD. The mean seeing across all images was $1''.14 \pm 0''.13$. We made use of software which required each multi-extension Flexible Image Transport System (FITS) file be split into its 62 constituent parts, which we refer to as images for the remainder of this paper. Note: some files contained only 61 chips due to an instrument hardware malfunction.




Figure 4.2: The SAFARI workflow.

4.2.2 High Performance Computing

We utilized *Monsoon*, the Northern Arizona University (NAU) High Performance Computing (HPC) computing cluster. *Monsoon* uses the *Slurm Workload Manager* (Yoo et al., 2003) software suite to manage the 884 Intel Xeon processors to deliver up to 12 teraflops of computing power. The majority of our tasks each utilized 8 cores and 48 Gb of memory. The online supplement contains the complete listing of requirements necessary for each task.

4.2.3 photometrypipeline

We utilized the *photometrypipeline* (Mommert, 2017) software package to carry out source extraction via *Source Extractor* (Bertin & Arnouts, 1996, 2010), photometry and astrometry via *SCAMP* (Bertin et al., 2006; Bertin & Arnouts, 2010), and asteroid identification via *SkyBot* (Berthier et al., 2006) and *Horizons* (Giorgini, 2015). We chose the *Anaconda*⁴ *Python* programming language distributions (versions 2.7 and 3.5) and the *Python* package *AstroPy* (Robitaille et al., 2013).

4.2.4 Procedure

1. *Image Reduction*– We employed standard image reduction techniques where each frame was bias subtracted, then flat-fielded using a combination of twilight flats and a master flat; full details of our imaging techniques can be found in Sheppard & Trujillo (2016).
2. *Splitting Multi-Extension FITS Files*– DECam produces multi-extension FITS files, where each extension contains data from one CCD; because *photometrypipeline* was incompatible with this format, we split each file into 62 separate FITS files via the *FTOOLS* (Blackburn et al., 1995) software package. We replicated global and extension headers for each output file to preserve metadata required for our image processing.
3. *Coordinate Correction*– Each DECam image came pre-encoded with right ascension (RA) and declination (Dec) information indicating the coordinates of the telescope pointing center. We shifted the RA & Dec of each remaining CCD to their true coordinate values. The RA & Dec offsets used for each CCD are provided with the online supplement.
4. *World Coordinate System Purging*– We discovered World Coordinate System (WCS) headers encoded in the FITS files were preventing *photometrypipeline* and/or *astrometry.net* from performing astrometry. We were able to resolve the issue by purging all WCS header information as part of our optimization process. The header record names are listed in the online supplement.

⁴www.anaconda.com




Figure 4.3: Two asteroid thumbnail contrast selection approaches are shown in **a** and **b**. **a**) The *photometry pipeline* thumbnail shows increased dynamic range. **b**) Iterative Rejection sacrifices some dynamic range (notice especially the edges of the center galaxy and the spiral galaxy to its upper-right) in favor of recovering more objects, many of which are not visible in **a** that can be easily seen in **b**. **c** & **d**) Asteroid 2012 YU2 is shown in two frames comprising one animated GIF file.

5. *WCS Population via astrometry.net*– We installed the *astrometry.net* (Lang et al., 2010) v0.72 software suite on *Monsoon*. We processed all 35,640 FITS files to retrieve coordinate information for each image by matching the image to one or more index files (catalogs of stars for specific regions of sky, designed for astrometric solving).
6. *photometrypipeline Image Processing*– We performed source extraction, photometry, astrometry and image correction via the *photometrypipeline* software suite.
7. *Identifying Known Asteroids* We identified known asteroid in our data by making use of *pp-distill*, a module of *photometrypipeline*.
8. *FITS Thumbnail Generation*– We extracted the RA, Dec, and (x, y) pixel coordinates of each object. We then produced 480×480 pixel, lossless, FITS format asteroid thumbnails, each a small image centered on an asteroid. For cases where the object was too close (< 240 pixels) to one or more image edges, we found it best to use the *NumPy*⁵ *Python* routine to “roll” the image array; the technique shifts an array as if it were wrapped around a cylinder. For example: array [0, 1, 2, 3] rolled left by 1 would result in array [1, 2, 3, 0].
9. *Create PNG Thumbnails*– We used an iterative-rejection technique to compute contrast parameters, then produced Portable Network Graphics (PNG) image files via *Matplotlib*⁶.
10. *Animated GIF Creation* We combined thumbnails of asteroids observed more than once (Figure 4.4c) to create animated GIF files (Figure 4.3) using the *Python Image Library*⁷ software package. There are a number of advantages to this inspection approach, including 1) the opportunity to inspect one asteroid at multiple epochs, 2) activity may not occur at every epoch, and 3) activity may be easier to spot if the inspector has the opportunity to become familiar with an object (e.g., the general shape or streak pattern), even if only briefly.
11. *Examination of Image Products* – Three authors served as asteroid thumbnail inspectors. Each inspector conducted a procedure consisting of rapid by-eye examination of asteroid thumbnails and animated GIFs, covering each thumbnail at least once. We flagged thumbnails and animations containing potential active asteroids for a later en masse review.




Figure 4.4: **a)** Exposure time distribution in our data. **b)** Histogram of apparent magnitudes for known asteroids we identified in our dataset. **c)** Observations per object; the 15,600 asteroid thumbnails contained 11,703 unique objects, 3029 of which were observed more than once. **d)** Cumulative histogram showing the depth of magnitudes (stars and asteroids) found in our dataset. 50% of our images reached a magnitude of $m_R = 23.7$. Sources with a signal-to-noise ratio of $<5:1$ were not included. **e)** Asteroids encountered shown in geocentric ecliptic space, where λ and β are the ecliptic longitude and latitude, respectively. Distinct patches sum to $\sim 1000 \text{ deg}^2$, as described in the text. Milky Way coordinates were retrieved from the *D3-Celestial* (<http://ofrohn.github.io>) software suite.

4.3 Results

Pipeline – We created a pipeline (Figure 4.2) that takes as its input DECam multi-extension FITS files, and returns individual asteroid thumbnails and animated GIF files. The initial total compute time requested across all tasks was 13,000 hours (1.5 compute-years), but after optimization (see Optimization section below) only ~ 500 compute hours were required. See the online supplement for a comprehensive table of resources utilized during this project.

Image Products We extracted 15,600 asteroid thumbnails from 35,640 DECam images ($\sim 2 \text{ Tb}$ total). Most of our data consisted of exposure times $>300\text{s}$ (Figure 4.4a). These longer integration times allowed us to probe deeper (fainter), with asteroids captured down to 25^{th} magnitude (Figure 4.4b). Each of the 11,703 unique objects identified in our data were observed between 1 and 5 times, with 3029 objects imaged more than once (Figure 4.4c).

To compute our coverage area on sky (depicted in Figure 4.4e) we employed a nearest neighbor algorithm to identify the distinct (non-overlapping) regions of our dataset. Two fields were considered overlapping if their center-to-center distance was < 1.8 degrees, the width of one DECam field. We computed our coverage to be ~ 200 distinct 3 deg^2 patches comprising ~ 1000 square degrees.

⁵www.numpy.org

⁶www.matplotlib.org

⁷www.pythonware.com/products/pil/




Figure 4.5: Asteroid (62412) shown with the “hsv” colormap and Mitchell interpolation. The asteroid is at the center of the frame and the tail can be seen between the dashed lines.

Active Asteroids – We imaged one asteroid previously discovered to be active (Sheppard & Trujillo, 2015): (62412). The object shows activity in our image (Figure 4.5; see the online supplement for additional image color map and interpolation permutations) and we were able to identify activity in two other DECam frames that were not part of this work. Sheppard & Trujillo (2015) confirmed activity with Magellan Telescope follow-up observations. We also imaged two other objects listed as active: (1) Ceres and (779) Nina but neither showed signs of activity.

Optimization – The final pipeline resulted from a series of iterative optimizations carried out with a subset of our large dataset. These optimizations produced order-of-magnitude reductions in compute time, and improved successful pipeline completion from the initial $\sim 35\%$ to the final 94%. The implemented optimizations and their results are broken down below by number (matched to the corresponding procedure number of Section 4.2.4). The final optimized *Slurm* parameters used on *Monsoon* can be found in the online supplement.

1. *Image Reduction*: No optimization needed.
2. *File-Splitting*: Splitting each multi-extension FITS file into 62 separate FITS files resulted in a larger number of smaller tasks which were better suited for parallel processing.
3. *Coordinate Correction*: Coordinate corrections proved cumbersome and inefficient, so we added *astrometry.net* to our pipeline.
4. *WCS Purging*: We identified mismatched distortion coefficients as the primary culprit behind roughly

1/3 of our images failing *photometrypipeline* analysis. We purged all World Coordinate System (WCS) headers, allowing us to employ *astrometry.net* which increased our overall throughput and output.

5. *astrometry.net Astrometry*: We cached all (~ 32 Gb) astrometry index files (described in Section 4.2.4 item 5) locally so *astrometry.net* would not be dependent on the speed of the internet connection and file host. We optimized the *astrometry.net* computation by supplying the following parameters we extracted from our FITS files. Providing a pixel scale range ($\sim 0''.25/\text{pixel}$ to $\sim 0''.28/\text{pixel}$) and R.A./decl. values narrowed the range of indices that required searching. We found a $15''$ search radius further reduced computation time without impacting image recognition efficacy. We disabled *astrometry.net* plotting due to a *Slurm* incompatibility, and computation time decreased further still. We found submitting *astrometry.net* “solve-field” tasks directly to *Slurm* was much faster. All but 41 images successfully matched for astrometry on first pass, and we improved *astrometry.net* image recognition speed roughly tenfold.
6. *photometrypipeline*: Proper configuration of prerequisite software and *photometrypipeline* proved crucial; the online supplement contains the necessary parameters we used. We made minor modifications to the *photometrypipeline* code, described in the online supplement. We found out *astropy* was using home directory temporary storage space, a fatal error for systems with enforced quotas; the home storage space was also slower than the scratch space. Proper configuration reduced computation time and increased the pipeline success rate.
7. *Known Asteroid Identification* We added an initial *SkyBot* query to identify the asteroids within each image. We then populated the requisite OBJECT FITS header keyword in each of our images, thereby enabling us to call *Horizons* to locate asteroids in our images and provide accurate astrometry. Prepending the *SkyBot* query and populating the OBJECT keyword enabled us to run asteroid identification tasks in parallel, reducing processing time by three orders-of-magnitude.
8. *FITS Thumbnails*: We “rolled” images (described in Section 4.2.4 item 8) so we could create full-sized (480×480 pixel) thumbnails. While thumbnails sometimes looked peculiar when rolled, this method preserved image statistics used to compute the narrow range of contrast achieved in the next section.
9. *PNG Thumbnails*: While *photometrypipeline* does output thumbnails by default, we were unable to see enough detail with the default scaling. Therefore, we employed an iterative rejection technique. Figures 4.3 a and 4.3 b compare the two contrast ranges. For each of the 15,600 asteroid thumbnails, we chose to output different colormap/interpolation combinations: two modes of interpolation (Mitchell–Netravali balanced cubic spline filter and one set unfiltered), each in 11 color schemes (afmhot, binary, bone, gist_sern, gist_yarg, gray, hot, hsv, inferno, Purples, and viridis), examples of which are shown in

Table 4.5: SAFARI Asteroid Populations

Zone	R_i (A:J)	a_{p_i} (au)	a_{p_o} (au)	R_o (A:J)	SAFARI (N) (%)	
Int.	...	0	2.064	4:3	115	1
IMB	4:3	2.064	2.501	3:1	3,605	26
MMB	3:1	2.501	2.824	5:2	5,358	39
OMB	5:2	2.824	3.277	2:1	4,599	33
Ext.	2:1	3.277	∞	...	162	1
Total*	...	...	...	...	13,839	100

Int., Ext.: Interior, Exterior to the main belt

IMB, MMB, OMB: Inner, Mid, Outer Main Belt

 a_{p_i}, a_{p_o} : inner, outer proper semi-major axisA:J Asteroid:Jupiter; R_i, R_o : inner/outer resonances

*Not included: 791 objects with unknown parameters.

the online supplement. The optimized dynamic ranges allowed faint trails to become more visible. These colormap/interpolation schemes gave us, as thumbnail inspectors, the ability to choose a comfortable theme for use while searching thumbnails for asteroid activity, thereby increasing our productivity.

10. *Animated GIFs*: We produced animated GIFs enabling an alternative inspection format.
11. *Examination*: We uncovered common sources of false positives (discussed in Section 4.4.3) and incorporated their presence into our visual examination procedures, resulting in a streamlined examination process while simultaneously reduced the number of false-positives.

4.4 Discussion

We set out to determine if DECam data would provide a suitable pool from which to search for active asteroids. We crafted a method to extract asteroid thumbnails from DECam data, and the large number of asteroids encountered (11,703) along with the exceptional depth our images probed (Figures 4.4b and 4.4d) indicate our data are well-suited to locating active asteroids.

4.4.1 Population Traits

As indicated by Figures 4.4a-d, the population imaged during our survey were subject to selection effects caused by the depth ($\bar{m}_R = 23.7$) of our survey (e.g., closer objects would have appeared as long trails which would have been difficult to identify with our pipeline). We classified the objects following the procedure of Hsieh et al. (2018a); we categorized our population as Inner Main Belt (IMB), Mid Main Belt (MMB), and Outer Main Belt (OMB), plus two additional regions: “Interior” (to the IMB) and “Exterior” (to the OMB). Table 4.5 indicates the boundaries, along with their Asteroid:Jupiter (A:J) resonances.

The synthetic proper semi-major axis a_p aims to minimize the influence of transient perturbations

(Knežević et al., 2000). We made use the *AstDyn-2*⁸ online catalog service (Knežević & Milani, 2003) in determining proper orbital parameters for asteroids in our dataset (Table 4.5).

Our target (object) aperture photometry was computed with a fixed diameter of 10 pixels, though photometric calibration was performed with an aperture radius determined by curve-of-growth analysis (see Mommert (2017) for details). To determine the surface brightness limit of our catalog we first computed the limit SB of each image

$$SB_{\text{lim}} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{k=N} \left(m_{0_k} - 2.5 \log_{10} \left(n \sigma_{\text{bg}_k} \sqrt{1/A} \right) \right)}{N}, \quad (4.3)$$

where m_0 is the photometric zero point (determined by *PhotometryPipeline*), n the order of detection level for background noise standard deviation σ_{bg} , and A is the area of one pixel in square arcseconds (Hsieh 2018, personal communication). The DECam camera had a pixel scale of $0''.263/\text{pixel}$, give a pixel area

$$A = (0''.263)^2 = 0.069169 \text{ arcseconds}^2. \quad (4.4)$$

For our surface brightness analysis we made use of $N = 32,790$ chips for which we had been able to determine a photometric zero point. We computed the 3σ mean surface brightness limit of our dataset to be $SB_{\text{lim}} = 26.44 \pm 0.24 \text{ mag/arcsec}^2$.

4.4.2 Occurrence Rates

We also aimed to validate the published asteroid activity occurrence rates of Table 4.4. Occurrence rates have been conservatively set at 1 in 10,000 (for all main belt asteroids), with the limiting magnitude of surveys the primary bottleneck. As shown in Figure 4.4d, the DECam instrument reaches an average magnitude of 24 (Sheppard & Trujillo, 2016), an unprecedented depth for large area active asteroid surveys. While our complete dataset was consistent with the 1:10,000 activity occurrence rate estimate, it is somewhat surprising we did not discover additional asteroidal activity.

Hsieh et al. (2015a) postulated many active asteroids could be continuously active throughout their orbits (not just at perihelion), but with weaker activity. We expected then to find active asteroids more frequently in our search, given the objects we observed were indeed of a fainter magnitude (Figure 4.4b), though our outer main belt occurrence rate ($\sim 1:4000$) was slightly higher than that reported by Hsieh et al. (2015a) which is in line with their prediction. Small number statistics may have contributed to the possible discrepancy, and it is plausible we missed activity indications due to the limitations of visual inspection which were further

⁸<http://hamilton.dm.unipi.it/astdys>




Figure 4.6: Common potential false-positives encountered in an asteroid thumbnail. (a) This thumbnail includes 4 potential false-positive sources: (A) Asteroid (432345). (B) *Scattered light* from a bright star trails toward the lower-left corner. (C) An *extended source*, such as this edge-on galaxy, can present itself as coma if close to an asteroid. (D) *Cosmic rays* with variable morphology are common throughout our images; they can look like trails if they align with a star as in this case. (E) *Juxtaposed* objects can masquerade as active asteroids, especially when a bright object is near one or more progressively dimmer objects along the direction of apparent motion.

compounded by an increased prevalence of background sources compared to shallower surveys. The use of a point spread function (PSF) comparison technique (e.g., Hsieh et al. (2015a) or a photometric search (e.g., Cikota et al. (2014)) could help us identify candidates, features we plan to investigate in future work.

4.4.3 False Positives

We found false-positive management to be a formidable task, with specific mechanisms responsible for creating false-positives recurring throughout the project. For the rare cases where one of the authors involved in inspecting thumbnails found potential activity in an asteroid thumbnail, we checked other interpolation and color schemes, other thumbnails of the same asteroid, and the animated GIF if available. We checked frames showing the same region on the sky, including original CCD images, for background sources or image artifacts. What follows is a discussion of the primary culprits in order to convey the challenges faced during by-eye inspection (which is subjective by nature).

Juxtaposition – Figure 4.6A marks asteroid (432345); the object is in close proximity to a galaxy, which, if juxtaposed in a confusing manner, could give the appearance of a coma. 4.6D shows how a cosmic ray can be juxtaposed with a star. Figure 4.6E demonstrates how multiple objects may appear to be an extended

source.

Extended Sources – Extended sources, especially galaxies, were present in a myriad of orientations and configurations. They can appear like active asteroids, as in the edge-on galaxy shown in Figure 4.6C. For a given brightness, galaxies occupied more sky area in a frame than other types of natural (i.e., non-artifact) objects and were more likely to be juxtaposed with other objects.

Scattered Light – Figure 4.6B is scattered light associated with an especially bright star; the flare originates from the star and tapers off the further the “tail” gets from the source. While obvious in Figure 4.6, the “tail” can be more difficult to identify as scattered light if the source is outside of the thumbnail.

Cosmic Rays – Cosmic rays (e.g. Figure 4.6D) are common throughout our images, most of which have exposure times of 300 seconds or longer (see Figure 4.3a). Figure 4.6 D demonstrates how cosmic rays may not appear as straight lines, and they may seem to connect two or more objects together.

Poor Seeing – Images with poor and/or rapidly varying seeing conditions suffered from fuzziness (potentially coma-like) and elongation implying a trailed object (e.g., an asteroid).

4.4.4 Limitations of By-eye Inspection

As proof-of-concept for future projects making use of larger datasets, we sought a general understanding of our throughput as thumbnail inspectors. It is worth noting we did not impose time limits upon ourselves. We noted markedly different inspection rates, with the time required to inspect all thumbnails ranging from 2 to 6 hours. Furthermore, our attention spans varied, with inspection sessions lasting roughly between 10 minutes to 3 hours before requiring a break. The false positive handling described above undoubtedly impacted our image examination efficacy to some degree. Given these challenges, it is evident a computational approach to screen for potential active asteroids (through e.g., PSF comparison) would improve our detection rate.

4.4.5 Asteroid Selection

We examined only known asteroids during this work, but certainly many unknown asteroids are present within our data. Future efforts involving Citizen Scientists could locate these objects and quantify previously unrecognized biases inherent to locating activity among known asteroids. We used observations from a southern observatory, and while there may be little to no effect on observed activity occurrence rates, we acknowledge this selection effect nonetheless.

4.4.6 Future Work

A broader study of the efficacy of human inspectors should be carried out if employing a larger number of inspectors. Injecting artificial active asteroids into the datasets would enable quantifying detection rates. The enormous datasets (2M+ thumbnails) we plan to generate will necessitate the deployment of a Citizen Science project, an endeavor that would thoroughly flush out these detection rates.

Citizen Science endeavors enable scientists to analyze otherwise prohibitively large datasets, with the added benefit of providing the scientific community with invaluable outreach opportunities proven to engage the public and spark far-reaching interest in science. *Zooniverse*⁹, designed with the average scientist in mind, facilitates deployment of crowd-sourcing science projects. Volunteers are enlisted to interpret data too complex for machines, but accomplishable by anyone with minimal training. *Zooniverse* has a proven track record, with notable successes such as *Galaxy Zoo* which, within 24 hours of launch, reached 70,000 identifications/hour (Cox et al., 2015). While traditional and social media coverage undoubtedly boosted the performance of *Galaxy Zoo* and other exemplary Citizen Science projects, the platform is designed to facilitate such exposure, especially through social media connectivity.

Our aim is to expand our survey to a second, comparably sized dataset already in-hand. We will first explore strategies to quantify active asteroid candidacy through computational techniques such as PSF comparison. We will then use the combined datasets to design, implement and test a Citizen Science project. We plan to start with a moderate (~ 10 member) group of thumbnail inspectors consisting of undergraduate and graduate students, whose feedback will inform the documentation and training system which is crucial to the success of a Citizen Science project. We subsequently intend to expand our dataset to the entire DECam public archive, at which point we would open our analysis system to public participation. We hope to incorporate machine learning into our pipeline as a means of reducing the number of thumbnails sent to the Citizen Science project or to help locate candidates missed at any point in the process.

4.5 Summary

We have developed an approach for finding active asteroids, rare objects visually like comets but dynamically like asteroids. We show DECam data are suitable for active asteroid searches. The approach involved processing 35,640 FITS files and extracting 15,600 asteroid thumbnails (small images centered on an asteroid) consisting of 11,703 unique objects. Upon visual examination of all thumbnails, we identified one previously known active asteroid (62412); our discovery rate of 1 in 11,703 is consistent with the currently accepted active asteroid occurrence rate of 1 in 10,000. We did observe (1) Ceres and (779) Nina, though the former is

⁹www.zooniverse.org

a special case of *a priori* activity knowledge (A’Hearn & Feldman, 1992; Küppers et al., 2014), and neither object has ever shown signs of activity visible from Earth; as we did not observe activity in either object, we did not include them in our activity occurrence rate estimate. From our proof-of-concept study, we conclude a significantly larger survey should be carried out to locate active asteroids, finally placing them into a regime where they may be studied as a population.

4.6 Acknowledgements

The authors thank the referee, Henry Hsieh (Planetary Science Institute), whose thorough and thoughtful feedback vastly improved the quality of this work. Prof. Ty Robinson of Northern Arizona University (NAU) helped us keep this project a priority and provided fresh perspectives on scientific dilemmas. Dr. Mark Jesus Mendoza Magbanua (University of California San Francisco) whose insights greatly improved the quality of the paper. Annika Gustaffson (NAU) provided frequent input and encouraged us to move this project forward. The enthusiastic support provided by Monsoon supercomputer system administrator Christopher Coffey (NAU) was essential in overcoming countless technical challenges. The Trilling Research Group (NAU) provided insight and feedback about our data visualization techniques. Prof. Mike Gowanlock (NAU) inspired numerous computational techniques which reduced our analysis compute time.

Computational analyses were run on Northern Arizona University’s Monsoon computing cluster, funded by Arizona’s Technology and Research Initiative Fund. This work was made possible in part through the State of Arizona Technology and Research Initiative Program. Michael Mommert was supported in part by NASA grant NNX15AE90G to David E. Trilling.

This research has made use of the VizieR catalogue access tool, CDS, Strasbourg, France. The original description of the VizieR service was published in A&AS 143, 23 (Ochsenbein et al., 2000). This research has made use of data and/or services provided by the International Astronomical Union’s Minor Planet Center. This research has made use of NASA’s Astrophysics Data System. This research has made use of the The Institut de Mécanique Céleste et de Calcul des Éphémérides (IMCCE) SkyBoT Virtual Observatory tool (Berthier et al., 2006). This work made use of the FTOOLS software package hosted by the NASA Goddard Flight Center High Energy Astrophysics Science Archive Research Center.

This project used data obtained with the Dark Energy Camera (DECam), which was constructed by the Dark Energy Survey (DES) collaboration. Funding for the DES Projects has been provided by the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. National Science Foundation, the Ministry of Science and Education of Spain, the Science and Technology Facilities Council of the United Kingdom, the Higher Education Funding Council for England, the National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois at

Urbana-Champaign, the Kavli Institute of Cosmological Physics at the University of Chicago, Center for Cosmology and Astro-Particle Physics at the Ohio State University, the Mitchell Institute for Fundamental Physics and Astronomy at Texas A&M University, Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos, Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo, Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos, Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico and the Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Collaborating Institutions in the Dark Energy Survey. The Collaborating Institutions are Argonne National Laboratory, the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Cambridge, Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas, Medioambientales y Tecnológicas–Madrid, the University of Chicago, University College London, the DES-Brazil Consortium, the University of Edinburgh, the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH) Zürich, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Institut de Ciències de l’Espai (IEEC/CSIC), the Institut de Física d’Altes Energies, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München and the associated Excellence Cluster Universe, the University of Michigan, the National Optical Astronomy Observatory, the University of Nottingham, the Ohio State University, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Portsmouth, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Stanford University, the University of Sussex, and Texas A&M University.

Based on observations at Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, National Optical Astronomy Observatory (NOAO Prop. IDs 2015A-0351 2016B-0288, 2017A-0367, 2015B-0265, 2013B-0453, 2014B-0303, 2016A-0401 and 2014A-0479; PI: Scott Sheppard), which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA) under a cooperative agreement with the National Science Foundation.

4.7 Appendix

4.7.1 Object-specific References

SPK-ID are found at the JPL Horizons Small Bodies Database (<https://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/sbdb.cgi>).

1. (1) Ceres, 1943 XB, A899 OF, SPK-ID=2000001; Activity Discovered: A'Hearn & Feldman (1992); Küppers et al. (2014); Mechanism: Küppers et al. (2014); Activity Obs.: 1 (1992) – A'Hearn & Feldman (1992), 2 (2011-2013) – Küppers et al. (2014); Nathues et al. (2015), 3 (2015-2016) – Thangjam et al. (2016); Nathues et al. (2017a); Landis et al. (2017); Roth (2018); Visit: Dawn (Russell et al., 2016); Absence of Family Association: Rivkin et al. (2014); Hsieh et al. (2018a); Additional: Tu et al. (2014); Witze (2015); Hayne & Aharonson (2015); Nathues et al. (2015); Li et al. (2016); Roth et al. (2016); Prettyman et al. (2017); McKay et al. (2017); Nathues et al. (2017b); Landis et al. (2017)
2. (145) Adeona, SPK-ID=2000145; Activity Discovery: Busarev et al. (2016); Mechanism: Busarev et al. (2016); Activity Obs.: 1 (2012) – Busarev et al. (2016)*; Visit: Dawn (cancelled)¹⁰; Additional: Busarev et al. (2018)
3. (315) Constantia, SPK-ID=2000315; Candidacy: Cikota et al. (2014); Flora family association: Alfvén (1969)
4. (493) Griseldis, 1902 JS, A915 BB, SPK-ID=2000493; Activity Discovery: Tholen et al. (2015a); Activity Obs.: 1 (2015) – Tholen et al. (2015a); Seargent (2017); Unknown impactor size: Hui & Jewitt (2017); Absence of Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a)
5. (596) Scheila, 1906 UA, 1949 WT, SPK-ID=2000596; Activity Discovery: Larson et al. (2010); Mechanism: Jewitt et al. (2011b); Bodewits et al. (2011); Yang & Hsieh (2011); Moreno et al. (2011b); Ishiguro et al. (2011b,c); Hsieh et al. (2012a); Husarik (2012); Neslušan et al. (2016); Activity Obs.: 1 (2010-2011) – Jewitt et al. (2011b); Bodewits et al. (2011); Yang & Hsieh (2011); Ishiguro et al. (2011b); Hsieh et al. (2012a); Husarik (2012); Neslušan et al. (2016); Absence of Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a)
6. (704) Interamnia, 1910 KU, 1952 MW, SPK-ID=2000704; Activity Discovery, Mechanism: Busarev et al. (2016); Activity Obs.: 1 (2012) – Busarev et al. (2016)*; Absence of Family Association: Rivkin et al. (2014); Shape Model: Satō et al. (2014); Additional: Busarev et al. (2018)
7. (779) Nina, 1914 UB, A908 YB, A912 TE, SPK-ID=2000779; Activity Discovery, Mechanism: Busarev et al. (2016); Activity Obs.: 1 (2012) – Busarev et al. (2016)*, 2 (2016) – Busarev et al. (2018)

¹⁰<https://www.nasa.gov/feature/new-horizons-receives-mission-extension-to-kuiper-belt-dawn-to-remain-at-ceres>

8. (1026) Ingrid, 1923 NY, 1957 UC, 1963 GD, 1981 WL8, 1986 CG2, 1986 ES2, SPK-ID=2001026; Candidacy: Cikota et al. (2014); Follow-up Observation (negative): Betzler et al. (2015); Flora family association: Alfvén (1969); Additional: Nakano (1986); Busarev et al. (2018)
9. (1474) Beira, 1935 QY, 1950 DQ, SPK-ID=2001474; Activity Discovery: Busarev et al. (2016); Mechanism: Busarev et al. (2016); Activity Obs.: 1 (2012) – Busarev et al. (2016)*; Chaotic Cometary Orbit: Hahn & Rickman (1985); Additional: Busarev et al. (2018)
10. (2201) Oljato, 1947 XC, 1979 VU2, 1979 XA, SPK-ID=2002201; Activity Discovery: Russell et al. (1984); Activity Obs.: 1 (1984) – Russell et al. (1984), Negative (1996) – (Chamberlin et al. (1996); Visit: Perozzi et al. (2001); Additional: Kerr (1985); McFadden et al. (1993); Connors et al. (2016)
11. (3200) Phaethon, 1983 TB, SPK-ID=2003200; Activity Discovery: Battams & Watson (2009); Mechanism: ; Activity Obs.: Negative – Chamberlin et al. (1996); Hsieh & Jewitt (2005), 1 (2009) – Battams & Watson (2009); Jewitt & Li (2010) 2 (2012) – Li & Jewitt (2013); Jewitt et al. (2013c), 3 (2016) – (Hui & Li (2017); Visit: Destiny Plus (Iwata et al., 2016); Pallas Family Association: Todorović (2018); Additional: Jewitt & Li (2010); Ryabova (2012); Li & Jewitt (2013); Jewitt et al. (2013c); Ansdell et al. (2014); Jakubík & Neslušan (2015); Hanuš et al. (2016); Sarli et al. (2017)
12. (3552) Don Quixote, 1983 SA, SPK-ID=2003552; Activity Discovery, Mechanism: Mommert et al. (2014); Activity Obs.: 1 (2009) – Mommert et al. (2014), (2018) – Mommert et al. (2018); Chaotic Cometary Orbit (as 1983 SA): Hahn & Rickman (1985)
13. (3646) Aduatiques, 1985 RK4, 1979 JL, 1981 WZ6, SPK-ID=2003646; Candidacy: Cikota et al. (2014); Follow-up (inconclusive): Sosa Oyarzabal et al. (2014)
14. (4015) Wilson–Harrington, 1979 VA, 107P, SPK-ID=2004015; Activity Discovery: Cunningham (1950); Activity Obs.: 1 (1949) – Cunningham (1950), 2 (1979) – Degewij et al. (1980), Negative (1992) – Bowell et al. (1992), Negative (1996) Chamberlin et al. (1996), Negative (2008) – Licandro et al. (2009), Negative (2009-2010) – Ishiguro et al. (2011b); Urakawa et al. (2011), 3-6 (1992, 1996, 2008, 2009-2010) Ferrín et al. (2012); Visits: Failed (Rayman & Varghese, 2001), Concept (Sollitt et al., 2009); Chaotic Cometary Orbit (as 1979 VA): Hahn & Rickman (1985); Additional: Harris (1950); van Biesbroeck (1951); Helin & Gaffey (1980); Helin (1981); Osip et al. (1995); Fernández et al. (1997)
15. (24684), 1990 EU4, 1981 UG28, SPK-ID=2024684; Candidacy: Cikota et al. (2014)
16. (35101) 1991 PL16, 1998 FZ37, SPK-ID=2035101; Candidacy: Cikota et al. (2014); Eunomia Family Association: Cikota et al. (2014)
17. (62412), 2000 SY178, SPK-ID=2062412; Activity Discovery: Sheppard & Trujillo (2015); Activity

- Obs.: 1 (2014) Sheppard & Trujillo (2015); Hygiea Family Association: Sheppard & Trujillo (2015); Hsieh et al. (2018a)
18. (162173) Ryugu, SPK-ID=2162173; Activity Discovery, Mechanism, Activity Obs.: 1 (2007) – Busarev et al. (2018)*; Visit: Hayabusa 2 (Tsuda et al., 2013); Clarissa Family Association Campins et al. (2013); Le Corre et al. (2018); Thermal Inertia: Liang-liang et al. (2014); Additional: Suzuki et al. (2018); Perna et al. (2017)
 19. (457175), 2008 GO98, 362P, SPK-ID=2457175; Activity Discovery: Kim et al. (2017a); Activity Obs.: 1 (2017) Masi (2017); Hilda Family Association: Warner & Stephens (2018); Additional: Sato (2017); Yoshimoto (2017); Birtwhistle (2017); Bacci et al. (2017a); Bell (2017); Bryssinck (2017)
 20. 133P/Elst-Pizarro, (7968), 1979 OW7, 1996 N2, SPK-ID=2007968; Activity Discovery: Elst et al. (1996); Mechanism: Hsieh et al. (2004); Jewitt et al. (2014b); Activity Obs.: 1 (1996) Elst et al. (1996), 2 (2002) Hsieh et al. (2004), Negative (2005) Toth (2006b), 2 (2007) Hsieh et al. (2010); Bagnulo et al. (2010); Rousselot et al. (2011), 3 (2013) Jewitt et al. (2014b); Visit: Castalia (Snodgrass et al., 2017c); Themis Family Association: Boehnhardt et al. (1998); Additional: Toth (2000); Ferrin (2006); Prialnik & Rosenberg (2009)
 21. 176P/LINEAR, (118401), P/1999 RE₇₀, 2001 AR7, SPK-ID=2118401; Activity Discovery: Hsieh et al. (2006); Hsieh (2009); Mechanism: Hsieh et al. (2014); Activity Obs.: 1 (2005) Hsieh et al. (2006), Negative (2006-2009) Hsieh et al. (2011b), Negative (2011) Hsieh et al. (2014); Themis Family Association: Hsieh (2009); Hsieh et al. (2018a) Additional: Hsieh et al. (2009a); Licandro et al. (2011); de Val-Borro et al. (2012)
 22. 233P (La Sagra), P/2009 W₅₀, 2005 JR71, SPK-ID=1003062; Activity Discovery: Mainzer et al. (2010), Activity Obs.: 1 (2009) Mainzer et al. (2010); Absence of Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a)
 23. 238P/Read, P/2005 U1, 2010 N2, SPK-ID=1001676; Activity Discovery: Read et al. (2005); Activity Obs.: 1 (2005) Read et al. (2005), 2 (2010) Hsieh et al. (2011c), 3 (2016) Hsieh et al. (2017b); Gorchakov Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a); Former Themis Family Association: Haghighipour (2009); Additional: Hsieh et al. (2009b); Pittichová & Chesley (2010)
 24. 259P/Garradd, 2008 R1, SPK-ID=1002991; Activity Discovery: Garradd et al. (2008); Mechanism: Jewitt et al. (2009); Activity Obs.: 1 (2008) Garradd et al. (2008), 2 (2017) Hsieh et al. (2017a,b); Absence of Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a); Additional: Kossacki & Szutowicz (2012); MacLennan & Hsieh (2012); Kleyna et al. (2012)
 25. 288P, (300163), 2006 VW139, SPK-ID=2300163; Activity Discovery: Hsieh et al. (2011a); Activity

- Obs.: 1 (2011) Hsieh et al. (2011a), 2 (2016-2017) Agarwal et al. (2017); Hsieh et al. (2017b); Themis Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2012c, 2018a); Additional: Hsieh et al. (2012c); Novaković et al. (2012); Agarwal et al. (2016)
26. 311P/Pan-STARRS, P/2013 P5, SPK-ID=1003273; Activity Discovery: Micheli et al. (2013); Mechanism: Jewitt et al. (2013a); Moreno et al. (2014); Hainaut et al. (2014); Jewitt et al. (2015b); Activity Obs.: 1 (2013-2014) Micheli et al. (2013); Jewitt et al. (2015b); Behrens Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a)
27. 313P/Gibbs, P/2014 S4, 2003 S10, SPK-ID=1003344; Activity Discovery: Gibbs & Sato (2014); Mechanism, Activity Obs.: 1 (2003) Nakano et al. (2014); Skiff et al. (2014); Hui & Jewitt (2015), 2 (2015) Jewitt et al. (2015d); Lixiaohua Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2013, 2015b, 2018a); Additional: Jewitt et al. (2015a); Hsieh et al. (2015b); Pozuelos et al. (2015)
28. 324P/La Sagra, P/2010 R2, 2015 K3, SPK-ID=1003104; Activity Discovery: Nomen et al. (2010); Activity Obs.: 1 (2010-2011) Nomen et al. (2010); Hsieh et al. (2012b), Negative (2013) Hsieh (2014), 2 (2015) Hsieh & Sheppard (2015); Jewitt et al. (2016); Alauda Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a); Additional: Moreno et al. (2011a); Hsieh et al. (2012b); Hsieh (2014); Hsieh & Sheppard (2015)
29. 331P/Gibbs, P/2012 F5, SPK-ID=1003182; Activity Discovery: Gibbs et al. (2012); Mechanism: Stevenson et al. (2012); Drahus et al. (2015); Activity Obs.: 1 (2012) Gibbs et al. (2012), 2 (2015) Drahus et al. (2015); Gibbs family association: Novaković et al. (2014); Additional: (Stevenson et al., 2012; Moreno et al., 2012)
30. 348P, P/2017 A2, P/2011 A5 (PANSTARRS), SPK-ID=1003492; Activity Discovery: Wainscoat et al. (2017); Activity Obs.: 1 (2017) Wainscoat et al. (2017); Absence of Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a)
31. 354P/LINEAR, P/2010 A2, 2017 B5, SPK-ID=1003055; Activity Discovery: Birtwhistle et al. (2010); Activity Obs.: 1 (2010) Birtwhistle et al. (2010); Jewitt et al. (2010a); Baptistina Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a); Additional: Moreno et al. (2010); Jewitt et al. (2010b); Snodgrass et al. (2010); Jewitt et al. (2011a); Hainaut et al. (2012); Kim et al. (2012); Agarwal et al. (2012); Kleya et al. (2013); Jewitt et al. (2013b); Agarwal et al. (2013); Kim et al. (2017a,b)
32. 358P/PanSTARRS, P/2012 T1, 2017 O3, SPK-ID=1003208; Activity Discovery: Wainscoat et al. (2012); Activity Obs.: 1 (2012) Wainscoat et al. (2012), 2 (2017) Kim et al. (2017a); Mechanism: Hsieh et al. (2013); Lixiaohua Family Association: (Hsieh et al., 2013, 2018a); Additional: Moreno

et al. (2013); O'Rourke et al. (2013); Snodgrass et al. (2017a)

33. P/2013 R3 (Catalina-Pan-STARRS), SPK-ID=1003275 (P/2013 R3-A SPK-ID=1003333, P/2013 R3-B SPK-ID=1003334); Activity Discovery: Bolin et al. (2013a); Hill et al. (2013); Activity Obs.: 1 (2013-2015) Bolin et al. (2013a); Hill et al. (2013); Jewitt et al. (2017); Mandragora Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a); Additional: Jewitt et al. (2014a); Hirabayashi et al. (2014)
34. P/2015 X6 (Pan-STARRS), SPK-ID=1003426; Activity Discovery: Lilly et al. (2015); Activity Obs.: 1 (2015) Lilly et al. (2015); Tubbiolo et al. (2015); Moreno et al. (2016a); Aeolia Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a)
35. P/2016 G1 (Pan-STARRS), SPK-ID=1003460; Activity Discovery: Weryk et al. (2016); Mechanism: Moreno et al. (2016b); Activity Obs.: 1 (2016) Weryk et al. (2016); Moreno et al. (2017); Adeona Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a)
36. P/2016 J1 (Pan-STARRS), P/2016 J1-A (SPK-ID=1003464), P/2016 J1-B (SPK-ID=1003465); Activity Discovery: Wainscoat et al. (2016); Activity Obs.: 1 (2016) Wainscoat et al. (2016); Hui et al. (2017); Theobalda Family Association: Hsieh et al. (2018a)

*: Under review.

Chapter 5

Manuscript II: Six Years of Sustained Activity from Active Asteroid (6478) Gault

Colin Orion Chandler¹, Jay Kueny¹, Annika Gustafsson¹, Chadwick A. Trujillo¹, Tyler D. Robinson¹, David E. Trilling¹

This is the Accepted Manuscript version of an article accepted for publication in Astrophysical Journal Letters. IOP Publishing Ltd is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it. The Version of Record is available online at <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.3847/2041-8213/ab1aaa>.

5.1 Abstract

We present archival observations demonstrating that main belt asteroid (6478) Gault has an extensive history of comet-like activity. Outbursts have taken place during multiple epochs since 2013 and at distances extending as far as 2.68 au, nearly aphelion. (6478) Gault is a member of the predominately S-type (i.e., volatile-poor) Phocaea family; no other main belt object of this type has ever shown more than a single activity outburst. Furthermore, our data suggest this is the longest duration of activity caused by a body spinning near the rotational breakup barrier. If activity is indeed unrelated to volatiles, as appears to be the case, (6478) Gault represents a new class of object, perpetually active due to rotational spin-up.

Keywords: minor planets, asteroids: individual ((6478) Gault) — comets: individual ((6478) Gault)

5.2 Introduction

Active asteroids like (6478) Gault (Figure 5.1, this work) are dynamically asteroidal objects but they uncharacteristically manifest cometary features such as tails or comae (Hsieh & Jewitt, 2006b). With only ~ 20 known to date (see Table 1 of Chandler et al. 2018), active asteroids remain poorly understood, yet they promise insight into solar system volatile disposition and, concomitantly, the origin of water on Earth (Hsieh & Jewitt, 2006a).

Active asteroids are often defined as objects with (1) comae, (2) semimajor axes interior to Jupiter, and (3) Tisserand parameters with respect to Jupiter $T_J > 3$; T_J describes an object’s orbital relationship to

¹Department of Physics & Astronomy, Northern Arizona University, PO Box 6010, Flagstaff, AZ 86011, USA

Jupiter by




Figure 5.1: (6478) Gault (dashed green circle) displays a prominent tail (indicated by white arrows) during this 2013 September 28 apparition when (6478) Gault was halfway between perihelion and aphelion. This 90 s g -band exposure reached ~ 7 mag fainter than (6478) Gault. The anti-Solar direction ($-\odot$; yellow) and negative heliocentric velocity vector ($-\vec{v}$; red) are shown.

$$T_J = \frac{a_J}{a} + 2\sqrt{\frac{a(1-e^2)}{a_J}} \cos(i) \quad (5.1)$$

where a_J is the semimajor axis of Jupiter, e is the eccentricity, and i is the inclination; see Jewitt (2012) for a thorough treatment. Main belt comets are a subset of active asteroids dynamically constrained to the main asteroid belt and thought to have volatile-driven activity (see e.g., Snodgrass et al. 2017b for an in-depth discussion). It is worth pointing out that some objects have had multiple classifications, for instance (3552) Don Quixote has an asteroid designation due to its low activity and has been called a near-Earth asteroid (Mommert et al., 2014) but has a T_J of 2.3 which indicates it is more properly a Jupiter family comet.

Discovering these objects has proven observationally challenging. The first active asteroid, (4015) Wilson-Harrington, was discovered in 1949 (Harris, 1950). In the mid-1980s a connection between bow-shock magnetic field disturbances detected by the *Pioneer* spacecraft suggested (2201) Oljato was leaving behind a distant comet-like gas trail (Kerr, 1985), even if not detected at the object itself (Russell et al., 1984). Despite many efforts (see e.g., Chamberlin et al. 1996) it was not until the 1996 discovery of activity in (7968) Elst-Pizarro that another active asteroid was visually identified (Elst et al., 1996). Though initially

impact appeared a possible cause (e.g., Toth 2000), when activity recurred (Hsieh et al., 2010) it was more indicative of volatile sublimation.

A significant complication hindering our understanding of active asteroids arises when assessing underlying activity mechanisms: causes are neither few nor mutually exclusive (see Jewitt 2012 for a comprehensive overview). Responsible primary processes include volatile sublimation (e.g., 133P/Elst-Pizarro, Hsieh et al. 2010), impact events (e.g., (596) Scheila, Bodewits et al. 2011; Moreno et al. 2011a), rotational breakup (e.g., 311P/PanSTARRS, Jewitt et al. 2013a; Moreno et al. 2014), thermal fracture (e.g., (3200) Phaethon, discussed below), and cryovolcanism (e.g., (1) Ceres, Küppers et al. 2014; Witze 2015). Physical interaction, or “rubbing binary,” has been proposed as a primary mechanism in the case of 311P (Hainaut et al. 2014, cf. Jewitt et al. 2018). Secondary mechanisms such as electrostatic gardening, physical properties like chemical makeup, and geometric effects (e.g., the opposition effect) may influence our ability to reliably detect and quantify outbursts.

One crucial diagnostic indicator of the underlying activity mechanism is whether or not activity recurs. If activity is observed on only one occasion (i.e., a single apparition), then the object may have experienced a recent impact event. Expelled material and/or exposed volatiles sublimating may both cause comae or tails to appear. Activity would then cease once ejecta dissipated or the volatile supply is exhausted, reburied, or refrozen.

Recurrent activity is typically associated with volatile sublimation. For example, Geminid Meteor Shower parent body (3200) Phaethon is thought to undergo thermal fracture during the rapid temperature changes accompanying its perihelion passages (Li & Jewitt, 2013) where it experiences temperatures > 800 K (Ohtsuka et al., 2009). Fracture events may directly expel material in addition to exposing volatiles for sublimation.

Thermally induced activity is thought to increase with decreasing heliocentric distance; that is, the closer a body is to the Sun, the more likely an outburst is to occur. Active asteroids are more likely to exhibit activity during perihelion passage (see Table 1 of Chandler et al. 2018). Notable exceptions where activity was discovered at distances far from perihelion include 311P/PanSTARRS (Jewitt et al., 2013a) and (493) Griseldis (Tholen et al., 2015a). Activity in “traditional” comets has been reported at distances that are substantially farther than the main asteroid belt, for instance Comet C/2010 U3 (Boattini) at 27 au (Hui et al., 2019). Of the ~ 20 active asteroids known to date, 16 are carbonaceous (i.e., C-type) but only four are believed to be composed of silicate-rich non-primitive material (i.e., DeMeo et al. 2009 S-type taxonomy): (2201) Oljato (Apollo-orbit), 233P/La Sagra (Encke-orbit), 311P/PanSTARRS (inner main belt), and 354P/LINEAR (outer main belt).

(6478) Gault activity was first reported in 2019 January (Smith et al., 2019). Ensuing follow-up observa-

tions (Maury et al., 2019) confirmed activity with subsequent reports (Lee, 2019; Ye et al., 2019a) providing evidence of ongoing activity. Ye et al. (2019b) reported that multiple outbursts actually began in 2018 December. Analysis of dust emanating from (6478) Gault via Monte Carlo tail brightness simulations indicate the current apparition, comprised of two outbursts, could have begun as early as 2018 November 5 (Moreno et al., 2019). Simultaneous to our own work, Jewitt et al. (2019) reported three tails with independent onsets, the earliest being 2018 October 28.

We set out to determine if any data in our local repository of National Optical Astronomy Observatory (NOAO) Dark Energy Camera (DECam) images showed signs of activity. The ~ 500 megapixel DECam instrument on the Blanco 4 m telescope situated on Cerro Tololo, Chile, probes faintly (~ 24 mag) and, as we demonstrated in Chandler et al. (2018), it is well-suited to detect active asteroids. We produced novel tools taking into account (1) orbital properties of (6478) Gault (summarized in Appendix 5.11.1) and (2) observational properties (e.g., apparent magnitude, filter selection, exposure time) to find ideally suited candidate images.

5.3 Methods

We searched our own in-house database of archival astronomical data (e.g., observation date, coordinates) in order to locate images that are likely to show (6478) Gault. Our database includes the entire NOAO DECam public archive data tables along with corresponding data from myriad sources (e.g., NASA JPL Horizons Giorgini et al. 1996; see also the Acknowledgements).

5.4 Locating Candidate Images

We began our search for (6478) Gault by making use of a fast grid query in R.A. and decl. space. We then passed these results through a more accurate circular filter prescribed for the DECam image sensor arrangement. Lastly, we computed image sensor chip boundaries precisely to ensure that the object fell on a sensor rather than, for example, gaps between camera chips. This progressively more precise query approach cut down image search time by orders of magnitude.

5.5 Observability Assessment

We created a reverse exposure time calculator to estimate how faintly (i.e., the magnitude limit) candidate images probed. After applying color coefficient corrections (see Willmer 2018 for procedure details) we transformed the color-corrected magnitudes to the absolute bolometric system used by the DECam exposure

Table 5.1: (6478) Gault Archival DECam Observations Examined

Activity	UT Date	Time	Processing	t_{exp} (s)	Filter	m_{lim}	m_V	Δm	r (au)	$\%_{T \rightarrow q}$	$\angle_{\text{STO}}$ ($^\circ$)
	2013 Sep 22	3:03	R, I, Re	45	Y	21.0	17.2	-4	2.27	54	3.41
*	2013 Sep 28	2:23	R, I, I, Re	90	g	24.2	17.0	-7	2.28	52	0.45
*	2013 Oct 13	3:06	I, I, I, Re	90	i	23.3	17.1	-6	2.32	49	8.21
	2013 Oct 13	3:08	I, I, Re	90	z	22.7	17.1	-6	2.32	49	8.21
*	2016 Jun 09	4:45	R, I, Re	96	r	23.9	16.8	-7	1.86	100	22.38
*	2016 Jun 10	4:40	R, I, Re	107	g	24.2	16.8	-7	1.86	100	22.48
	2017 Oct 23	8:57	R, I, Re	80	z	22.7	18.8	-4	2.66	10	14.79
	2017 Nov 11	7:13	R, I, Re	80	z	22.7	18.5	-5	2.68	8	10.92
*	2017 Nov 12	5:14	R, I, Re	111	g	24.3	18.5	-6	2.68	8	10.81

Note. Process types: Raw (R), InstCal (I), Resampled (Re); r : Sun-target distance; $\%_{T \rightarrow q}$: target distance toward perihelion from aphelion (Equation 5.2); t_{exp} : exposure time; m_{lim} : estimated exposure magnitude limit; m_V : (6478) Gault apparent V-band magnitude; Δm : $m - m_{\text{lim}}$; $\angle_{\text{STO}}$: Sun-Target-Observer (phase) angle. Thumbnails are included in Appendix 5.11.2.

time calculator². These steps enabled us to compute differences between apparent magnitude and the specific magnitude limit of the DECam exposure so that we could produce a list of images where (6478) Gault could be detected.

5.6 Thumbnail Extraction

We downloaded the image files containing (6478) Gault from the NOAO archive and, following the procedures of Chandler et al. (2018), we extracted flexible image transport system (FITS) thumbnails of (6478) Gault. We then performed image processing to enhance contrast before finally producing portable network graphics (PNG) image files for inspection.

5.7 Image Analysis

We visually inspected our (6478) Gault thumbnail images to check for signs of activity. PNG thumbnails with activity indicators were examined in greater detail via the corresponding FITS thumbnail image.

To assess the influence of heliocentric distance on activity level we employed a simple metric (see Chandler et al. (2018) “ $\%_{\text{peri}}$ ” for motivation) describing how far from perihelion q the target T was located (at distance d) relative to its aphelion distance Q by

$$\%_{T \rightarrow q} = \left(\frac{Q - d}{Q - q} \right) \cdot 100\%. \quad (5.2)$$

5.8 Results

We successfully extracted thumbnails from 9 archival observations of (6478) Gault; see Table 5.1 for details. Most data were available in raw and calibrated form (“InstCal” and “Resampled” are described by Collaboration et al. 2016) allowing us to extract ~ 30 thumbnail images in total. Figure 5.1 shows (6478) Gault in 2013 with a pronounced tail in the 6 o’clock direction. Figure 5.4 (a) and Figure 5.4 (b) show (6478) Gault in 2016 and 2017, respectively. Additional images may be found in Appendix 5.11.2.

Figure 5.2 summarizes our observed activity. We found activity at least once in every set of observations and no correlation with distance. We plotted apparent V -band magnitude (solid green line) and found that all periods of activity were observed near opposition events. We further define “observability” (dashed yellow line) as when the object was (1) above 15° elevation, and (2) visible outside of daylight hours. This allowed us to assess potential observational biases specific to the southern hemisphere where our data were collected. As demonstrated by the coinciding of apparent magnitude maxima with spikes in apparent magnitude, the primary observability factor was solar elongation.

Figure 5.3 shows how (6478) Gault varies in both temperature T and distance r through time. Indicated are our activity observations (red stars) and the current apparition (blue pentagon). Temperature varies between ~ 165 K at aphelion Q (blue dash-dotted line) and ~ 200 K at perihelion q (orange dotted line).

We define persistent activity as activity detectable across contiguous sets of observations spanning at least two epochs, even if activity is not visible in every image (due to, for example, exposure time and/or filter selection). We also expect to see activity at all positions throughout the orbit where (6478) Gault may be detectable by DECam, given appropriate observing parameters (e.g., exposure time, filter selection).

5.9 Discussion

Most active asteroids, like comets, are composed of low-albedo (i.e., dark), primitive material allowing for sublimation or release of volatiles to occur when the body is heated during close passages with the Sun (Hsieh et al., 2018b).

Of the ~ 20 known active asteroids, four belong to the S-type asteroid taxonomy defining non-primitive silicate-rich material (DeMeo et al., 2009). For these four objects, the causes of activity, when identifiable, are thought to be rotational breakup or impact. Rotational breakup and impact events are consistent with single apparitions or short-lived activity. Furthermore, Hsieh et al. (2018a) found that processed material bodies, such as S-types, are more likely to become active due to disruption, while primitive material bodies, such as C-types, can become active via multiple mechanisms due to their volatile abundances.

²<http://www.ctio.noao.edu/noao/node/5826>

(6478) Gault has been identified as a core member of the Phocaea Family (Knežević & Milani, 2003). The Phocaea family is dominated by 75% S-types, followed by 15% C-types, and 10% a mix of other asteroid taxonomies (Carvano et al., 2001). While this work was in review, Smith et al. (2019); Jewitt et al. (2019) reported color measurements suggesting that (6478) Gault is closer in taxonomic class to a C-type body, rather than an S-type. However, gases were not detected in their spectra, suggesting that sublimation may not be the underlying cause.

Sustained activity near perihelion normally can point to sublimation driven activity, but we observe activity nearly at aphelion during opposition. We do see variability in activity intensity, but we observe activity in (6478) Gault in at least one image in each set of observations in our DECam data set, suggesting that the target is perpetually active. As a result, we conclude there is no correlation between distance and activity for (6478) Gault.

Because we observe persistent activity, impact-driven disruption seems unlikely as we would expect the timescale for the activity to be relatively short. The most probable cause for activity has been presented as disruption due to rotational breakup of (6478) Gault (Moreno et al., 2019; Ye et al., 2019b,a) due to the Yarkovsky–O’Keefe–Radzievskii–Paddack (YORP) effect spin-up (Kleyna et al., 2019); see McNeill et al. (2016), Lowry et al. (2007), and Bottke et al. (2006) for detailed explanations of YORP forces.

Rotational breakup holds for an S-type composition where we would anticipate landslides or surface material redistribution caused by rapid rotation near the 2.2 hr spin rate barrier, which is consistent with the measured ~ 2 hr light curve period reported by Kleyna et al. (2019). We predict that (6478) Gault will continue to show signs of activity as it has for the last 6 years in a relatively steady state. We do not expect catastrophic disruption of (6478) Gault (cf. Moreno et al. (2019)).

The activity observed in (6478) Gault over multiple epochs and throughout its orbit make (6478) Gault the first known sustained-activity active asteroid in the main asteroid belt. As a likely S-type asteroid, this is also the first time that we have observed a sustained active body at the rotational barrier for such an extended duration. If activity is in fact not volatile-related, then Gault is a new class of object, perpetually active due to spin-up. We encourage continued monitoring of both the lightcurve and activity level of (6478) Gault, as well as photometric color observations or spectra to further explore its composition.

5.10 Acknowledgements

The authors thank the anonymous referee whose comments greatly improved the quality of this Letter.

We wish to thank Nick Moskovitz (Lowell Observatory), who strongly encouraged us to pursue this report. We thank Dr. Mark Jesus Mendoza Magbanua (University of California San Francisco) for his frequent and

timely feedback on the project. Many thanks to David Jewitt and Man-To Hui (Univeristy of California Los Angeles) for their helpful comments. The authors express their gratitude to Jonathan Fortney (University of California Santa Cruz), Mike Gowanlock (NAU), Cristina Thomas (NAU), and the Trilling Research Group (NAU), all of whom provided invaluable insights which substantially enhanced this work. The unparalleled support provided by Monsoon cluster administrator Christopher Coffey (NAU) and his High Performance Computing Support team facilitated the scientific process wherever possible.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. (2018258765). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Computational analyses were run on Northern Arizona University’s Monsoon computing cluster, funded by Arizona’s Technology and Research Initiative Fund. This work was made possible in part through the State of Arizona Technology and Research Initiative Program. “GNU’s Not Unix!” (GNU) Astro *astfits* (Akhlaghi & Ichikawa, 2015) provided command-line FITS file header access.

This research has made use of data and/or services provided by the International Astronomical Union’s Minor Planet Center. This research has made use of NASA’s Astrophysics Data System. This research has made use of the The Institut de Mécanique Céleste et de Calcul des Éphémérides (IMCCE) SkyBoT Virtual Observatory tool (Berthier et al., 2006). This work made use of the FTOOLS software package hosted by the NASA Goddard Flight Center High Energy Astrophysics Science Archive Research Center. This research has made use of SAO ImageDS9, developed by Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (Joye & Mandel, 2003). This work made use of the Lowell Observatory Asteroid Orbit Database *astorbDB* (Bowell et al., 1994; Moskovitz et al., 2018). This work made use of the *astropy* software package (Robitaille et al., 2013).

This project used data obtained with the Dark Energy Camera (DECam), which was constructed by the Dark Energy Survey (DES) collaboration. Funding for the DES Projects has been provided by the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. National Science Foundation, the Ministry of Science and Education of Spain, the Science and Technology Facilities Council of the United Kingdom, the Higher Education Funding Council for England, the National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Kavli Institute of Cosmological Physics at the University of Chicago, Center for Cosmology and Astro-Particle Physics at the Ohio State University, the Mitchell Institute for Fundamental Physics and Astronomy at Texas A&M University, Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos, Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo, Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos, Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico and the Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Col-

laborating Institutions in the Dark Energy Survey. The Collaborating Institutions are Argonne National Laboratory, the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Cambridge, Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas, Medioambientales y Tecnológicas–Madrid, the University of Chicago, University College London, the DES-Brazil Consortium, the University of Edinburgh, the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH) Zürich, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Institut de Ciències de l’Espai (IEEC/CSIC), the Institut de Física d’Altes Energies, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München and the associated Excellence Cluster Universe, the University of Michigan, the National Optical Astronomy Observatory, the University of Nottingham, the Ohio State University, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Portsmouth, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Stanford University, the University of Sussex, and Texas A&M University.

Based on observations at Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, National Optical Astronomy Observatory (NOAO Prop. IDs 2012B-0001, PI: Frieman; 2014B-0404, PI: Schlegel), which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA) under a cooperative agreement with the National Science Foundation.

5.11 Appendix

5.11.1 Gault Data



For reference we provide essential information regarding (6478) below.

Properties of (6478) Gault

Parameter	Value	Source
Discovery Date	1988 May 12	Schmadel & Union (2003)
Discovery Observers	C. S. & E. M. Shoemaker	Schmadel & Union (2003)
Discovery Observatory	Palomar	Schmadel & Union (2003)
Activity Discovery Date		Smith et al. (2019)
Alternate Designations	1988 JC1, 1995 KC1	NASA JPL Horizons
Orbit Type	Inner Main Belt	NASA JPL Horizons
Family	Phocaea (Core Member)	Knežević & Milani (2003)
Taxonomic Class	S	via Phocaea association
Diameter	$D = 4.5$ km	Harris & Lagerros (2002)
Absolute V -band Magnitude	$H = 14.4$	NASA JPL Horizons
Slope Parameter	$G = 0.15$	NASA JPL Horizons
Orbital Period	$P = 3.5$ yr	NASA JPL Horizons
Semimajor Axis	$a = 2.305$ au	NASA JPL Horizons
Eccentricity	$e = 0.1936$	NASA JPL Horizons
Inclination	$i = 22.8113^\circ$	NASA JPL Horizons
Longitude of Ascending Node	$\Omega = 183.558$	Minor Planet Center
Mean Anomaly	$M = 289.349^\circ$	Minor Planet Center
Argument of Perihelion	$\omega = 83.2676^\circ$	NASA JPL Horizons
Perihelion Distance	$q = 1.86$ au	NASA JPL Horizons
Aphelion Distance	$Q = 2.75$ au	NASA JPL Horizons
Tisserand Parameter w.r.t. Jupiter	$T_J = 3.461$	astorbDB



5.11.2 Thumbnail Gallery

For all thumbnails, red arrows indicate the negative motion vector $-\vec{v}$ of (6478) Gault; yellow arrows point away from the Sun ($-\odot$). When possible, (6478) Gault has been circled with a dashed green line and white arrows placed perpendicular to any observed activity. Areas outside of chip boundaries appear black in color.




Left

panel: 2013 September 22 3:03 (UT); 45 s Y-band. Right panel: 2013 October 13 03:06 (UT); 90 s *i*-band.



Left

panel: 2013 October 13 03:08 (UT); 90 s *z*-band. Right panel: 2016 June 09 04:45 (UT); 96 s *r*-band.



Left panel: 2017 October 23 08:57 (UT); 80 s z-band. Right panel: 2017 November 11 07:13 (UT); 80 s z-band.




Figure 5.2: (6478) Gault activity timeline beginning with DECam operation commencement (2012 September) to present. Red stars show when we found visible activity; the blue pentagon represents the current apparition where prominent activity has been seen. Above the top axis are marked perihelion (q) and aphelion (Q) events. The solid green line indicates the apparent V-band magnitude of (6478) Gault as viewed from Earth. The dashed yellow line shows our “observability” metric, defined as the number of hours per UT observing date meeting both of the following conditions possible for DECam: (1) elevation $> 15^\circ$, and (2) the refracted solar upper-limb elevation was $< 0^\circ$ (i.e., nighttime). Peaks in apparent magnitude coinciding with peaks in observability indicate opposition events; conversely, secondary magnitude peaks aligned with observability troughs highlight solar conjunctions, i.e., when (6478) Gault was “behind” the Sun as viewed from Earth. All activity has been observed near opposition events. Also, activity was seen at every epoch in our data. The histogram (vertical blue bars) indicate the number of thumbnails that we extracted for a given observing month.




Figure 5.3: Positive detections of (6478) Gault activity with DECam as a function of heliocentric distance r (au) and surface temperature T (K). Our activity observations are indicated by red stars, whereas the current apparition is represented by the blue pentagon. Distance and temperature of (6478) Gault perihelion q (orange dashed line) and aphelion Q (blue dashed-dotted line) events are shown. During the course of one full orbit, (6478) Gault is exposed to temperatures greater than 165 K. As a result, (6478) Gault is consistently subjected to temperatures that are too high for water ice to form at the 5 au ice formation distance (Snodgrass et al., 2017b).




Figure 5.4: **(a)** A tail (indicated by white arrows) at ~ 8 o'clock is seen in this 107-second g -band exposure imaged June 10, 2016. The yellow arrow indicates anti-Solar ($-\odot$) direction and red the negative heliocentric velocity vector ($-\vec{v}$). **(b)** (6478) Gault top seen on November 12, 2017. The 111 second exposure in the g -band delivered a flux limit 6 magnitudes fainter than (6478) Gault, revealing a faint tail (~ 2 o'clock, indicated by white arrows) and coma. The yellow arrow indicates anti-Solar ($-\odot$) direction and the red arrow negative heliocentric velocity ($-\vec{v}$). Dashed green circles outline (6478) Gault and white arrows have been placed perpendicular to any observed activity.

Chapter 6

Manuscript III: Cometary Activity Discovered on a Distant Centaur: A Nonaqueous Sublimation Mechanism

Colin Orion Chandler¹, Jay K. Kueny^{1,2}, Chadwick A. Trujillo¹, David E. Trilling¹, William J. Oldroyd¹

This is the Accepted Manuscript version of an article accepted for publication in Astrophysical Journal Letters. IOP Publishing Ltd is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it. The Version of Record is available online at <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.3847/2041-8213/ab7dc6>.

6.1 Abstract

Centaurs are minor planets thought to have originated in the outer solar system region known as the Kuiper Belt. Active Centaurs enigmatically display comet-like features (e.g., tails, comae) even though they orbit in the gas giant region where it is too cold for water to readily sublimate. Only 18 active Centaurs have been identified since 1927 and, consequently, the underlying activity mechanism(s) have remained largely unknown up to this point. Here we report the discovery of activity emanating from Centaur 2014 OG₃₉₂, based on archival images we uncovered plus our own new observational evidence acquired with the Dark Energy Camera (Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory Blanco 4 m telescope), the Inamori-Magellan Areal Camera & Spectrograph (Las Campanas Observatory 6.5 m Walter Baade Telescope), and the Large Monolithic Imager (Lowell Observatory 4.3 m Discovery Channel Telescope). We detect a coma as far as 400,000 km from 2014 OG₃₉₂, and our novel analysis of sublimation processes and dynamical lifetime suggest carbon dioxide and/or ammonia are the most likely candidates for causing activity on this and other active Centaurs. We find 2014 OG₃₉₂ is optically red, but CO₂ and NH₃ are spectrally neutral in this wavelength regime so the reddening agent is as yet unidentified.

Keywords: Centaurs (215), Comae (271), Comet tails (274), Astrochemistry (75)

¹Department of Physics & Astronomy, Northern Arizona University, PO Box 6010, Flagstaff, AZ 86011, USA

²Lowell Observatory, 1400 W Mars Hill Rd, Flagstaff, AZ 86001, USA

6.2 Introduction

Prior to the mid-20th century, comets were thought to be the only astronomical objects with tails or comae. Unsurprisingly, then, the first two active Centaur discoveries—29P/Schwassman–Wachmann 1 (Schwassmann & Wachmann, 1927) and 39P/Oterma (Oterma, 1942)—were initially classified as comets.




Figure 6.1: 2014 OG₃₉₂ (dashed arrow) displays a coma (short arrows) during our 2019 August 30 observations. Stack of 4×250 s DECam exposures.

In 1949 the discovery of the first active asteroid, (4015) Wilson–Harrington (also designated 107P), blurred the dividing line between asteroid and comet (Cunningham, 1950). In 1977 (2060) Chiron was discovered (Kowal & Gehrels, 1977), the first member of the population now known as Centaurs. (2060) Chiron was later found to be active, making it the first object to be identified as a Centaur prior to activity discovery (Meech & Belton, 1990).

We adopt the Centaur classification system (Jewitt, 2009) that defines Centaurs as objects (1) with perihelia and semi-major axes between the orbits of Jupiter (~ 5 au) and Neptune (~ 30 au) and (2) not in 1:1 mean-motion resonance with a giant planet (as is the case for the Trojans). We distinguish between Centaurs and Jupiter-Family Comets (following Levison & Duncan 1994) via the Tisserand parameter with respect to Jupiter, given by

$$T_J = \frac{a_J}{a} + 2\sqrt{(1 - e^2) \frac{a}{a_J} \cos(i)}, \quad (6.1)$$

with eccentricity e , inclination i , and the semi-major axes of the body and Jupiter a and a_J , respectively. Centaurs have $T_J \geq 3$ whereas Jupiter-Family Comets range between $2 < T_J < 3$.

Centaurs are thought to have migrated inward from the Kuiper Belt (see review; Morbidelli 2008), a

Table 6.1: Active Centaurs

Object Name or Designation	Orbital Elements				r (au)	$\%_{T \rightarrow q}$	M_V	Activity Discovery Date (UT)	Ref.
	P (yr)	a (au)	q (au)	Q (au)					
Chiron (95P)	50.5	6.0	8.5	18.9	11.8	68	17.0	1989 Apr 10	1
Echeclus (174P)	35.3	10.8	5.9	15.6	13.1	25	21.1	2005 Dec 04	2
29P/Schwassmann–Wachmann 1	14.8	6.0	5.5 [†]	6.6	6.0	53	15.3	1927 Nov 15	3
39P/Oterma	19.5	7.2	3.4 [†]	9.0	3.5	99	15.1	1942 Feb 12	4
165P/LINEAR	76.4	18.0	6.8	29.3	6.9	100	19.4	2000 Jan 09	5
166P/NEAT	51.9	13.9	8.6	19.2	8.6	100	19.6	2001 Oct 15	6
167P/CINEOS	64.8	16.1	11.8	20.5	12.2	96	20.7	2004 Jun 07	7
P/2005 S2 (Skiff)	22.5	8.0	6.4	9.5	6.5	98	19.7	2005 Sep 16	8
P/2005 T ₃ (Read)	20.6	7.5	6.2	8.8	6.2	100	20.7	2005 Aug 07	9
P/2011 C2 (Gibbs)	20.0	7.4	5.4	9.3	5.5	97	20.3	2011 Feb 12	10
C/2011 P2 (PanSTARRS)	30.6	9.8	6.2	13.4	6.3	98	20.3	2011 Aug 03	11
P/2011 S1 (Gibbs)	25.4	8.6	6.9	10.4	7.5	82	21.0	2011 Sep 18	12
C/2013 C2 (Tenagra)	64.4	16.1	9.1	23.0	9.8	96	19.1	2013 Feb 14	13
C/2013 P4 (PanSTARRS)	56.8	14.8	6.0	23.6	6.3	98	19.5	2013 Aug 15	14
P/2015 M2 (PanSTARRS)	19.3	7.2	5.9	8.5	5.9	100	19.5	2015 Jun 28	15
C/2015 T5 (Sheppard–Tholen)	147.9	28.0	9.3	46.6	9.4	100	22.3	2015 Oct 13	16
C/2016 Q4 (Kowalski)	69.0	16.8	7.1	26.5	7.5	98	20.1	2016 Aug 30	17
2003 QD ₁₁₂	82.8	19.0	7.9	30.1	12.7	57	21.7	2004 Oct 10	18
2014 OG ₃₉₂	42.5	12.2	10.0	14.4	10.6	86	21.1	2017 Jul 18	19

Notes. P : orbital period; a : semi major axis; q : perihelion–distance; Q : aphelion distance; r : heliocentric distance; $\%_{T \rightarrow q}$: fractional perihelion-aphelion distance (Equation 6.2); M_V : apparent V -band magnitude. Q computed via $Q = a(1 + e)$ when otherwise unavailable. Asteroid parameters provided by the Minor Planet Center. Heliocentric distance and apparent magnitude courtesy of JPL Horizons (Giorgini et al., 1996).

^a Original value(s) from activity discovery epoch adopted where available; otherwise, values adopted from more recent epoch(s). Reference points to a source that discusses activity of the object.

References. 1:Meech & Belton (1990), 2:Choi et al. (2006); 3:Schwassmann & Wachmann (1927), 4:Oterma (1942), 5:Green (2005), 6:Pravdo et al. (2001), 7:Romanishin et al. (2005), 8:Gajdos et al. (2005), 9:Read & Scotti (2005), 10:Gibbs et al. (2011a), 11:Wainscoat et al. (2011), 12:Gibbs et al. (2011b), 13:Holvorcem et al. (2013), 14:Wainscoat et al. (2013), 15:Bacci et al. (2015), 16:Tholen et al. (2015b), 17:Kowalski et al. (2016), 18:Jewitt (2009), 19:this work

region that spans 30 au (Neptune’s orbital distance) to 50 au. Neptune Trojans may also serve as a Centaur reservoir (Horner & Lykawka, 2010). Centaurs all orbit exterior to the 3 au water ice line so they cannot readily undergo sublimation. Surprisingly, though, 18 Centaurs ($\sim 4\%$ of known Centaurs) have been found to display prominent comet-like features such as comae (e.g., Fig. 6.1) or tails; these are the active Centaurs. Table 6.1 lists the known active Centaurs along with key physical parameters and discovery circumstances.

Our understanding of active Centaurs has been limited because of their faint apparent magnitudes (the mean apparent magnitude m_V at discovery is ~ 20 ; Table 6.1), since it is necessary to probe several magnitudes fainter in order to reliably detect activity via telescopic imaging. Spectroscopy has been used with some success to identify cometary activity originating from asteroids (Busarev et al., 2018) but this method requires even brighter targets than detection by imaging. Discovering activity on Centaurs is observationally challenging because they are faint, telescope time-intensive, and because they are rare. Active centaurs are discovered, on average, within $\sim 10\%$ of their perihelion distance (Table 6.1) where they are significantly brighter and, importantly, warmer.

Another significant obstacle to understanding active Centaurs stems from the extreme cold found at their orbital distances. Water and methanol ices have been detected on the surfaces of ~ 10 Centaurs, but only one of these, (2060) Chiron, has also been visibly active (see review, Peixinho et al. 2020). At surface temperatures less than 150 K and pressures below $\sim 10^{-12}$ bar many thermodynamical properties (e.g., enthalpy of sublimation) of volatile ices are not well known from laboratory experiments (Fray & Schmitt, 2009). Moreover, ices may exist in two or more different structural forms; energy from the H_2O crystalline–amorphous state transition may even play a role in generating activity (Jewitt, 2009).

6.3 Mining Archival Data

In order to overcome the observational challenges discussed in Section 6.2 we began by searching archival images captured with the 0.5 gigapixel Dark Energy Camera (DECam) on the Blanco 4 m telescope at the Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory in Chile. Archival data from this facility allow the detection of faint activity because of the relatively large aperture and because a large number of objects serendipitously imaged by the instrument can be searched.

We identified Centaurs in our own proprietary database cataloging the NSF’s National Optical-Infrared Astronomy Research Laboratory (NSF’s OIR Lab, formerly NOAO) public DECam archive following the methodology outlined in Chandler et al. (2018). Our general approach was to correlate image celestial coordinate and temporal data with object ephemeris services such as NASA JPL Horizons (Giorgini et al., 1996) and IMCCE SkyBot (Berthier et al. (2006); see also the acknowledgements).

We (1) extracted event information from the entire DECam public archive database, (2) submitted objects to SkyBot or matched against ephemerides produced via the Minor Planet Center and/or Horizons, and then (3) carried out a database query to identify potential images containing Centaurs.

After (4) downloading the data, we (5) checked each chip for the presence of the Centaur to ensure the object was visible and free of imaging complications (e.g., gaps between chips, scattered light from bright stars, cosmic rays). Finally, we (6) adhered to the routine outlined in Chandler et al. (2018) where, following image file retrieval of 2014 OG₃₉₂ from the archive, we extracted Flexible Image Transport System (FITS) and Portable Network Graphics (PNG) thumbnails (480×480 pixel images). We subjected these thumbnails to image processing techniques in order to assist by-eye analysis.

While examining each Centaur PNG thumbnail image by eye we flagged any with apparent activity for later analysis. FITS thumbnail images corresponding to those flagged were subjected to additional image processing techniques in an effort to enhance image quality, especially comae contrast.

To ascertain potential heliocentric distance effects we made use of a simple metric (Chandler et al., 2018), $\%_{T \rightarrow q}$, which describes how close to perihelion (q) an object’s distance (d) is relative to its aphelion distance (Q):

$$\%_{T \rightarrow q} = \left(\frac{Q - d}{Q - q} \right) \cdot 100\%. \quad (6.2)$$

From DECam archival data we extracted ~ 20 thumbnail images of 2014 OG₃₉₂; Figure 6.2 shows the number of thumbnails obtained along with the predicted apparent V -band magnitude and observability of 2014 OG₃₉₂. In images from 2017, July and August, we spotted what appeared to be activity emanating from 2014 OG₃₉₂ (see gallery; Figure 6.5); at that time the object was 10.60 au from the Sun.

6.4 Follow-up Observing

To confirm the presence of activity we used the same DECam instrument and made additional observations on UT 2019 August 30. Fig. 1 shows 2014 OG₃₉₂ with a telltale coma revealed by a combined 1000 s exposure. Figure 6.6 contains a gallery showing the four constituent 250 s DECam exposures, plus two images where isophotal contours were overplotted to help identify coma extent for each of the first two exposures (Figure 6.7).

We made use of three observatories for follow-up observations of 2014 OG₃₉₂: (1) NSF’s OIR Labs DECam with VR filter on the Blanco 4 m telescope at the Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory in Chile (2) WB4800-7800 filtered imaging with the Magellan 6.5 m Walter Baade Telescope equipped with the Inamori-Magellan Areal Camera & Spectrograph (IMACS) at the Las Campanas Observatory on Cerro




Figure 6.2: 2014 OG₃₉₂ activity timeline beginning 2012 September (DECam first light) to present. Red stars show when we found visible activity. The orbital period is ~ 42 yr so neither perihelion (2021 December 3) nor aphelion are visible on this plot. The solid green line (left vertical axis) shows the geocentric apparent V -band magnitude of 2014 OG₃₉₂. Dashed lines (right vertical axis) indicate the number of nighttime hours with elevation $> 15^\circ$ for the southern hemisphere DECam (blue; site code: 807) and for the northern hemisphere DCT (orange; site code: G37). The overlaid histogram (vertical blue bars and right axis) shows the number of thumbnail images captured during one calendar month. Note that in all instances when observability was high and many thumbnails were present, activity was observed.

Manqui, Chile, and (3) g , r , and i filter images taken with the Large Monolithic Imager (LMI) at the Lowell Observatory 4.3 m Discovery Channel Telescope (DCT) in Arizona, USA. Galleries showing our Magellan images and DCT images are shown in Figure 6.8 6.9.respectively. A log of observations is provided in Appendix 6.12.1. Astrometric calibration was performed using the *astrometry.net* (Lang et al., 2010) and/or *PhotometryPipeline* (Mommert, 2017) software packages.

6.5 Simulating Dynamical Lifetime

Determining the total mass loss possible for different volatiles requires knowledge of the dynamical lifetime of 2014 OG₃₉₂ in the Centaur region (where both perihelion distance and semi-major axis are between 5 and 30 au). To this end we made use of the REBOUND N -body integrator to model the orbits of 2014 OG₃₉₂ and giant planets Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune (Rein et al., 2019). We also carried out 25 simulations of 2014 OG₃₉₂, each with an orbital clone derived from the orbital uncertainties published by the Minor Planet Center. From these dynamical integrations, we found that the lifetime of 2014 OG₃₉₂ spans the range of 13,000–1.8 million years, roughly in agreement with prior work (Liu & Ip, 2019).

6.6 Sublimation Modeling

In order to better assess potential processes responsible for 2014 OG₃₉₂ activity, we computed equilibrium temperatures and modeled mass-loss rates for seven astrophysically relevant ices: ammonia (NH₃), carbon dioxide (CO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), methane (CH₄), methanol (CH₃OH), nitrogen (N₂), and water (H₂O).

Object distance is the primary factor in determining potential ice sublimation effects. We began with a simple sublimation model (Hsieh et al., 2015a) well suited to gaining broad insight into the observed activity from 2014 OG₃₉₂; we expanded the procedure to apply more generally to other volatile ices. As we do not know the composition of 2014 OG₃₉₂ we cannot make use of a more comprehensive model which includes effects of, for example, porosity, tortuosity, or crystal structure (Schorghofer, 2008b). Moreover, 2014 OG₃₉₂ is undoubtedly not composed of a single ice, and mixtures of ices can exhibit behavior uncharacteristic for any lone constituent (Grundy & Stansberry, 2000). For the limiting case of an inert gray body orbiting at a distance R from the Sun (measured in au)

$$\frac{F_{\odot}}{R^2}(1 - A) = \chi\epsilon\sigma T_{\text{eq}}^4 \quad (6.3)$$

where the fiducial solar flux $F_{\odot}$ is 1360 W m⁻², A is the Bond albedo (we choose 0.1 as representative for

Centaurs; Peixinho et al. 2020), ϵ is the infrared emissivity of the ice (set here as 0.9), T_{eq} is the equilibrium temperature of the body, and σ is the Stefan–Boltzmann constant ($5.670 \times 10^{-8} \text{ W m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-4}$). Here χ is a factor that describes the rotational and axial tilt effects on how much flux is received from the Sun: $\chi = 1$ indicates the maximum heating scenario where the body is a “slab” facing the Sun at all times; $\chi = \pi$ describes a body that rotates quickly with no axial tilt with respect to the Sun; and $\chi = 4$, which we adopt here, is used for a fast-rotating (on the order of a few hours) isothermal body in thermodynamic equilibrium. Here “fast-rotating” means that the rotation period of the object is short compared to the thermal wave propagation time (Schorghofer, 2008b; Hsieh et al., 2015a).

We next consider an energy balance that incorporates sublimation in addition to blackbody radiation (Hsieh et al., 2015a):

$$\frac{F_{\odot}}{R^2}(1 - A) = \chi [\epsilon \sigma T^4 + L f_{\text{D}} \dot{m}_{\text{S}}(T)] \quad (6.4)$$

where f_{D} is the “diffusion barrier factor” that describes how much emission is blocked by overlaying material (e.g., regolith), and L the latent heat of sublimation. The mass-loss rate $\dot{m}_{\text{S}}(T)$ is given by

$$\dot{m} = P_{\text{v}}(T) \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{2\pi kT}} \quad (6.5)$$

with μ the SI mass of one molecule, and k the Boltzmann constant of $1.38069 \times 10^{-23} \text{ J K}^{-1}$. The vapor pressure (in Pa) of the substance can be related to temperature by the Clausius–Clapeyron relationship

$$P_{\text{v}}(T) = e_{\text{S}} \exp \left[\frac{\Delta H_{\text{subl}}}{R_{\text{g}}} \left(\frac{1}{T_{\text{triple}}} - \frac{1}{T} \right) \right] \quad (6.6)$$

in which e_{S} is the saturation vapor pressure (in Pa) of the substance at the triple-point temperature T_{triple} , ΔH_{subl} is the heat of sublimation of the substance (in kJ mol^{-1}), and R_{g} is the ideal gas constant ($8.341 \text{ J/mol} \cdot \text{K}$).

Solving Equation 6.4 for heliocentric distance R (in au) yields

$$R(T) = \sqrt{\frac{F_{\odot}(1 - A)}{\chi [\epsilon \sigma T^4 + L f_{\text{D}} \dot{m}_{\text{S}}(T)]}}. \quad (6.7)$$

Energy of sublimation values (Luna et al., 2014) and triple-point temperatures and pressures (Fray & Schmitt, 2009) were incorporated as needed. To validate our model we computed the mass-loss rate for (2060) Chiron assuming $\chi = 4$, an albedo of 0.057, a diameter of 206 km, and an orbit ranging from 8.47 au at perihelion to 18.87 au at aphelion. Our (2060) Chiron model validation results were in rough agreement with the $0.5\text{--}20 \text{ kg s}^{-1}$ mass-loss rate reported by Womack et al. (2017).




Figure 6.3: Mass-loss rates for seven different astrophysically relevant ices on an isothermal ($\chi = 4$) body; water (H_2O) and methanol (CH_3OH) ices have been detected on Centaurs. Orbital distances of Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune are indicated about the top axis. The current 10.11 au heliocentric distance of 2014 OG₃₉₂ is indicated by a vertical black bar, bracketed by perihelion (9.97 au) and aphelion (14.40 au) distances (leftmost and rightmost dashed vertical lines, respectively). Over the course of one orbit (between the vertical dashed lines), water and methanol never appreciably sublime and carbon monoxide (CO), methane (CH₄), and molecular nitrogen (N₂) sublime at high and relatively constant rates; we rule out all of these molecules as potential causes of activity. (The shallow slopes of CO, CH₄, and N₂ extend beyond 50 au [not shown], which informs us the mass loss would have begun long before 2014 OG₃₉₂ became a Centaur.) However, over the course of one orbit the sublimation rates for CO₂ and NH₃ vary substantially, presumably producing significant variation in visible activity. Order-of-magnitude estimates of mass-loss-rate upper limits for the dynamical lifetime of 2014 OG₃₉₂ are shown as horizontal dotted lines. Only CO₂ and NH₃ have sublimation rates near these limits.

We use our computed dynamical lifetime to circumstantially constrain the molecule(s) responsible for the sublimation of 2014 OG₃₉₂. Fig. 6.3 shows, over the orbit of 2014 OG₃₉₂, the mass-loss rates for the different ices determined via modeling and validated through laboratory measurements. If 2014 OG₃₉₂ has an albedo of 10%, similar to that measured for other Centaurs (see review; Peixinho et al. 2020), then the body is about 20 km in diameter (see Section 6.8). Assuming a spherical body of low density in the range of 1–3 g cm^{−3} suggests a reasonable body mass of $4.2 - 12.6 \times 10^{15}$ kg and a surface area of 3.1×10^8 m². Thus, the 13,000–1.8 Myr dynamical lifetime of 2014 OG₃₉₂ suggests a maximum orbit-averaged mass-loss rate in the range of 7.1×10^{-7} to 3.3×10^{-5} kg/m²/s (horizontal dashed lines in Figure 6.3) before the body would be entirely lost due to sublimation.

6.7 Colors

The archival data and our confirmation observations did not contain enough information to determine colors, so we obtained six 300 s exposures of 2014 OG₃₉₂ in a *g-r-i* filter sequence at the DCT (Section 6.4). We made use of the *PhotometryPipeline* software package (Mommert, 2017) to automate astrometry using SCAMP (Bertin et al., 2006) which made use of the Vizier catalog service (Ochsenbein et al., 2000) Gaia Data Release 2 catalog (Collaboration et al., 2018b), and photometric image calibration using solar stars from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey Data Release 9 (SDSS-DR9) catalog (Ahn et al., 2012). We carried out manual aperture photometry using the Aperture Photometry Tool (Laher et al., 2012).

Prior to analysis we examined all thumbnail images showing activity emanating from 2014 OG₃₉₂ to ensure no significant background sources were blended with the nucleus. To help us identify unseen contaminants we measured and modeled surface brightness radial profiles of 2014 OG₃₉₂ (Figure 6.4) and a nearby solar-type star, using the Aperture Photometry Tool. The radial profile itself (i.e., not the model) was used to identify flux contribution by unseen background sources; we rejected images in which the nucleus or nearby coma was significantly contaminated. We note that we identified at least one background source within the coma in all of our images, although for color measurement we were able to use an aperture small enough (5 pixel radius) to exclude all resolvable background objects.

We measured 2014 OG₃₉₂ apparent magnitudes to be $g = 21.99 \pm 0.018$, $r = 21.19 \pm 0.016$, and $i = 20.81 \pm 0.018$. We compared our colors of $g - r = 0.80 \pm 0.024$ and $r - i = 0.39 \pm 0.024$ to SDSS reported solar colors of $g - r = 0.44 \pm 0.02$ and $r - i = 0.11 \pm 0.02$ ³. Centaur colors are often reported in Johnson *B - R* colors (see, e.g., Tegler et al. 2016), so we computed the *B - R* color for 2014 OG₃₉₂ via Jester et al. (2005) transformations. We found $B - R = 1.64 \pm 0.4$, which is about one magnitude redder than the Sun,

³<http://www.sdss.org/dr12/algorithms/ugrizvegasun>




Figure 6.4: Surface brightness radial profiles of 2014 OG₃₉₂ and a nearby SDSS-DR9 catalog solar-type star (J004840.66-022335.6) are plotted along with a model fit for each object. After subtracting the background flux from the two profiles we normalized the standard star profile to the peak of the 2014 OG₃₉₂ profile. The coma flux tapers from 125 counts to background (0 counts) at $\rho \simeq 60$ pixels, or 4.3×10^5 km. We estimate there are $\sim 5.8 \times 10^{17}$ particles in the coma assuming a grain radius of 1 mm; for a density of 1 g cm^{-3} the total mass is 2.4×10^{15} g. Data from our 300 s *g*-band exposure taken on UT 2019 December 30 2:29 using the LMI on the Lowell Observatory 4.3 m DCT.

and red according to the classification system of Tegler et al. (2016) (see discussion in Section 6.10).

6.8 Absolute Magnitude and Diameter Estimation

To gauge the overall spatial extent of the coma we examined the radial surface brightness profiles of 2014 OG₃₉₂ and nearby solar-type star J004840.66-022335.6 (see Section 6.7). We fit the profiles to the model

$$S(r) = A + Br + Cr^2 + Dr^3 + Er^4 + Fe^{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}} \quad (6.8)$$

as described in Gwyn et al. (2012a).

After subtracting the sky flux from each profile and each model we scaled the star to the peak flux of the 2014 OG₃₉₂ radial profile. Figure 6.4 shows the radial profiles and their corresponding models plotted; we estimate the coma returns to sky background flux levels at ~ 60 pixels from the aperture center, thus the coma extent is $\sim 4.3 \times 10^5$ km. The FWHM of 2014 OG₃₉₂ was 13.62 ± 0.37 pixels ($3''.2 \pm 0''.09$), whereas the star FWHM was 6.05 ± 0.05 pixels ($1.45 \pm 0''.012$).

As reported in Section 6.6, the coma is likely present throughout the orbit of 2014 OG₃₉₂. As a result, prior absolute (*H*) magnitude estimates would have included the excess flux caused by the coma, as evinced in Figure 6.4. To estimate the absolute nuclear magnitude of 2014 OG₃₉₂ we compared the ratio of the total

(nucleus + coma) flux (blue line and circles, Figure 6.4) to the scaled stellar flux (orange line and triangles, Figure 6.4). We estimate the coma accounts for 0.75 and 1.1 magnitudes of the observed r -band and g -band fluxes, respectively, implying the nucleus apparent magnitudes are $m_r = 21.9$ and $m_g = 23.1$.

The absolute magnitude of an asteroid, H , is commonly used to estimate the size of small bodies in the solar system. H is defined as equal to the apparent V -band magnitude of an object observed at a heliocentric distance $R = 1$ au, a geocentric distance $\Delta = 1$ au, and a phase angle $\alpha = 0^\circ$. Here we employ the International Astronomical Union defined (Swings, 1986) $H - G$ magnitude system approximated from Bowell et al. (1989):

$$V = 5 \log (R\Delta) + H - 2.5 \log [(1 - G) \Phi_1 + G\Phi_2] \quad (6.9)$$

where the phase function Φ is given by

$$\Phi_i = \exp \left[-A_i \tan (\alpha/2)^{B_i} \right]; i = 1, 2 \quad (6.10)$$

with constants $A_1 = 3.33$, $A_2 = 1.87$, $B_1 = 0.63$, and $B_2 = 1.22$.

We make use of the relationships put forth by Jester et al. (2005) to derive Johnson $V = 22.4$ from our g and r nuclear magnitudes. The JPL Horizons ephemerides service (Giorgini et al., 1996) provided $G = 0.150$ (the standard assumed slope for dark surfaces), $r = 10.10$ au, $\Delta = 10.01$ au, and $\alpha = 5^\circ 58'$ for UT 2019 December 30. Via Equation 6.9 we find $H = 11.3$, 0.5 magnitudes fainter than reported by the Minor Planet Center and JPL Horizons.

Harris & Harris (1997) provide a convenient method to approximate object diameter D ,

$$D = \frac{1329}{\sqrt{G}} \times 10^{-H/5}, \quad (6.11)$$

which, for 2014 OG₃₉₂, gives $D \approx 20$ km.

6.9 Coma Dust Analysis

To facilitate comparing our 2014 OG₃₉₂ dust-related metrics with other works we adopt the instrument and aperture-independent cometary dust production parameter described by A'Hearn et al. (1984). The metric, $Af\rho$ (units of cm), combines the mean albedo A of ejecta grains within an aperture of radius ρ (in cm), scaled by the filling factor f (unitless), which describes how much of the aperture area ($\pi\rho^2$) is filled by N grains of cross section area σ (in cm²),

Table 6.2: Solar Apparent Magnitude by Filter

Filter	$m_{\odot,F}$
SDSS- <i>g</i>	-26.34
SDSS- <i>r</i>	-27.04
SDSS- <i>i</i>	-27.38

$$f = \frac{N(\rho)\sigma}{\pi\rho^2}. \quad (6.12)$$

We measured $Af\rho$ (following the method outlined by Shi et al. 2019) via

$$Af\rho = 4R^2\Delta^2 10^{0.4(m_{\odot,F}-m_{\text{OG},F})}\rho^{-1} \quad (6.13)$$

where R is the 2014 OG₃₉₂ heliocentric distance in au, Δ is the geocentric distance of 2014 OG₃₉₂ in cm, and, for filter F , $m_{\odot,F}$ and $m_{\text{OG},F}$ are the magnitudes of the Sun and 2014 OG₃₉₂, respectively. For $m_{\odot,F}$ we made use of solar apparent Vega magnitudes⁴ (see Willmer (2018) for details) in Table 6.2:

To estimate the number of particles N within our measured $Af\rho$ we can substitute Equation 6.12 into the equality $Af\rho = Af\rho$

$$Af = A \frac{N(\rho)\sigma}{\pi\rho^2} \rho \quad (6.14)$$

and solve for $N(\rho)$,

$$N(\rho) = Af\rho \frac{\pi\rho}{A\sigma}. \quad (6.15)$$

To quantify the total number of particles in the coma N_{tot} we can scale the aperture of Equation 6.15 to the 60 pixel aperture containing the entire coma, ρ_{max} ,

$$N(\rho_{\text{max}}) = Af\rho \frac{\pi\rho_{\text{max}}^2}{A\sigma\rho}. \quad (6.16)$$

Recall the quantity $Af\rho$, here, is a measured value, so the quantities $A\rho$ do not cancel in Equation 6.16.

Four of our observations, Images 15-18 (details in Appendix 6.12.1) were suitable for directly measuring $Af\rho$. We found $Af\rho = 487 \pm 12$ cm with an aperture of 4.3×10^5 km. With the albedo adopted for our sublimation modeling ($A = 0.1$) and a 1 mm radius grain, the coma around 2014 OG₃₉₂ is composed of roughly 5.8×10^{17} particles. Assuming a grain density of 1 g cm^{-3} the total coma mass is $\sim 2.4 \times 10^{15}$ g.

⁴<http://mips.as.arizona.edu/~cnaw/sun.html>

6.10 Discussion

The activity we observed spans more than two years, which rules out impact-driven activity. We determined that the two ices previously detected on Centaurs, water and methanol, would not appreciably sublimate at any point in 2014 OG₃₉₂'s orbit and so should still be present in solid form on the surface (Figure 6.3). Moreover, CO, N₂ and CH₄ are highly volatile and sublimate at temperatures low enough that their supply is likely depleted, though reservoirs could still be trapped below the surface. We reiterate our model encompasses single-species ices subjected to the thermodynamic conditions outlined in Section 6.6; heterogeneous ice environments may alter sublimation chemistry (see, e.g., Grundy & Stansberry 2000), as can single-species state transitions (e.g., energy released during crystallization of amorphous water ice; see, e.g., Jewitt 2009).

We find that the molecule(s) most likely to drive the observed activity is either CO₂ and/or possibly NH₃. Neither would have sublimated appreciably at Kuiper Belt distances prior to 2014 OG₃₉₂ becoming a Centaur. Interestingly, both of these substances sublimate at rates that vary by over two orders of magnitude over the course of a 2014 OG₃₉₂ orbit, peaking at perihelion. As a result we predict 2014 OG₃₉₂ will become less active post-perihelion. This further implies that all other active Centaurs should follow this trend, with peak sublimation near perihelion and a significant drop in outgassing for most of their orbits.

We determined 2014 OG₃₉₂ is at present roughly one magnitude redder than the Sun at visible wavelengths. However, we were only able to obtain two images in each filter, so uncertainty could be improved upon with additional observations. Our color measurements inexorably included the coma; future observations during a quiescent period (should one exist) would allow for color measurements of the bare nucleus. We did, however, attempt to better estimate the H magnitude by subtracting the coma measured in the radial surface brightness profiles. We found 2014 OG₃₉₂ has $H \approx 11.3$, 0.5 magnitudes fainter than previously reported. The H magnitude implies a radius of about 20 km when assuming a slope parameter $G = 0.15$ as is typical for a dark surface.

In our images of 2014 OG₃₉₂ background sources were typically present in the coma and/or blended with the nucleus, but from four images we were able to directly measure dust properties. Assuming a 10% albedo and a grain radius of 1 mm we estimate the coma contains roughly 5.8×10^{17} particles. If the grain density is 1 g cm^{-3} , the total mass is $\sim 2.4 \times 10^{15} \text{ g}$, or $\sim 0.01\%$ the total mass of 2014 OG₃₉₂. If the coma mass is indeed of this scale, 2014 OG₃₉₂ must be eroding very quickly, undergoing new activity, or the ejecta is accumulating faster than it is escaping. Our measured $Af\rho$ of $487 \pm 12 \text{ cm}$ is comparable to other Centaurs active at the same orbital distance as 2014 OG₃₉₂: C/2011 P2 (PANSTARRS) with $Af\rho = 161 \pm 4 \text{ cm}$ at $\sim 9 \text{ au}$ (Epifani et al., 2017), and for 166P (NEAT) $Af\rho = 288 \pm 19 \text{ cm}$ at $\sim 12 \text{ au}$ (Shi & Ma, 2015).

Centaurs are sometimes classified as either gray or red depending on whether the object has a $B-R$ color closer to ~ 1.2 or ~ 1.7 , respectively (see Tegler et al. 2008 and Peixinho et al. 2020 reviews for in-depth discussions). We find our derived $B-R$ color of 1.64 ± 0.4 consistent with the red classification. Notably both molecules we find viable for sublimation are spectrally neutral in visible wavelengths so the reddening agent is as yet unidentified. 2014 OG₃₉₂ will remain observable through 2020 February and will again be observable beginning around 2020 August. We anticipate imaging and spectroscopy will yield further insight into the nature of these rare objects. We wish to emphasize further lab work is needed to characterize sublimation processes of volatiles under low pressure and temperature regimes.

6.11 Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Mark Jesus Mendoza Magbanua (University of California San Francisco) for his frequent and timely feedback on the project. J.K.K. acknowledges support from Northern Arizona University through a startup award administered by TD Robinson. Mark Loeffler (NAU) and Patrick Tribbett (NAU) helped us interpret lab results. Stephen Tegler (NAU) provided extensive insight into the nuances of Centaur colors. Kazuo Kinoshita provided cometary elements that saved us considerable time and energy. The authors express their gratitude to Mike Gowanlock (NAU), Cristina Thomas (NAU), and the Trilling Research Group (NAU), all of whom provided insights that substantially enhanced this work. Thank you to Stephen Kane (University of California Riverside), Dawn Gelino (NASA Exoplanet Science Institute at California Institute of Technology), and Jonathan Fortney (University of California Santa Cruz) for encouraging the authors to pursue this work. The unparalleled support provided by Monsoon cluster administrator Christopher Coffey (NAU) and his High Performance Computing Support team greatly facilitated the work presented here.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under grant No. 2018258765. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Computational analyses were carried out on Northern Arizona University’s Monsoon computing cluster, funded by Arizona’s Technology and Research Initiative Fund. This work was made possible in part through the State of Arizona Technology and Research Initiative Program.

This research used the facilities of the Canadian Astronomy Data Centre operated by the National Research Council of Canada with the support of the Canadian Space Agency. We also employed their solar system Object Search (Gwyn et al., 2012a). This research has made use of data and/or services provided by the International Astronomical Union’s Minor Planet Center. This research has made use of NASA’s

Astrophysics Data System. This research has made use of the The Institut de Mécanique Céleste et de Calcul des Éphémérides (IMCCE) SkyBoT Virtual Observatory tool (Berthier et al., 2006). Simulations in this Letter made use of the REBOUND code, which is freely available at <http://github.com/hannorein/rebound>. This work made use of the FTOOLS software package hosted by the NASA Goddard Flight Center High Energy Astrophysics Science Archive Research Center. This research has made use of SAO Image DS9, developed by Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (Joye & Mandel, 2003). This work made use of the Lowell Observatory Asteroid Orbit Database *astorbDB* (Moskovitz et al., 2019). This work made use of the *astropy* software package (Robitaille et al., 2013).

This project used data obtained with the Dark Energy Camera (DECam), which was constructed by the Dark Energy Survey (DES) collaboration. Funding for the DES Projects has been provided by the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. National Science Foundation, the Ministry of Science and Education of Spain, the Science and Technology Facilities Council of the United Kingdom, the Higher Education Funding Council for England, the National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Kavli Institute of Cosmological Physics at the University of Chicago, Center for Cosmology and Astro-Particle Physics at the Ohio State University, the Mitchell Institute for Fundamental Physics and Astronomy at Texas A&M University, Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos, Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo, Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos, Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico and the Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Collaborating Institutions in the Dark Energy Survey. The Collaborating Institutions are Argonne National Laboratory, the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Cambridge, Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas, Medioambientales y Tecnológicas–Madrid, the University of Chicago, University College London, the DES-Brazil Consortium, the University of Edinburgh, the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH) Zürich, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Institut de Ciències de l’Espai (IEEC/CSIC), the Institut de Física d’Altes Energies, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München and the associated Excellence Cluster Universe, the University of Michigan, NSF’s National Optical-Infrared Astronomy Research Laboratory, the University of Nottingham, the Ohio State University, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Portsmouth, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Stanford University, the University of Sussex, and Texas A&M University.

This work is based in part on observations at Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, National Optical Astronomy Observatory (Prop. IDs 2019A-0337, PI: Trilling; 2014B-0404, PI: Schlegel), which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA) under a cooperative agreement with the National Science Foundation.

Table 6.3: Activity Observations

#	Instrument	Date/Time (UT)	Exp. [s]	Filter
1	DECam ¹	2017-07-18 09:27	137	<i>z</i>
2	DECam ¹	2017-07-18 10:20	250	<i>z</i>
3	DECam ¹	2017-07-22 05:37	79	<i>g</i>
4	DECam ¹	2017-07-25 06:25	60	<i>r</i>
5	DECam ¹	2017-07-25 06:32	52	<i>r</i>
6	DECam ¹	2017-08-20 04:48	67	<i>r</i>
7	DECam ²	2019-08-30 09:54	250	<i>VR</i>
8	DECam ²	2019-08-30 09:58	250	<i>VR</i>
9	DECam ²	2019-08-30 10:03	250	<i>VR</i>
10	DECam ²	2019-08-30 10:08	250	<i>VR</i>
11	IMACS	2019-12-27 00:54	300	WB4800-7800
12	IMACS	2019-12-27 01:01	300	WB4800-7800
13	IMACS	2019-12-27 01:36	600	WB4800-7800
14	LMI	2019-12-30 02:08	300	<i>g</i>
15	LMI	2019-12-30 02:17	300	<i>r</i>
16	LMI	2019-12-30 02:23	300	<i>i</i>
17	LMI	2019-12-30 02:29	300	<i>g</i>
18	LMI	2019-12-30 02:35	300	<i>r</i>
19	LMI	2019-12-30 02:41	300	<i>i</i>

¹Program 2014B-0404 (PI: Schlegel)

²Program 2019A-0337 (PI: Trilling)

These results made use of the Discovery Channel Telescope at Lowell Observatory. Lowell is a private, non-profit institution dedicated to astrophysical research and public appreciation of astronomy and operates the DCT in partnership with Boston University, the University of Maryland, the University of Toledo, Northern Arizona University and Yale University. The Large Monolithic Imager was built by Lowell Observatory using funds provided by the National Science Foundation (AST-1005313). This Letter includes data gathered with the 6.5 m Magellan Telescopes located at Las Campanas Observatory, Chile.

6.12 Appendix

6.12.1 Activity Observation details

Table 6.3 provides a listing of the observations used in this work.

6.12.2 Thumbnail Gallery

Figure 6.5 shows six of the archival images in which we originally spotted what appeared to be activity emanating from 2014 OG₃₉₂. We obtained confirmation first through DECam observations (Figure 6.6); the coma is more readily apparent in the isophotal contours shown in Figure 6.7. Figure 6.8 shows two additional we took at Magellan provided additional confirmation. Figure 6.9 shows six images of 2014 OG₃₉₂ we




Figure 6.5: *DECam Archival Images*. Top left: UT 2017-Jul-18 09:27 – 137 s *z*-band. Top center: UT 2017-Jul-18 10:20 – 250 s *z*-band. Top right: UT 2017-Jul-22 05:37 – 79 s *g*-band. Bottom left: UT 2017-Jul-25 06:25 – 60 s *r*-band. Bottom center: UT 2017-Jul-25 06:32 – 52 s *r*-band. Bottom right: UT 2017-Aug-20 04:48 – 67 s *r*-band. All Images: The coma (green arrows) was exceptionally faint in all of these DECam archival images of 2014 OG₃₉₂ (indicated by dashed red arrows) but nevertheless they prompted us to obtain follow-up observations.




Figure 6.6: *New DECam Observations Gallery*. Top left: UT 9:54. Top right: UT 9:58. Bottom left: UT 10:03; Bottom right: UT 10:08. All images: (1) dashed red arrow points to 2014 OG₃₉₂, (2) green arrows highlight the comae if visible, (3) observing date was UT 2019 August 30, (4) filter was *VR*, (5) exposure time was 250 s. The apparent decrease in coma prominence was the result of increasing background noise as images were taken into twilight.





Figure 6.7: *Isophotal Contours*. Isophotal contours indicate the extent and irregularity of the coma emanating from 2014 OG₃₉₂ (dashed arrows), especially when contrasted with background objects (yellow arrows) presenting relatively symmetric radial profiles. These two 250 s *VR*-band exposures were taken at 9:54 (left) and 9:58 (right) during our 2019 August 30 follow-up campaign.



New Magellan Observations Gallery.

Figure 6.8: 2014 OG₃₉₂ imaged December 27, 2019 via the Magellan 6.5m Baade Telescope using the WB4800-7800 filter on the Inamori-Magellan Areal Camera & Spectrograph (IMACS) at Las Campanas Observatory on Cerro Manqui, Chile. The three images reveal an apparent coma (green arrows) emerging from the object (red dashed arrow) and were taken at 300 s (left, center) exposures and one 600 s exposure (right).




Figure 6.9: *New DCT Observations Gallery*. 2014 OG₃₉₂ imaged December 30, 2019, via the Lowell Observatory 4.3 m Discovery Channel Telescope (Arizona, USA) using the Large Monolithic Imager (LMI). Green arrows trace out a diffuse coma and a dashed red arrow points to the nucleus in each of the six images. Each exposure in the two *g-r-i* sequences (top and bottom rows) was 300 s long.

captured a the DCT which enabled us to perform color measurement and radial surface brightness profiling.

Chapter 7

Manuscript IV: Recurrent Activity from Active Asteroid (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃: A Main-belt Comet

Colin Orion Chandler¹, Chadwick A. Trujillo¹, Henry H. Hsieh²

This is the Accepted Manuscript version of an article accepted for publication in Astrophysical Journal Letters. IOP Publishing Ltd is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it. The Version of Record is available online at <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.3847/2041-8213/ac365b>.

7.1 Abstract

We present archival observations of main-belt asteroid (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ (also designated 433P) that demonstrate this recently discovered active asteroid (a body with a dynamically asteroidal orbit displaying a tail or coma) has had at least one additional apparition of activity near perihelion during a prior orbit. We discovered evidence of this second activity epoch in an image captured 2016 July 22 with the DECam on the 4 m Blanco telescope at the Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory in Chile. As of this writing, (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is just the 8th active asteroid demonstrated to undergo recurrent activity near perihelion. Our analyses demonstrate (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is likely a member of the active asteroid subset known as main-belt comets, a group of objects that orbit in the main asteroid belt that exhibit activity that is specifically driven by sublimation. We implement an activity detection technique, *wedge photometry*, that has the potential to detect tails in images of solar system objects and quantify their agreement with computed antisolar and antismotion vectors normally associated with observed tail directions. We present a catalog and an image gallery of archival observations. The object will soon become unobservable as it passes behind the Sun as seen from Earth, and when it again becomes visible (late 2022) it will be farther than 3 au from the Sun. Our findings suggest (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is most active interior to 2.7 au (0.3 au from perihelion), so we encourage the community to observe and study this special object before 2021 December.

¹Department of Astronomy and Planetary Science, Northern Arizona University, PO Box 6010, Flagstaff, AZ 86011, USA

²Planetary Science Institute, 1700 East Fort Lowell Rd., Suite 106, Tucson, AZ 85719, USA, Institute of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Academia Sinica, P.O. Box 23-141, Taipei 10617, Taiwan




Figure 7.1: The $126'' \times 126''$ thumbnail image (left) shows (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ (green dashed arrow) at center with a tail (white arrows) oriented towards 5 o'clock. This 89 s z -band exposure captured with the DECam is the only image in which we could unambiguously identify activity. We conducted wedge photometry (right) that shows the tail orientation is $251.3^\circ \pm 1.4^\circ$ (blue star), in close agreement with the 251.6° antisolar angle (yellow $\odot$) and the 251.7° antimotion vector (red v) as computed by JPL Horizons. The plot shows counts radially outward from the the object center at (0,0).

7.2 Introduction

Active asteroids are objects that are dynamically asteroidal but that display comet-like activity such as a tail or coma (Hsieh & Jewitt, 2006b). Activity may be caused by mechanisms unrelated to volatiles (e.g., impact, rotational disruption) or by sublimation as is typically the case with comets. Sublimation driven active objects provide key insights into the present-day volatile distribution in our solar system, as well as clues about the origins of those volatiles and how they arrived on Earth (Hsieh & Jewitt, 2006a). These objects have been persistently difficult to study because of the small numbers detected to date: fewer than 30 active asteroids, of which roughly half are thought to exhibit sublimation driven activity; see Chandler et al. 2018 for a summary.

When the aforementioned sublimation driven activity is connected with a main-belt asteroid, the object is classified as a main-belt comet (MBC). MBCs are often characterized by activity near perihelion and the absence of activity elsewhere in the orbit (Hsieh et al., 2015a; Agarwal et al., 2017; Hsieh et al., 2018b), suggesting that the primary activity mechanism is sublimation of volatiles such as water ice (Snodgrass et al., 2017b).

By contrast, stochastic events like impacts may result in comet-like activity but, in such cases, the appearance of activity is expected to cease once the material dissipates. Roughly 60% of known active asteroids have been observed to display activity during only a single apparition (Chandler et al., 2018).

Asteroid (7968), now comet 133P/Elst-Pizarro, was the first active main-belt asteroid to be discovered. While it was unclear at the time whether the activity was sublimation driven (Boehnhardt et al., 1996, 1998) or due to a one-time event (Toth, 2000), subsequent apparitions showing activity indicated sublimation was the cause (Hsieh et al., 2004, 2010). This example illustrates the importance of detecting additional activity epochs.

Asteroid (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is a 3.2 ± 0.4 km diameter (Hsieh et al., 2021b) outer main-belt asteroid ($a=3.075$ au, $e=0.226$, $i=0.067^\circ$) that has a 5.37 yr orbit that ranges from a perihelion distance of $q=2.374$ au to an aphelion distance of $Q=3.761$ au. The object first drew particular attention when it was reported as active on 2021 July 9 (Fitzsimmons et al., 2021). Subsequently, Zwicky Transient Facility (ZTF) data were used to help constrain the activity onset to between 2020 July 10 and 2021 June 11 (Kelley et al., 2021a).

We set out to locate archival astronomical images of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ in order to characterize prior activity. We made use of solar system object thumbnails (small image cutouts like Figure 7.1) derived from publicly available archival data. We previously demonstrated how our data sources, such as the Dark Energy Camera (DECam), are well suited to discovering and characterizing active objects (Chandler et al., 2018, 2019, 2020).

Here we report activity of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ on 2016 July 22 (Chandler et al., 2021d), an apparition prior to the 2021 outburst. We describe the process by which the activity was identified and examine the implications of this discovery.

7.3 Second Activity Epoch

In order to find an additional activity epoch for (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃, we searched, assessed, and analyzed publicly available archival image data, building upon the methods of Chandler et al. (2018, 2019, 2020).

7.3.1 Data Acquisition

To locate archival images of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃, we queried our own database of publicly available observation metadata (see Chandler et al., 2018). This database, which updates daily, includes observing details such as sky coordinates, exposure time, and filter selection. Additionally, we searched Palomar Transient Factory (PTF) and ZTF data through 2021 August 31 through online search tools (listed in Appendix 7.7.1) as well as a ZTF Alert Stream search and retrieval tool we created for this purpose. All instruments and

data sources we made use of are listed in Appendix 7.7.1, and we note that some data were found or retrieved via more than one pathway.

Table 7.1: (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ Observations

Image ^a	Obs. Date ^b	Source	N ^c	Exp. [s] ^d	Filter	V_e	r [au] ^f	STO	ν [°] ^g	ν [°] ^h	% $Q \rightarrow q$ ⁱ	Act? ^j	Archive
a	2004-07-08	MegaPrime	3	180	<i>i</i>	20.7	2.74	17.6	287.5		73%	N	CADC,*
b	2005-06-08	SuprimeCam	3	60	<i>W-J-VR</i>	21.0	2.42	23.8	18.6		96%	N	CADC,SMOKA
c	2010-06-14	Pan-STARRS1	2	30	<i>z</i>	20.2	2.42	21.1	339.2		96%	N	CADC
d	2010-08-02	Pan-STARRS1	1	45	<i>i</i>	19.0	2.39	3.9	353.5		99%	N	CADC
e	2010-08-05	Pan-STARRS1	1	40	<i>r</i>	18.9	2.39	2.5	355.4		99%	N	CADC
f	2010-08-06	Pan-STARRS1	1	43	<i>g</i>	18.8	2.39	2.0	354.7		99%	N	CADC
g	2010-08-28	PTF	2	60	<i>r</i>	19.2	2.39	8.4	1.2		99%	N	IRSA/PTF
h	2010-08-31	Pan-STARRS1	2	45	<i>i</i>	19.3	2.39	9.7	2.1		99%	N	CADC
i	2010-09-01	PTF	2	60	<i>r</i>	19.3	2.39	10.1	2.3		99%	N	IRSA/PTF
j	2010-09-06	Pan-STARRS1	2	43	<i>g</i>	19.5	2.39	12.2	3.8		99%	N	CADC
k	2010-09-12	Pan-STARRS1	2,2	43,40	<i>g,r</i>	19.6	2.40	14.5	5.6		98%	N	CADC
l	2010-09-15	PTF	2	60	<i>r</i>	19.7	2.39	15.5	6.5		99%	N	IRSA/PTF
m	2010-10-30	Pan-STARRS1	2	30	<i>z</i>	20.6	2.41	23.8	19.6		97%	N	CADC
n	2011-07-14	Pan-STARRS1	1	40	<i>r</i>	21.8	2.86	15.8	84.2		65%	N	CADC
o	2011-11-24	Pan-STARRS1	2,2	43,40	<i>g,r</i>	20.6	3.15	4.0	109.3		44%	N	CADC
p	2011-11-30	Pan-STARRS1	2	45	<i>i</i>	20.4	3.16	1.8	110.3		43%	N	CADC
q	2011-12-01	Pan-STARRS1	2	43	<i>g</i>	20.4	3.16	1.4	110.5		43%	N	CADC
r	2014-03-01	OmegaCam	5	360	<i>r</i>	21.4	3.53	7.0	218.2		17%	N	CADC,ESO
s	2016-07-22	DECcam	1	89	<i>z</i>	21.2	2.59	22.7	56.5		84%	Y	CADC,*
t	2019-07-03	DECcam	9	40	<i>VR</i>	22.6	3.55	14.6	216.9		15%	N	CADC,*
u	2020-02-04	DECcam	1	38	<i>r</i>	21.6	3.16	18.1	248.9		43%	N	CADC,*
v	2020-02-10	DECcam	1	199	<i>z</i>	21.8	3.15	18.2	249.9		44%	N	CADC,*
w	2020-04-25	ZTF	1,1	30,30	<i>g,r</i>	20.0	2.99	4.4	263.3		55%	N	IRSA/ZTF
x	2020-05-18	ZTF	1,1	30,30	<i>g,r</i>	19.9	2.93	4.7	267.7		60%	N	IRSA/ZTF
x	2020-05-27	ZTF	1,1	30,30	<i>g,r</i>	20.1	2.91	8.4	269.5		61%	N	IRSA/ZTF
x	2020-06-11	ZTF	1,3	30,30	<i>g,r</i>	20.3	2.88	13.3	272.5		63%	N	IRSA/ZTF
x	2020-06-14	ZTF	1,1	30,30	<i>g,r</i>	20.4	2.87	14.1	273.1		64%	N	IRSA/ZTF
x	2020-06-17	ZTF	2,2	30,30	<i>g,r</i>	20.4	2.87	14.9	273.8		64%	N	IRSA/ZTF
x	2020-06-20	ZTF	2,2	30,30	<i>g,r</i>	20.5	2.86	15.7	274.4		65%	N	IRSA/ZTF
x	2020-06-23	ZTF	2,1	30,30	<i>g,r</i>	20.5	2.85	16.5	275.0		65%	N	IRSA/ZTF
x	2020-06-26	ZTF	4,1	30,30	<i>g,r</i>	20.6	2.85	17.2	275.6		65%	N	IRSA/ZTF

Note *W-J-VR* is a single wide-band filter. See Appendix 7.7.1 for image source and archive details.

* indicates the data were obtained from our local repository.

Table entries with multiple comma-separated values contain groups of exposures taken with different filters.

^aLabel in image gallery figures.

^bUT observing date in year-month-day format.

^cNumber of images.

^dExposure time for each image.

^eApparent V-band magnitude (Horizons).

^fHeliocentric distance.

^gSun-target-observer angle.

^hTrue anomaly.

ⁱPercentage to perihelion q from aphelion Q .

^jActivity observed.

We identified candidate images where (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ was expected to be within the field of view (FOV) based on observation times, pointing centers, and FOV sizes and orientations, downloaded associated data, and extracted image cutouts. We organized data by instrument and observation date and summarize observation details in Table 7.1.

We extracted eighty-one 480×480 pixel thumbnail images (such as the image shown in Figure 7.1) in which we could confidently identify (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ (Table 7.1). We coadded images from the same instrument when observations were close enough in time for computed tail orientation to be in close agreement such that coaddition could enhance activity, if present. The thumbnails with the “best activity detection potential” – meaning the images were judged to have observing conditions (e.g., seeing) and depth (i.e., magnitude limit) amenable to activity detection – are shown in Figure 7.2. To allow for uniform spatial comparisons and to magnify the region of interest around (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃, all thumbnail images in Figure 7.2 are displayed with $30'' \times 30''$ fields of view.

7.3.2 Image Assessment

We vetted each thumbnail by visually confirming (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ was visible. In cases where the object could not be readily identified, we employed our pipeline to produce comparison thumbnails derived from DECam data that showed the same region of sky, instrument, broadband filter, and exposure time, but from epochs when the object was not in the FOV. We made use of Gaia DR2 (Collaboration et al., 2018a) and Sloan Digital Sky Survey Release 9 (SDSS DR-9) catalogs (Ahn et al., 2012) to visually validate World Coordinate System of images within the SAOImageDS9 Vizier (Ochsenbein et al., 2000) catalog query system.

We next identified vetted thumbnails that were suitable for coaddition by clustering images based on instrument and date. For compatible image sets that included multiple broadband filters, we carried out coaddition among matching filters as well as combining all images. Finally, we visually examined the results and flagged images with potential activity.

We found a single image with clear evidence of activity (Figure 7.1) in an 89 s *z*-band exposure captured 2016 July 22 by Dustin Lang and Alistair Walker as part of the DECam Legacy Survey (DECaLS; Dey et al., 2019). This discovery makes (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ the ninth recurrently active main-belt asteroid to be identified to date. The other objects, 238P/Read, 259P/Garradd, 288P, 311P/PANSTARRS, 313P/Gibbs, 324P/La Sagra, (6478) Gault, and (7968) Elst-Pizarro, have all demonstrated recurrent activity near perihelion, with the exception of (6478) Gault (Chandler et al., 2019).

We measured the tail length to be about 2'.14 (2.4×10^5 km) in this image but a longer tail may well




Figure 7.2: Archival images of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ with the best activity detection potential (i.e., sufficient depth and observing conditions) for (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃. For all images, north is up, east is left, the FOV is $30'' \times 30''$, the antisolar (yellow $-\odot$) and antismotion (red $-v$) directions are shown with the origin at image center. See Appendix 7.7.1 for instrument and archive details. Panel (s) is from the only thumbnail in which we could identify activity unambiguously (Figure 7.1). (a) 2004 July 8 MegaPrime 3×180 s i band. (b) 2005 June 8 SuprimeCam 3×60 s $W-J-VR$ band. (c) 2010 June 14 PS1 2×60 s z band. (d) 2010 August 2 PS1 1×45 s i band. (e) 2010 August 5 PS1 1×40 s r band. (f) 2010 August 6 PS1 1×43 s g band. (g) 2010 August 28 PTF 2×60 s r band. (h) 2010 August 31 PS1 1×45 s i band. (i) 2010 September 1 PTF 2×60 s r band. (j) 2010 September 6 PS1 2×43 s g band. (k) 2010 September 12 PS1 2×40 s r band + 2×43 s g band. (l) 2010 September 15 PTF 2×60 s r band. (m) 2010 October 30 PS1 2×30 s z band. (n) 2011 July 14 PS1 1×40 s r band. (o) 2011 November 24 PS1 2×40 s r band + 2×43 s g band. (p) 2011 November 30 PS1 2×45 s i band. (q) 2011 December 1 PS1 2×43 s g band. (r) 2014 January 31 OmegaCAM 5×360 s r band. (s) 2016 July 22 1×89 s z band. (t) 2019 July 3 DECam 9×40 s VR band. (u) 2020 February 4 DECam 1×38 s r band. (v) 2020 February 10 DECam 1×199 s z band. (w) 2020 April 25 ZTF 1×30 s g band + 1×30 s r band. (x) 2020 May 18, 27 + 2020 June 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, & 26 ZTF 9×30 s r band + 12×30 s g band.

have been revealed with a longer exposure (see Hsieh et al. (2021b) for 2021 apparition tail measurement). Applying our wedge photometry technique (Section 7.3.3), we produced a diagnostic plot (Figure 7.1) and measured a position angle on the sky of $251.3^\circ \pm 1.4^\circ$ for the tail, in close agreement with the Horizons computed 251.6° antisolar and 251.7° antimotion vectors.

7.3.3 Wedge Photometry Tail Tool

We crafted a new algorithm to (a) identify potentially active objects by detecting likely tails, and (b) quantify alignment between an observed tail and predicted antisolar and antimotion vectors, which are commonly associated with tail direction. Currently, the tool is designed to analyze single tails $< 15^\circ$ in angular extent, though we plan to address multiple tails and comae in the future. The technique, which we refer to as *wedge photometry*, sums all pixel values in a variable-width wedge bound between an inner and outer radius and identifies wedges containing excess flux relative to other wedges, if present. A similar approach was used in Sonnett et al. (2011b) but we have made improvements in angular resolution and algorithmic efficiency. Excess flux within a particular wedge may indicate the presence of a tail, and testing tail alignment with antisolar and antimotion vectors provides additional weight that a detected tail is real. Here we focused on quantifying tail orientation and position angle agreement.

To optimize the process, we convert Cartesian pixel coordinates (x,y) to polar coordinates (r,θ) where the central thumbnail pixel is defined as $(0,0)$. The resulting three-dimensional array has columns r , θ , and c (counts).

For a series of wedge sizes θ (1° – 10° in 1° increments) we summed pixel values in annular segments spanning an angle $\pm\theta/2$ along a radial component r from an inner bound, $r_0 = 5$ pixels, to a maximum of $r_{\max} = 50$ pixels ($13''$ for our DECam data), as given by

$$c(\theta, \Delta\theta) = \sum_{\theta=-\Delta\theta/2}^{\theta=+\Delta\theta/2} \sum_{r=r_0}^{r=r_{\max}} c(r, \theta). \quad (7.1)$$

We further optimize the procedure by selecting for the target a starting radius r_0 outside the FWHM, and choosing a maximum radius $r_{\max}$ that allows for a wedge length long enough to ensure that all bins have sufficient counts to avoid necessitating resampling of any individual pixels. Thus, pixels are assigned to wedges based solely on their precise pixel center coordinate, and any fractional flux from a pixel that spans a wedge boundary is automatically assigned to the wedge containing the pixel center coordinate. We then compute the mean and standard deviation of the resulting counts for each θ to compare with the predicted antisolar and antimotion vectors.

We produce a polar plot (Figure 7.1) to aid assessing relative radial flux distribution. Most position

angles have a 1σ of ~ 200 counts. The tail is clearly identified by our algorithm at $> 7\sigma$ for several $\Delta\theta$ wedge sizes.

7.4 Main-belt Comet Classification

Once we had identified a previous activity epoch we set out to determine if (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ could be an MBC.

7.4.1 Prerequisites

For (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ to qualify as an MBC it must (1) be an active asteroid, (2) orbit within the Main Asteroid Belt, and (3) exhibit sublimation driven activity.

(1) To qualify as an active asteroid, a body must typically meet three criteria (see Jewitt 2012 for discussion): (i) A coma or tail must have been observed visually (as is the case in this work) or, potentially, through alternate means such as spectroscopy (e.g., Küppers et al., 2014; Busarev et al., 2018) or detecting magnetic field enhancements (e.g., Russell et al., 1984). (ii) The semi-major axis a must not be exterior to that of Jupiter ($a_J \approx 5.2$ au) as is the case for comets and active Centaurs (Jewitt, 2009); (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ has $a = 3.1$ au. And (iii) the Tisserand parameter with respect to Jupiter, T_J , must be greater than 3; this is because objects with $T_J < 3$ are canonically considered cometary and $T_J > 3$ asteroids (Vaghi, 1973a,b).

T_J describes how an orbit is related to Jupiter by

$$T_J = \frac{a_J}{a} + 2\sqrt{\frac{a(1-e^2)}{a_J}} \cos(i). \quad (7.2)$$

where e is the eccentricity and i is the orbital inclination. T_J for (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is 3.192 and thus it qualifies as asteroidal. (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ properties are provided in Appendix 7.7.2, and are established with this criterion.

(2) (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ orbits between 2.4 au and 3.76 au and thus does not cross the orbits of either Mars or Jupiter. With a semi-major axis of 3.1 au, (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is an outer main-belt asteroid orbiting between the Kirkwood gaps corresponding to the 7:8 and 2:1 mean motion resonances with Jupiter.

(3) Recurrent activity near perihelion is diagnostic of volatile sublimation as the most likely mechanism responsible for the observed activity (e.g., Hsieh et al., 2012a). However, other underlying causes of recurrent activity are known, so this point warrants further investigation.

7.4.2 Activity Mechanism

We demonstrated in Section 7.3 that (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ has been active during at least two epochs. This helps rule out activity mechanisms such as *impact events* (e.g., (596) Scheila; Bodewits et al. 2011; Ishiguro et al. 2011b; Moreno et al. 2011b) that are only expected to produce one-time outbursts but which can expel dust and produce comet-like activity. Aside from *temperature-correlated volatile sublimation* (which we examine further in Section 7.4.3) other mechanisms for producing recurrent activity have been proposed.

Rotational destabilization causes dust to be flung from a body in a potentially multiepisodic manner, as may be the case for (6478) Gault (Chandler et al., 2019; Kleyna et al., 2019). Taxonomic classification can help diagnose rotational destabilization, as with S-type (6478) Gault, because activity from desiccated asteroid classes is unlikely to be sublimation driven. As discussed in Section 7.4.3, the taxonomic class of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is not yet known but it is likely a C-type asteroid. An accurate rotation period for (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is currently unavailable, and as such, we can neither confirm nor rule out destabilization as a contributing factor to the observed activity at this time.

Rubbing binaries is a hypothetical scenario whereby two merging asteroids repeatedly collide and eject material. Proposed as a possible mechanism for the activity of 311P/PANSTARRS (Hainaut et al., 2014), the rubbing binary scenario has yet to be confirmed for that object (Jewitt et al., 2018) or any other. As of this writing, there is no evidence that (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is a binary asteroid, and activity spans two epochs separated by 5 yr, so we would expect merging processes to have either finished or that the binary orbit would have stabilized (see Jewitt et al. 2018 for additional discussion concerning dissipation timescales). Therefore we find it unlikely that rubbing causes the activity associated with (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃.

Geminid meteor stream parent (3200) Phaethon undergoes extreme temperature changes (~ 600 K) and peaks at 800 K to 1100 K, well above the 573 K serpentine-phylosilicate decomposition threshold (Ohtsuka et al., 2009). These temperatures likely induce *thermal fracture* (Licandro et al., 2007; Kasuga & Jewitt, 2008) leading to mass shedding (Li & Jewitt, 2013; Hui & Li, 2017).

Two mechanisms, thermal fracture and temperature-correlated volatile sublimation warrant further inquiry into the thermophysical properties of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃.

7.4.3 Temperature Estimation

Estimating temperatures experienced by (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ aids us in understanding direct thermal effects (e.g., thermal fracture) as well as assessing long-term volatile survival, especially water. For these reasons, we computed temperatures for an airless body over the course of an orbit similar to that of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃.

Following Hsieh et al. (2015a), the energy balance equation for a gray body on which water ice sublimation

is occurring is

$$\frac{F_{\odot}}{r_h^2}(1 - A) = \chi [\varepsilon \sigma T_{eq}^4 + L f_D \dot{m}_w(T_{eq})] \quad (7.3)$$

where r_h is the object's heliocentric distance, T_{eq} is the equilibrium surface temperature, $F_{\odot} = 1360 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ is the solar constant, r_h is in au, $A = 0.05$ is the assumed Bond albedo of the body, χ accounts for the distribution of solar heating over the object's surface, σ is the Stefan–Boltzmann constant, and $\varepsilon = 0.9$ is the assumed effective infrared emissivity, and $L = 2.83 \text{ MJ kg}^{-1}$ is the latent heat of sublimation of water ice (which we approximate here as being independent of temperature), f_D represents the reduction in sublimation efficiency caused by mantling, where $f_D = 1$ in the absence of a mantle, and $\dot{m}_w$ is the water mass-loss rate due to sublimation of surface ice.

In this equation, $\chi = 1$ corresponds to a flat slab facing the Sun, known as the subsolar approximation, and produces the maximum expected temperature for an object, while $\chi = 4$ applies to objects with fast rotation or low thermal inertia, known as the isothermal approximation, and produces the minimum expected temperature for an object.

Next, the sublimation rate of ice into a vacuum can be computed using

$$\dot{m}_w = P_v(T) \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{2\pi kT}} \quad (7.4)$$

where $\mu = 2.991 \cdot 10^{-26} \text{ kg}$ is the mass of one water molecule, and k is the Boltzmann constant, and the equivalent ice recession rate, $\dot{\ell}_i$, corresponding to $\dot{m}_w$ is given by $\dot{\ell}_i = \dot{m}_w / \rho$, where ρ is the bulk density of the object.

Finally, the Clausius–Clapeyron relation,

$$P_v(T) = 611 \times \exp \left[\frac{\Delta H_{\text{subl}}}{R_g} \left(\frac{1}{273.16} - \frac{1}{T} \right) \right] \quad (7.5)$$

gives the vapor pressure of water, $P_v(T)$, in Pa, where $\Delta H_{\text{subl}} = 51.06 \text{ MJ kmol}^{-1}$ is the heat of sublimation for ice to vapor and $R_g = 8314 \text{ J kmol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$ is the ideal gas constant. Solving these three equations iteratively, one can calculate the equilibrium temperature of a gray body at a given heliocentric distance on which water ice sublimation is occurring.

In Figure 7.3, we plot the object's expected equilibrium temperature over several orbit cycles, as computed by solving the system of equations above. We plot temperatures computed using both $\chi = 1$ and $\chi = 4$ to show the full range of possible temperatures.

Figure 7.3 (top) shows two parameters key to observing (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ between 2015 and 2023: apparent V -band magnitude and “observability,” which we define as the number of hours an object remains

above 15° elevation during nighttime for a given UT observing date. This plot informs us of potential observational biases or geometric effects that may bias activity detection, such as preferential activity discovery during opposition events, as was the case with (6478) Gault (Chandler et al., 2019).

Figure 7.3 (bottom) illustrates (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃’s heliocentric distance and temperature (as computed using Equations 7.3-7.5) over time, plus dates of observed activity and images where no visible activity was conclusively identified. Throughout its entire orbit the surface of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is consistently warmer than 145 K, the temperature above which water ice is not expected to survive over timescales on the order of the age of the solar system (Schorghofer, 2008a; Snodgrass et al., 2017b).

However, it is possible for water ice to remain preserved over long (Gyr) timescales on small asteroids at depths as shallow as a few centimeters to 30 cm below the surface (Schorghofer, 2008a; Prialnik & Rosenberg, 2009), where present-day activity may be triggered by meter-scale impactors that excavate subsurface ice. We note that water ice has been detected on the surface of main-belt asteroid (24) Themis (Campins et al., 2010; Rivkin & Emery, 2010), but the mechanism by which that water ice is able to persist on its surface – likely requiring continual replenishment from subsurface volatile reservoirs – is not well understood, and furthermore may not have the same effectiveness on kilometer-scale objects like (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ as it does on the 200 km diameter (24) Themis.

The surface temperature of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ varies at most between 145 K and 190 K over its orbit (Figure 7.3), far less than the 600 K temperature swings peaking at 800–1000 K described in Section 7.4.2. We consider it is unlikely that thermal fracture is the primary cause of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃’s activity.

7.4.4 Nondetection of Activity

The two known epochs of activity for (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ both occurred when the object was interior to a heliocentric distance of 2.7 au. However, (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ was observed in 2005 and 2010 when the object was interior to 2.7 au but no activity was detected. We believe the circumstances of these epochs preclude a definitive assessment of activity.

The 2010 Pan-STARRS1 data suffer from image artifacts that are significant enough to obscure activity that may have been present. The 2005 SuprimeCam observations should have been well suited to detecting activity as the 8 m Subaru telescope has a large aperture, exposure times (60 s) were sufficiently long, the *W-J-VR* filter covered a broad wavelength range, and the object was well placed in the sky in terms of airmass/elevation during the observations. However, extinction varied significantly over the observing sequence as the summit log for that night³ indicated that conditions were windy with cirrus clouds and the

³https://smoka.nao.ac.jp/calendar/slog/2005/slog_20050608.txt

differential image motion monitor measured significant seeing variation (roughly $0''.8$ to $> 3''$)⁴, potentially contributing to a considerable reduction in our ability to detect activity. All sources in the field could be matched to SDSS DR-9 stars but the faintest stars we were able match to the SDSS DR-9 catalog were $r \approx 21.3$, very similar to the JPL Horizons computed $V=21.0$ for (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃. The Subaru Exposure Time Calculator estimates an equivalent r -band exposure would deliver a signal-to-noise ratio of 66 for a source of equivalent magnitude, but we estimate the images are at best ~ 0.5 mag deeper than necessary to detect the object and thus we find it unlikely that activity would be detectable unless the object was undergoing a significant outburst at the time.

Although we cannot definitively rule out the presence of activity in 2005 or 2010 from these observations, another possibility is that a triggering event (e.g., impact, rotational destabilization) that started (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃'s current activity occurred between 2005 June and 2016 July. This would explain the object's apparent inactivity and activity on each of those dates, respectively.

7.4.5 Main-belt Comet Membership

Given the above reasoning, we find it most likely that the activity associated with (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is sublimation driven, in which case the object is an MBC. However, we emphasize that in order to rule out rotational destabilization as the root cause of the observed activity, additional work is needed. Moreover, confirmation of a third activity epoch would lend further evidence favoring sublimation as the primary agency of activity.

7.5 Summary and Future Work

We harvested eighty-one images of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ (also designated 433P) spanning thirty-one observing dates. We found clear evidence of a previous activity epoch on 2016 July 22. We provide a catalog of archival observations along with an image gallery. Making use of wedge photometry – a novel tail detection and characterization tool we introduce in this Letter – we measure tail orientation to be in close agreement with the antisolar and antimotion vectors computed by Horizons. We showed that (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is a likely member of the MBCs, a group of active asteroids orbiting within the Main Asteroid Belt that are active due to volatile sublimation.

The current observing window for this object ends around 2021 December, and when it returns in late 2022 it will be over 3 au from the Sun and less likely to show activity. We did not find any images showing (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ active at beyond 3 au, so we call on observers to make use of the present

⁴<https://smoka.nao.ac.jp/calendar/subaruseeing/20050608.gif>

activity apparition while it is still possible to do so. Continued monitoring to study the evolution of the tail’s brightness, including surface brightness measurements, can lead to better characterization of ejected dust grain sizes and total mass loss during this apparition. Once activity subsides, time-series observations to measure a rotation period will be especially useful for diagnosing rotational breakup. Preliminary color measurements suggest (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is a C-type asteroid (Hsieh et al., 2021b), but a robust taxonomic classification would help further solidify our assessment of the underlying activity mechanism.

7.6 Acknowledgements

The authors thank the anonymous referee whose comments greatly improved the quality of this Letter.

We thank Dr. Mark Jesus Mendoza Magbanua (University of California San Francisco) for his frequent and timely feedback on the project. The authors express their gratitude to Prof. Mike Gowanlock (NAU), Dr. Annika Gustafsson (NAU, Lowell Observatory, Southwest Research Institute), Jay Kueny (Steward Observatory), and the Trilling Research Group (NAU), all of whom provided invaluable insights which substantially enhanced this work. The unparalleled support provided by Monsoon cluster administrator Christopher Coffey (NAU) and the High Performance Computing Support team facilitated the scientific process.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under grant No. (2018258765). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. C.O.C., H.H.H. and C.A.T. also acknowledge support from the NASA Solar System Observations program (grant 80NSSC19K0869).

Computational analyses were run on Northern Arizona University’s Monsoon computing cluster, funded by Arizona’s Technology and Research Initiative Fund. This work was made possible in part through the State of Arizona Technology and Research Initiative Program. World Coordinate System (WCS) corrections facilitated by the *Astrometry.net* software suite (Lang et al., 2010).

This research has made use of data and/or services provided by the International Astronomical Union’s Minor Planet Center. This research has made use of NASA’s Astrophysics Data System. This research has made use of The Institut de Mécanique Céleste et de Calcul des Éphémérides (IMCCE) SkyBoT Virtual Observatory tool (Berthier et al., 2006). This work made use of the FTOOLS software package hosted by the NASA Goddard Flight Center High Energy Astrophysics Science Archive Research Center. This research has made use of SAOImageDS9, developed by Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (Joye, 2006). This work made use of the Lowell Observatory Asteroid Orbit Database *astorbDB* (Bowell et al., 1994; Moskovitz

et al., 2021). This work made use of the *astropy* software package (Robitaille et al., 2013).

This project used data obtained with the Dark Energy Camera (DECam), which was constructed by the Dark Energy Survey (DES) collaboration. Funding for the DES Projects has been provided by the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. National Science Foundation, the Ministry of Science and Education of Spain, the Science and Technology Facilities Council of the United Kingdom, the Higher Education Funding Council for England, the National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Kavli Institute of Cosmological Physics at the University of Chicago, Center for Cosmology and Astro-Particle Physics at the Ohio State University, the Mitchell Institute for Fundamental Physics and Astronomy at Texas A&M University, Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos, Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo, Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos, Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico and the Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Collaborating Institutions in the Dark Energy Survey. The Collaborating Institutions are Argonne National Laboratory, the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Cambridge, Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas, Medioambientales y Tecnológicas–Madrid, the University of Chicago, University College London, the DES-Brazil Consortium, the University of Edinburgh, the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH) Zürich, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Institut de Ciències de l’Espai (IEEC/CSIC), the Institut de Física d’Altes Energies, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München and the associated Excellence Cluster Universe, the University of Michigan, the National Optical Astronomy Observatory, the University of Nottingham, the Ohio State University, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Portsmouth, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Stanford University, the University of Sussex, and Texas A&M University.

Based on observations at Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, National Optical Astronomy Observatory (NOAO Prop. ID 2016A-0190, PI: Dey), which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA) under a cooperative agreement with the National Science Foundation. This research has made use of the NASA/IPAC Infrared Science Archive, which is funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and operated by the California Institute of Technology.

The Legacy Surveys consist of three individual and complementary projects: the Dark Energy Camera Legacy Survey (DECaLS; Proposal ID #2014B-0404; PIs: David Schlegel and Arjun Dey), the Beijing-Arizona Sky Survey (BASS; NOAO Prop. ID #2015A-0801; PIs: Zhou Xu and Xiaohui Fan), and the Mayall z-band Legacy Survey (MzLS; Prop. ID #2016A-0453; PI: Arjun Dey). DECaLS, BASS and MzLS together include data obtained, respectively, at the Blanco telescope, Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, NSF’s NOIRLab; the Bok telescope, Steward Observatory, University of Arizona; and the Mayall telescope, Kitt

Peak National Observatory, NOIRLab. The Legacy Surveys project is honored to be permitted to conduct astronomical research on Iolkam Du’ag (Kitt Peak), a mountain with particular significance to the Tohono O’odham Nation. BASS is a key project of the Telescope Access Program (TAP), which has been funded by the National Astronomical Observatories of China, the Chinese Academy of Sciences (the Strategic Priority Research Program “The Emergence of Cosmological Structures” Grant # XDB09000000), and the Special Fund for Astronomy from the Ministry of Finance. The BASS is also supported by the External Cooperation Program of Chinese Academy of Sciences (Grant # 114A11KYSB20160057), and Chinese National Natural Science Foundation (Grant # 11433005). The Legacy Survey team makes use of data products from the Near-Earth Object Wide-field Infrared Survey Explorer (NEOWISE), which is a project of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory/California Institute of Technology. NEOWISE is funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Legacy Surveys imaging of the DESI footprint is supported by the Director, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH1123, by the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center, a DOE Office of Science User Facility under the same contract; and by the U.S. National Science Foundation, Division of Astronomical Sciences under Contract No. AST-0950945 to NOAO.

Based in part on data collected at Subaru Telescope and obtained from the SMOKA, which is operated by the Astronomy Data Center, National Astronomical Observatory of Japan (Baba et al., 2002a).

7.7 Appendix

7.7.1 Equipment and Archives

Table 7.2 lists the instruments and telescopes used in this work, along with their respective pixel scales, locations, and data archives.

7.7.2 (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ Data

We provide current information regarding (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ below (Table 7.3).

Instrument	Telescope	Pixel Scale [" / pix]	Location	NOIR	ESO	IRSA	SMOKA	SSOIS	STScI
------------	-----------	--------------------------	----------	------	-----	------	-------	-------	-------

DECam	4 m Blanco	0.263	Cerro Tololo, Chile	S,R	S
OmegaCAM	2.6 m VLT Survey	0.214	Cerro Paranal, Chile	R	S
GigaPixel1	1.8 m Pan-STARRS1	0.258	Haleakala, Hawaii		S
MegaPrime	3.6 m CFHT	0.185	Mauna Kea, Hawaii		S,R
PTF/CFHT 12K	48" Samuel Oschin	1.010	Mt. Palomar, California		S,R
SuprimeCam	8.2 m Subaru	0.200	Mauna Kea, Hawaii	R	S
ZTF Camera	48" Samuel Oschin	1.012	Mt. Palomar, California		S,R

NOIR: NSF National Optical Infrared Labs AstroArchive (<https://astroarchive.noirlab.edu>).

IRSA: NASA/CalTech Infrared Science Archive (<https://irsa.ipac.caltech.edu>).

SSOIS: CADC Solar System Object Image Search (<https://www.cadc-ccda.hia-ihp.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/en/ssois/>).

STScI: Space Telescope Science Institute (<https://www.stsci.edu/>).

STScI: Space Telescope Science Institute (<https://www.stsci.edu/>).




Figure 7.3: (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ heliocentric distance (top plot), observability timeline (middle plot) and temperature (bottom plot), beginning the year of our first archival data (2004) through 2022. Top: triangles represent positive (filled red) and negative (unfilled blue) activity detections. Markers indicate when the object was inbound (downward pointing triangles) or outbound (upward pointing triangles). Table 7.1 lists observation details. Middle: apparent V -band magnitude (solid green line) and our “observability” metric (yellow dashed line) that represents hours during a given UT observing date the object is above $> 15^\circ$ elevation while the Sun is below the horizon. Peaks in apparent magnitude coinciding with observability occur during opposition events, and observability troughs indicate solar conjunctions when (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ was only above the horizon during daylight. Perihelion (orange q) and aphelion (blue Q) events are indicated. Bottom: temperature T (K) by date for different χ values, where $\chi = 1$ (top line) represents a “flat slab” and $\chi = 4$ (bottom line) an isothermal body.

Table 7.3: (248370) 2005 QN ₁₇₃ Properties		
Parameter	Value	Source
Discovery Date	2005 August 29	Minor Planet Center
Discovery Observers	Near-Earth Asteroid Tracking (NEAT)	Minor Planet Center
Discovery Observatory	Palomar	Minor Planet Center
Activity Discovery Date	2021 July 7	CBET 4995
Activity Discoverer(s)	A. Fitzsimmons / ATLAS	CBET 4995 (Fitzsimmons et al., 2021)
Orbit Type	Outer Main-belt	IMCCE, AstOrb
Taxonomic Class	C-type (unconfirmed)	Hsieh et al. (2021b)
Diameter	$D = 3.6$ km; 3.4 ± 0.4 km	Horizons, Harris & Lagerros (2002) ; Hsieh et al. (2021b)
Absolute V -band Magnitude	$H = 16.02$	Horizons
Geometric Albedo	0.054	Horizons, Mainzer et al. (2019)
Rotation Period	unknown	
Orbital Period	$P = 5.37$ yr	Horizons
Semimajor Axis	$a = 3.075$ au	Horizons
Eccentricity	$e = 0.226$	Horizons
Inclination	$i = 0.067^\circ$	Horizons
Longitude of Ascending Node	$\Omega = 174.28$	Minor Planet Center
Mean Anomaly	$M = 8.79^\circ$	Minor Planet Center
Argument of Perihelion	$\omega = 146.09^\circ$	Horizons
Perihelion Distance	$q = 2.374$ au	Horizons
Aphelion Distance	$Q = 3.761$ au	Horizons
Tisserand Parameter w.r.t. Jupiter	$T_J = 3.192$	AstOrb

Chapter 8

Manuscript V: Migratory Outbursting Quasi-Hilda Object 282P/(323137) 2003 BM80

Colin Orion Chandler¹, William J. Oldroyd¹, Chadwick A. Trujillo¹

This is a preliminary version of an article submitted for publication in Astrophysical Journal Letters. IOP Publishing Ltd is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it.

8.1 Abstract

We report object 282P/(323137) 2003 BM₈₀ is undergoing a sustained activity outburst, lasting over 15 months thus far. These findings stem in part from our NASA Partner Citizen Science project *Active Asteroids* (<http://activeasteroids.net>), which we introduce here. We acquired new observations of 282P via our observing campaign (Vatican Advanced Technology Telescope (VATT), Lowell Discovery Telescope (LDT), and the Gemini South telescope), confirming 282P was active on UT 2022 June 7, some 15 months after 2021 March images showed activity in the 2021–2022 epoch. We classify 282P as a member of the Quasi-Hilda Objects (QHOs), a group of dynamically unstable objects found in an orbital region similar to, but distinct in their dynamical characteristics to, the Hilda asteroids (objects in 3:2 resonance with Jupiter). Our dynamical simulations show 282P has undergone at least five close encounters with Jupiter and one with Saturn over the last 180 years. 282P was most likely a Centaur or Jupiter Family Comet (JFC) 250 years ago. In 350 years, following some 15 strong Jovian interactions, 282P will most likely migrate to become a JFC or, less likely, an outer main-belt asteroid orbit. These migrations highlight a dynamical pathway connecting Centaurs and JFCs with Quasi-Hildas and, potentially, active asteroids. Synthesizing these results with our thermodynamical modeling and new activity observations, we find volatile sublimation is the primary activity mechanism. Observations of a quiescent 282P, which we anticipate will be possible in 2023, will help confirm our hypothesis by measuring a rotation period and ascertaining spectral type.

¹Department of Astronomy and Planetary Science, Northern Arizona University, PO Box 6010, Flagstaff, AZ 86011, USA

8.2 Introduction

Volatiles are vital to life as we know it and are critically important to future space exploration, yet basic knowledge about where volatiles (e.g., H_2O , CO , CH_4) are located within our own solar system is still incomplete. Moreover, the origin of solar system volatiles, including terrestrial water, remains inconclusive. Investigating sublimation-driven active solar system bodies can help answer these questions (Hsieh & Jewitt, 2006a).

We define volatile reservoirs as a dynamical class of minor planet that harbors volatile species, such as water ice. Comets have long been known to contain volatiles, but other important reservoirs are coming to light, such as the active asteroids – objects on orbits normally associated with asteroids, such as those found in the main-belt, that surprisingly display cometary features such as tails and/or comae (Jewitt et al., 2015c). Fewer than 30 active asteroids have been discovered (Chandler et al., 2018) since the first, (4015) Wilson-Harrington, was discovered in 1949 (Cunningham, 1950) and, as a result, they remain poorly understood. One scientifically important subset of active asteroids consists of members that display recurrent activity attributed to sublimation: the Main-belt Comets (MBCs) (Hsieh et al., 2015a). An important diagnostic of indicator sublimating volatiles, like water ice, is recurrent activity near perihelion (Hsieh et al., 2012a; Snodgrass et al., 2017b), a feature common to the MBCs (Hsieh et al., 2015a; Agarwal et al., 2017; Hsieh et al., 2018b). Fewer than 10 recurrently active MBCs have been discovered (though others exhibit activity attributed to sublimation), and as a result we know very little about this population.

Another potential volatile reservoir, active Centaurs, came to light after comet 29P/Schwassmann-Wachmann 1 (Schwassmann & Wachmann, 1927) was identified as a Centaur following the 1977 discovery of (2060) Chiron (Kowal & Gehrels, 1977). Centaurs, found between the orbits of Jupiter and Neptune, are cold objects thought to primarily originate in the Kuiper Belt prior to migrating to their current orbits (see review, Jewitt 2009). The dynamical properties of these objects are discussed in Section 8.6. Fewer than 20 active Centaurs have been discovered to date, thus they, like the active asteroids, are both rare and poorly understood.

In order to enable the study of active objects in populations not typically associated with activity (e.g.,

Based on observations obtained at the international Gemini Observatory, a program of NSF’s NOIRLab, which is managed by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA) under a cooperative agreement with the National Science Foundation on behalf of the Gemini Observatory partnership: the National Science Foundation (United States), National Research Council (Canada), Agencia Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo (Chile), Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación (Argentina), Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia, Inovações e Comunicações (Brazil), and Korea Astronomy and Space Science Institute (Republic of Korea).

Magellan telescope time was granted by NSF’s NOIRLab, through the Telescope System Instrumentation Program (TSIP). TSIP was funded by National Science Foundation (NSF).

near-Earth objects (NEOs), main-belt asteroids), we created a Citizen Science project designed to identify roughly 100 active objects via volunteer identification of activity in images of a known minor planets. The Citizen Science paradigm involves concurrently crowdsourcing tasks yet too complex for computers to perform, while also carrying out an outreach program that engages the public in a scientific endeavor. Launched in Fall 2021, our NSF funded, NASA partner program *Active Asteroids*² immediately began yielding results.




Figure 8.1: Top row: four images, spanning 15 months, showing 282P/(323137) 2003 BM₈₀ activity during the recent 2021–2022 activity epoch. (a) Epoch II thumbnail image of 282P was classified as “active” by 14 of 15 volunteers of our Citizen Science project *Active Asteroids*, a NASA Partner program. This 90 s *i* band image was taken with the Dark Energy Camera on UT 2021 March 14, Prop. ID 2019A-0305 (PI Drlica-Wagner). (b) Epoch II, 12×300 s co-added exposures imaged by Michael Jäger with a QHY600 camera on a 14” Newtonian telescope in Weißenkirchen, Austria. Image reproduced with permission of Michael Jäger. (c) Epoch II 5×300 s co-added images captured by Roland Fichtl using a CDS cooled Canon 5D Mark III camera on a 16” Newtonian telescope in Engelhardsberg, Germany. Image reproduced with permission of Roland Fichtl. (d) For this most recent Epoch II image we co-added six 120 s *g'* band images of 282P (green dashed arrow) we acquired on UT 7 June 2022 with the GMOS imager on the 8.1 m Gemini South telescope (Prop. ID GS-2022A-DD-103, PI Chandler); a tail is clearly visible (orange arrows). Bottom row: Archival images of 282P that show clear evidence of activity. For each 126'×126' thumbnail image, north is up and east is left. With the center of each image as the origin, the antisolar (yellow -⊙) and antimotion (red -v) directions (often correlated with tail appearance) are indicated. 282P is indicated by the green dashed arrow, and visible activity is marked by the white arrows. (e) Epoch I image from UT 2012 March 28 MegaPrime 120 s *r* band, Prop. ID 12AH16 (PI Wainscoat). (f) Epoch I image from UT 2013 May 5 DECam 150 s *r* band, Prop. ID 2013A-0327 (PI Rest). (g) Epoch I image from UT 2013 June 13 MegaPrime 120 s *r* band, Prop. ID 13AH09 (PI Wainscoat). (h) Epoch II image from UT 2021 March 17 DECam 90 s *i* band, Prop. ID 2019A-0305 (PI Drlica-Wagner).

282P/(323137) 2003 BM₈₀, hereafter 282P, was originally discovered as 2003 BM₈₀ on UT 2003 Jan 31

²<http://activeasteroids.net>

by Brian Skiff of the Lowell Observatory Near-Earth-Object Search (LONEOS) survey, and independently as 2003 FV₁₁₂ by Lincoln Near-Earth Asteroid Research (LINEAR) on UT 2003 Apr 18. 282P was identified to be active during its 2012–2013 epoch (centered on its perihelion passage) in 2013 (Bolin et al., 2013b), at which time 282P was given the additional identifier 282P. Here, we introduce an additional activity epoch, spanning 2021–2022.

In this work we (1) present our National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Partner Citizen Science project *Active Asteroids*, (2) describe how volunteers identified activity that led to our investigation into 282P, (3) present (a) archival images and (b) new observations of 282P that show it has undergone periods of activity during at least two epochs (2012–2013 and 2021–2022) spanning consecutive perihelion passages, (4) classify 282P as a QHO, (5) explore the migratory nature of this object through dynamical modeling, including identification of a dynamical pathway between QHOs and active asteroids, and (6) determine volatile sublimation as the most probable activity mechanism.

8.3 Citizen Science

We prepared thumbnail images (e.g., Figure 8.1a) for examination by volunteers of our NASA Partner Citizen Science project *Active Asteroids*, hosted on the Zooniverse³ online Citizen Science platform. First we extract thumbnail images from publicly available Dark Energy Camera (DECam) archival images using a pipeline, Hunting for Activity in Repositories with Vetting-Enhanced Search Techniques (HARVEST), first described in Chandler et al. (2018) and expanded upon in Chandler et al. (2019, 2020, 2021b). We optimize the Citizen Science process by excluding thumbnail images based on specific criteria, for example when (a) the image depth is insufficient for detecting activity, (b) no source was detected in the thumbnail center, and (c) too many sources were in the thumbnail to allow for reliable target identification.

Our workflow is simple: we show volunteers an image of a known minor planet and ask whether or not they see evidence of activity (like a tail or coma) coming from the object at the center of the image, as marked by a reticle (Figure 8.1a). Each thumbnail is examined by at least 15 volunteers to minimize volunteer bias. To help train volunteers and validate that the project is working as intended, we created a training set of thumbnail images that we positively identified as showing activity, consisting of comets and other active objects, such as active asteroids. Training images are injected at random, though the interval of injection decays over time so that experienced volunteers only see a training image 5% of the time.

We take the ratio of “positive for activity” classifications to the total number of classifications the object received, as a score to estimate the likelihood of the object being active. Members of the science team

³<https://www.zooniverse.org>

visually examines all images with a likelihood score of $\geq 80\%$ and flag candidates that warrant archival image investigation and telescope follow-up (Section 8.4). We also learn of activity candidates through Zooniverse forums where users interact with each other, moderators, and our science team. Volunteers can share images they find interesting which has, in turn, led us directly to discoveries.

As of this writing, over 6,600 volunteers have participated in *Active Asteroids*. They have conducted over 2.8×10^6 classifications, completing assessment of over 171,000 thumbnail images. One image of 282P from UT 2021 March 14 (Figure 8.1a) received a score of 93% after 14 of 15 volunteers classified the thumbnail as showing activity. A second image from UT 2021 March 17 (Figure 8.1h) was classified as active by 15 of 15 volunteers, providing additional strong evidence of activity from 2021 March.

8.4 Observations

8.4.1 Archival Data

For each candidate active object stemming from *Active Asteroids* we conduct an archival data investigation, following the procedure described in Chandler et al. (2021b). For this task, we query public astronomical image archives and identify images which may show 282P in the field of view (FOV). We download the data, extract thumbnail images centered on 282P, and visually examine all images to search for evidence of activity.

After visually inspecting > 400 thumbnail images we found 57 images (listed in Table 8.1) in which we could confidently identify 282P in the frame. The remaining images either did not probe faintly enough, did not actually capture 282P (e.g., 282P was not on a detector), or suffered from image artifacts that made the image unsuitable for activity detection. The 57 images span 22 observing dates; nine dates had at least one image we ascertained showed probable activity, five from the 2012–2013 epoch and four dates from the 2021–2022 apparition. Section 8.4 provides a complete listing of observations used in this work.

Figure 8.2 shows three plots with shared x -axes (years).

Apparent magnitude and observability (the number of hours an object is above the horizon and the Sun is below the horizon) together provide insight into potential observational biases. For example, observations for detecting activity are ideal when 282P is brightest, near perihelion, and observable for many hours in an observing night. When contrasting hemispheres, this plot makes it clear that some periods (e.g., 2016 – 2020) are more favorable for observations in the northern hemisphere, whereas other observation windows (e.g., 2013 – 2015, 2022) are better suited to southern hemisphere facilities.

8.4.2 Follow-up Telescope Observations

Magellan During twilight on UT 2022 March 7 we observed 282P with the Inamori-Magellan Areal Camera and Spectrograph (IMACS) instrument (Dressler et al., 2011) on the Magellan 6.5 m Baade telescope located atop Las Campanas Observatory (Chile). We successfully identified 282P in the images, however 282P was in front of a dense part of the Milky Way, preventing us from unambiguously identifying activity. We used these observations to inform our Gemini signal to noise ratio (SNR) calculations.

VATT On UT 2022 April 6 we observed 282P with the 1.8 m VATT at the Mount Graham International Observatory (MGIO) in Arizona (Proposal ID S165, Principal Investigator (PI) Chandler). 282P was in an especially dense part of the galaxy so we conducted test observations to assess the viability of activity detection under these conditions. We concluded object detection would be challenging and activity detection essentially impossible in such a dense field.

LDT On UT 2022 May 21 we observed 282P with the LDT in Arizona (PI: Chandler). Finding charts indicated 282P was in a less dense field compared to our VATT observations, however we were hardly able to resolve 282P or identify any activity because the field was still too crowded.

Gemini South On UT 2022 June 7 we observed 282P with the GMOS South instrument (Hook et al., 2004; Gimeno et al., 2016) on the 8.1 m Gemini South telescope located atop Cerro Pachón in Chile (Proposal ID GS-2022A-DD-103, PI Chandler). We timed this observation to take place during a ~ 10 day window when 282P was passing in front of a less dense region of the Milky Way. We acquired eighteen images, six each in g' , r' , and i' . Activity was clearly visible in the reduced data in all filters, with activity appearing strongest in g' (Figure 8.1d). Our observations confirmed 282P was still active, 15 months after the 2021 archival data, evidence supporting sublimation as the most likely cause for activity (Section 8.8).

8.5 Dynamical Modeling

We analyzed 282P orbital characteristics in order to (1) determine its dynamical class (Section 8.6), and (2) inform our activity mechanism assessment (Section 8.8). We simulated a cloud of 500 282P orbital clones, randomly drawn from Gaussian distributions centered on the current fitted parameters of 282P, with widths corresponding to uncertainties of those fits (Table 8.3 lists parameters and associated uncertainties), as reported by JPL Horizons (Giorgini et al., 1996).

We modeled the gravitational influence of the Sun and the planets (except Mercury) on each orbital clone using the Integrator with Adaptive Step-size control, 15th order (IAS15) N-body integrator (Rein & Spiegel,

2015), typically accurate to machine precision, with the **REBOUND** Python package (Rein & Liu, 2012; Rein et al., 2019). We ran simulations 1,000 years forward and backward through time. Longer integrations were unnecessary because dynamical chaos ensues prior to ~ 200 years ago and after ~ 350 years into the future. Beyond these times the orbit of 282P is not deterministic due to observational uncertainties.

Results from the dynamical evolution of the 282P orbital clones are shown in Figure 8.3 and Figure 8.4. For all plots, time $t = 0$ corresponds to Julian Date (JD) 2459600.5 (UT 2022 Jan 21) and time ranges from $t = -250$ to $t = +350$ (1772–2372 AD). Horizontal lines at distances of one, three, and five Hill radii (Equation 8.1) from Jupiter and Saturn are shown in Figure 8.4 panels a and b. The Hill Radius (Hill, 1878) r_H is a metric of orbital stability and indicates the region where a secondary body (e.g., a planet) has dominant gravitational influence over a tertiary body (e.g., a moon), with both related to a primary body, such as the Sun. At pericenter, the Hill radius of the secondary body can be approximated as

$$r_H \approx a(1 - e)(m/3M)^{1/3}, \quad (8.1)$$

where a , e , and m are the semi-major axis, eccentricity and mass of the secondary (Jupiter or Saturn in our case), respectively, and M is the mass of the primary (here, the Sun). Close passages of a small body within a few Hill radii of a planet are generally considered to be significant perturbations and may drastically alter the orbit of the small body (see Hamilton & Burns 1992 Section 2.1.2 for discussion).

From ~ 180 years ago until ~ 300 years in the future, the orbit of 282P is well-constrained in our simulations. Figure 8.4a illustrates that 282P has roughly 10 close encounters (within ~ 2 au) with Jupiter, and one with Saturn, over the range $-250 < t < 350$ yr. These encounters have a strong effect on the semi-major axis a of 282P (Figure 8.3b), and, as illustrated by Figure 8.4d, a noticeable influence on its Tisserand parameter with respect to Jupiter T_J ,

$$T_J = \frac{a_J}{a} + 2 \cos(i) \sqrt{\frac{a}{a_J} (1 - e^2)}, \quad (8.2)$$

where a_J is the semi-major axis of Jupiter and a , e and i are the semi-major axis, eccentricity and inclination of the body, respectively. T_J essentially describes an object’s close approach speed to Jupiter or, in effect, the degree of dynamical perturbation an object will experience as a consequence of Jovian influence. T_J is often described as invariant (Kresák, 1972) or conserved, meaning that changes in orbital parameters still result in the same T_J , although, in practice, its value does change slightly as a result of close encounters (see Figure 8.4d).

Due to the small Jupiter-centric distances of 282P during these encounters, compounded by its orbital uncertainties, the past orbit of 282P, prior to $t \approx -180$ yrs, is not deterministic. Dynamical chaos is plainly

evident in all panels as orbital clones take a multitude of paths within the parameter space, resulting in a broad range of possible orbital outcomes due only to slight variations in initial 282P orbital parameters.

A consequential encounter with Saturn occurred around 1838 ($t \approx -184$ yr; Figure 8.4b), followed by another interaction with Jupiter in 1846 ($t = -176$ yr; Figure 8.4a). After these encounters 282P was a JFC (100% of orbital clones) with a semi-major axis between Jupiter’s and Saturn’s semi-major axes (Figure 8.3b), and crossing the orbits of both planets (Figure 8.4c). These highly perturbative passages placed 282P on the path that would lead to its current Quasi-Hilda orbit.

In 1940 ($t = -82$ yr), 282P had a very close encounter with Jupiter, at a distance of 0.3 au – interior to one Hill radius. As seen in Figure 8.3a, this encounter dramatically altered 282P’s orbit, shifting 282P from an orbit primarily exterior to Jupiter to an orbit largely interior to Jupiter (Figure 8.3b). This same interaction also caused 282P’s orbit to migrate from Jupiter- and Saturn-crossing to only a Jupiter-crossing orbit (Figure 8.4c). This step in the orbital evolution of 282P also changed its T_J (Figure 8.4d) to be close to the traditional $T_J = 3$ comet–asteroid dynamical boundary. At this point in time, 282P remained a JFC (100% of orbital clones) despite its dramatic change in orbit.

Around $t \approx 200$ yr, 282P crosses the $T_J = 3$ boundary dividing the JFCs and the asteroids on the order of 10 times. Although no major changes in the orbit 282P occur during this time, because of the stringency of this boundary, relatively minor perturbations result in oscillation between dynamical classes.

After a major encounter with Jupiter around 2330 AD ($t \approx 308$ yrs), dynamical chaos again becomes dominant and remains so for the rest of the simulation. Following this encounter, the orbit of 282P does not converge around any single solution. Slight diffusion following the previous several Jupiter passages are also visible in Figure 8.3b-d and Figure 8.4a-d, and these also add uncertainty concerning encounters around 2301 to 2306 ($t \approx 280$ to 285 yrs). Although we are unable to precisely determine past and future orbits of 282P outside of $-180 \lesssim t \lesssim 300$ because of dynamical chaos, we are able to examine the fraction of orbital clones that finish the simulation (forwards and backwards) on orbits associated with different orbital classes.

8.6 Dynamical Classifications: Past, Present and Future

Minor planets are often classified dynamically, based on orbital characteristics such as semi-major axis. 282P was labeled a JFC by Hsieh et al. (2015a), in agreement with a widely adopted system that classifies objects dynamically based on their Tisserand parameter with respect to Jupiter, T_J (Equation 8.2).

Via Equation 8.2, Jupiter’s T_J is 2.998 given $a_J = 5.20$, $e_J = 0.049$, and $i_J = 0.013$. Notably, objects with $T_J > 3$ cannot cross the Jovian orbit, thus their orbits are entirely interior or exterior to Jupiter’s orbit (Levison, 1996). Objects with $T_J < 3$ are considered cometary (Levison, 1996), while those with $T_J > 3$

are not (Vaghi, 1973a,b), a classification approach first suggested by Carusi et al. (1987, 1996). JFCs have $2 < T_J < 3$ (see e.g., Jewitt 2009), and Damocloids have $T_J < 2$ (Jewitt, 2005). We note, however, that the traditional T_J asteroid – JFC – Damocloid continuum does not include (or exclude) QHOs.

As discussed in Section 8.2, we adopt the Jewitt (2009) definition of Centaur, which stipulates that a Centaur has an orbit entirely exterior to Jupiter, with both q and a interior to Neptune, and the body is not in 1:1 resonance with a planet. 282P has a semi-major axis $a = 4.240$ au, well interior to Jupiter’s $a_J = 5.2$ au. This disqualifies 282P as presently on a Centaurian orbit.

Active objects other than comets orbiting interior to Jupiter are primarily the active asteroids, defined as (1) $T_J > 3$, (2) displaying comet-like activity, and (3) orbiting outside of mean-motion resonance with any of the planets. This last stipulation rules out the Jupiter Trojans (1:1 resonance) and the Hildas (3:2 resonance with Jupiter), even though both classes have members above and below the $T_J = 3.0$ asteroid–comet transition line. We compute $T_J = 2.99136891 \pm (3.73 \times 10^{-8})$ for 282P (see Table 8.3 for a list of orbital parameters). These values do not exceed the traditional $T_J = 3$ cutoff; thus 282P cannot be considered an active asteroid in its current orbit. MBCs are an active asteroid subset defined as orbiting entirely within the main asteroid belt (Hsieh et al., 2015a). Figure 8.4c shows that 282P’s heliocentric distance does not stay within the boundaries of the Asteroid Belt (i.e., between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter), and so 282P does not qualify as a MBC.

Blurring the lines between JFC and Hilda is the Quasi-Hilda regime. A Quasi-Hilda, also referred to as a QHO, Quasi-Hilda Asteroid (QHA) (Jewitt & Kim, 2020), or Quasi-Hilda Comet (QHC), is a minor planet on an orbit similar to a Hilda (Toth, 2006a; Gil-Hutton & Garcia-Migani, 2016). Hildas are defined by their 3:2 interior mean-motion resonance with Jupiter, however Quasi-Hildas are not in this resonance, though they do orbit near it. Quasi-Hildas likely migrated from the JFC region (see discussion, Jewitt & Kim 2020). We favor the term QHO or QHA over QHC, given that fewer than 15 Quasi-Hildas have been found to be active, while the remainder of the > 270 identified Quasi-Hildas (Gil-Hutton & Garcia-Migani, 2016) have not been confirmed to be active. Notable objects from the Quasi-Hilda class are 39P/Oterma (Oterma, 1942), an object that was a Quasi-Hilda prior to 1963, when a very close (0.095 au) encounter with Jupiter redirected the object into a Centaurian orbit. Another notable Quasi-Hilda was D/Shoemaker-Levy 9, which famously broke apart and impacted Jupiter in 1994 (e.g., Weaver et al. 1995).

Quasi-Hildas have orbital parameters similar to that of the Hildas, approximately $3.7 \lesssim a \lesssim 4.2$ au, $e \leq 0.3$, and $i \leq 20^\circ$. In rough agreement, 282P has $a = 4.24$ au, $e = 0.188$, and $i = 5.8^\circ$ (Table 8.3). Hildas are also known for their trilobal orbits as viewed in the Jupiter corotating frame (caused by their residence in the 3:2 interior mean motion resonance with Jupiter), especially the namesake asteroid (153) Hilda (Figure 8.5d). Because (153) Hilda is in a stable 3:2 resonant orbit with Jupiter, its orbit remains roughly constant,

with a small amount of libration over time. By contrast, Quasi-Hildas like 246P/NEAT (Figure 8.5e) are near the same resonance and show signs of this characteristic trilobal pattern, however their orbits drift considerably on timescales of hundreds of years. 282P (Figure 8.5f) also displays a typical Quasi-Hilda orbit as viewed in the Jupiter corotating reference frame.

In the past, prior to 250 yr ago, 52% (260) of the 500 orbital clones were JFCs, 48% (239) were Centaurs, 5% (26) were already QHOs, and one (0.2%) was an outer main-belt asteroid (OMBA). The most probable scenario prior to 250 years ago was that was either a JFC or Centaur, both classes that trace their origins to the Kuiper Belt (see reviews, Morbidelli & Nesvorný 2020 and Jewitt 2009, respectively).

In the future, after 350 years time, 81% (403) of clones become JFCs, 18% (90) remain QHOs, 14% (69) become OMBAs, and 5.6% (28) return to Centaurian orbits. Clearly the most likely scenario is that 282P will become a JFC, however there are still significant possibilities that 282P remains a QHO or becomes an active OMBA.

8.7 Thermodynamical Modeling

In order to understand the approximate temperature ranges that 282P experiences over the course of its present orbit in order to (1) understand what role, if any, thermal fracture may play in the activity we observe, and (2) evaluate the likelihood of ices surviving on the surface, albeit with limited effect because of the narrow window (~ 500 years) of dynamically well-determined orbital parameters available (Section 8.5).

Following the procedure of Chandler et al. (2021b) (originally adapted from Hsieh et al. 2015a), we compute the surface equilibrium temperature T_{eq} for 282P as a gray airless body. χ describes the distribution of heat over the surface of a body, with $\chi = 1$ the isothermal approximation (i.e., a fast-rotating body) and $\chi = 4$ the “slab” case, where an object has one side that always faces the Sun; these cases result in the minimum and maximum expected temperatures for the body, respectively.

Solving Equations 3 – 5 of Chandler et al. (2021b) (energy balance for a gray airless body, sublimation mass loss rate, and the Clausius–Clapeyron relationship) for the body’s heliocentric distance r_h (in au) as a function of equilibrium temperature T_{eq} and χ , where $A = 0.05$ is the assumed typical bond albedo, $\Delta H_{\text{subl}} = 51.06$ MJ/kmol is the ice-to-gas heat of sublimation, $\epsilon = 0.9$ is the assumed typical effective infrared emissivity, $f_D = 1$ accounts for sublimation efficiency dampening due to mantling (unity in the absence of mantle), $F_{\odot}$ is the solar constant 1360 W/m², $L = 2.83$ MJ/kg is the latent heat of H₂O ice (approximated here as temperature independent), $R_G = 8314$ J kmol^{−1} K^{−1} is the ideal gas constant, and $\sigma = 5.67037 \times 10^{-8}$ W m^{−2} K^{−4} is the Stefan–Boltzmann constant:

$$r_h(T_{\text{eq}}, \chi) = \frac{F_{\odot} (1 - A) \chi^{-1}}{\epsilon \sigma T_{\text{eq}}^4 + L f_D \cdot 611 e^{\frac{\Delta H_{\text{subl}}}{R_G} \left(\frac{1}{273.16 \text{K}} - \frac{1}{T_{\text{eq}}} \right)}} \quad (8.3)$$

We translate Equation 8.3 to a function of equilibrium temperature T_{eq} by computing r_h for an array of values (100 K to 300 K in this case), then fit a model to these data with a `SciPy` (Virtanen et al., 2020) (Python package) univariate spline. Using this model we compute 282P temperatures for 282P heliocentric distances from perihelion and aphelion with this function to arrive at temperatures for 282P over the course of its orbit.

Figure 8.2 (bottom panel) shows the temperature evolution for the maximum and minimum solar heating distribution scenarios ($\chi = 1$ and $\chi = 4$, respectively) for 282P from 2012 through 2024. Temperatures range between roughly 175 K and 220 K for $\chi = 1$, or 130 K and 160 K for $\chi = 4$, with a ~ 45 K maximum temperature variation in any one orbit. 282P spends some ($\chi = 4$) or all ($\chi = 1$) of its time with surface temperatures above 145 K. Water ice is not expected to survive above this temperature on Gyr timescales (Schorghofer, 2008a; Snodgrass et al., 2017b), however we showed in Section 8.5 that, prior to ~ 80 years ago, 282P had a semi-major axis of $a > 6$ au, a region much colder than 145 K. Even if 282P had spent most of its life with temperatures at the high end of our computed temperatures (> 220 K), water ice can survive on Gyr timescales at shallow (a few cm) depths (Schorghofer, 2008a; Prialnik & Rosenberg, 2009). Some bodies, such as (24) Themis, have been found to have surface ices (Campins et al., 2010; Rivkin & Emery, 2010) that suggest that an unknown mechanism may replenish surface ice with subsurface volatiles. In this case the ice lifetimes could be greatly extended.

8.8 Activity Mechanism

Infrequent stochastic events, such as impacts (e.g., (596) Scheila, Bodewits et al. 2011; Ishiguro et al. 2011b; Moreno et al. 2011b), are highly unlikely to be the activity mechanism given the multi-epoch nature of the activity we identified in this work. Moreover, it is unlikely that activity ceased during the 15 month interval between the UT 2021 March 14 archival activity and our UT 7 June 2022 Gemini South activity observations (Section 8.4), when 282P was at a heliocentric distance $r_H = 3.548$ au and $r_H = 3.556$ au, respectively, and 282P was only closer to the Sun in the interim. Similarly, our archival data shows activity lasted ~ 15 months during the 2012 – 2013 apparition.

Recurrent activity is most commonly caused by volatile sublimation (e.g., 133P, Boehnhardt et al. 1996; Hsieh et al. 2004) or rotational instability (e.g., (6478) Gault, Kleyna et al. 2019; Chandler et al. 2019). Rotational instability is impossible to rule out entirely for 282P because its rotation period is unknown.

However, (1) no activity attributed to rotational stability for any object has been observed to be continuous for as long as the 15 month episodes we report, and (2) rotational instability is not correlated with perihelion passage. It is worth noting that there are not yet many known objects with activity attributed to rotational disruption, so it is still difficult to draw firm conclusions about the behavior of those objects. In any case it would be useful to measure a rotation period for 282P to help assess potential influence of rotational instability in the observed activity of 282P. The taxonomic class of 282P is unknown, but should 282P be classified as a member of a desiccated spectral class (e.g., S-type), then sublimation would not likely be the underlying activity mechanism. Color measurements or spectroscopy when 282P is quiescent would help determine its spectral class.

A caveat, however, is that many of our archival images were taken when 282P was significantly fainter than the images showing activity (Figure 8.2), thereby making activity detection more difficult than if 282P was brighter. Consequently, archival images showing 282P were predominately taken near its perihelion passage. The farthest evidently quiescent image of 282P was taken when it was at ~ 4 au (Figure 8.2). Thus we cannot state with total certainty that 282P was inactive elsewhere in its orbit.

Thermal fracture can cause repeated activity outbursts. For example, (3200) Phaethon undergoes 600 K temperature swings, peaking at 800 K – 1100 K, exceeding the serpentine-phylosilicate decomposition threshold of 574 K (Ohtsuka et al., 2009), and potentially causing thermal fracture (Licandro et al., 2007; Kasuga & Jewitt, 2008) including mass loss (Li & Jewitt, 2013; Hui & Li, 2017). Temperatures on 282P reach at most ~ 220 K (Figure 8.2), with ~ 45 K the maximum variation. Considering the relatively low temperatures and mild temperature changes we (1) consider it unlikely that 282P activity is due to thermal fracture, and (2) reaffirm that thermal fracture is generally considered a nonviable mechanism for any objects other than NEOs.

Overall, we find volatile sublimation on 282P the most likely activity mechanism, because (1) it is unlikely that an object originating from the Kuiper Belt such as 282P would be desiccated, (2) archival and new activity observations are from when 282P was near perihelion (Figure 8.2), a characteristic diagnostic of sublimation-driven activity (e.g., Hsieh et al., 2012a), and (3) 15 months of continuous activity has not been reported for any other activity mechanism (e.g., rotational instability, impact events) to date, let alone two such epochs.

8.9 Summary and Future Work

This study was prompted by Citizen Scientists from the NASA Partner program *Active Asteroids* classifying two images of 282P from 2021 March as showing activity. Two additional images by astronomers Roland

Fichtl and Michael Jäger brought the total number of images (from UT 2021 March 31 and UT 2021 April 4) to four. We conducted follow-up observations with the Gemini South 8.1 m telescope on UT 2022 June 7 and found 282P still active, indicating it has been active for > 15 months during the current 2021 – 2022 activity epoch. Our archival investigation revealed the only other known apparition, from 2012–2013, also spanned ~ 15 months. Together, our new and archival data demonstrate 282P has been active during two consecutive perihelion passages, consistent with sublimation-driven activity.

We conducted extensive dynamical modeling and found 282P has experienced a series of ~ 5 strong interactions with Jupiter and Saturn in the past, and that 282P will again have close encounters with Jupiter in the near future. These interactions are so strong that dynamical chaos dominates our simulations prior to 180 years ago and beyond 350 years in the future, but we are still able to statistically quantify a probable orbital class for 282P prior to -180 yr (52% JFCs, 48% Centaur) and after $+350$ yr (81% JFCs, 18% QHO, 14% OMBA). We classify present-day 282P as a Quasi-Hilda Object (QHO).

We carried out thermodynamical modeling that showed 282P undergoes temperatures ranging at most between 135 K and 220 K, too mild for thermal fracture but warm enough that surface water ice would not normally survive on timescales of the solar system lifetime. However, 282P arrived at its present orbit recently; prior to 1941 282P was primarily exterior to Jupiter’s orbit and, consequently, sufficiently cold for water ice to survive on its surface. Given that both activity apparitions (Epoch I: 2012 – 2013 and Epoch II: 2021 – 2022) each lasted over 15 months, and both outbursts spanned perihelia passage, we determine the activity mechanism to most likely be volatile sublimation.

Coma likely accounts for the majority of the reflected light we observe emanating from 282P, so it is infeasible to determine the color of the nucleus and, consequently, 282P’s spectral class (e.g., C-type, S-type). Measuring its rotational period would also help assess what (if any) role rotational instability plays in the observed activity. Specifically, a rotation period faster than the spin-barrier limit of two hours would indicate breakup.

Most images of 282P were taken when it was near perihelion passage (3.441 au), though there were observations from Epoch I that showed 282P clearly, without activity, when it was beyond ~ 4 au. 282P is currently outbound and will again be beyond 4 au in mid-2023 and, thus, likely inactive; determining if/when 282P returns to a quiescent state would help bolster the case for sublimation-driven activity because activity occurring preferentially near perihelion, and a lack of activity elsewhere, is characteristic of sublimation-driven activity.

282P is currently observable, especially from the southern hemisphere, however the object is passing in front of dense regions of the Milky Way until the end of 2022 November (see Lowell **AstFinder**⁴ finding

⁴<https://asteroid.lowell.edu/astfinder/>

charts). 282P will be in a less dense region of the Milky Way and be observable, in a similar fashion to our Gemini South observations (Section 8.4) on UT 2022 September 26 for ~ 12 days, carefully timed for sky regions with fewer stars. As Earth’s orbit progresses around the Sun, 282P becomes observable for less time each night through 2022 November, until UT 2022 December 26, when it becomes observable only during twilight. Observations during this window would help constrain the timeframe for periods of quiescence.

8.10 Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. Mark Jesus Mendoza Magbanua of University of California San Francisco (UCSF) for his frequent and timely feedback on the project. Many thanks for the helpful input from Henry Hsieh of the Planetary Science Institute (PSI) and David Jewitt of University of California Los Angeles (UCLA).

The authors express their gratitude to Prof. Mike Gowanlock (NAU), Jay Kueny of University of Arizona (UA) and Lowell Observatory, and the Trilling Research Group (NAU), all of whom provided invaluable insights which substantially enhanced this work. The unparalleled support provided by Monsoon cluster administrator Christopher Coffey (NAU) and the High Performance Computing Support team facilitated the scientific process.

We thank Gemini Observatory Director Jennifer Lotz for granting our Director’s Discretionary Time (DDT) request for observations, German Gimeno for providing science support, and Pablo Prado for observing. Proposal ID GS-2022A-DD-103, PI Chandler.

The VATT referenced herein refers to the Vatican Observatory’s Alice P. Lennon Telescope and Thomas J. Bannan Astrophysics Facility. We are grateful to the Vatican Observatory for the generous time allocations (Proposal ID S165, PI Chandler). We especially thank Vatican Observatory Director Br. Guy Consolmagno, S.J. for his guidance, Vice Director for Tucson Vatican Observatory Research Group Rev. Pavel Gabor, S.J. for his frequent assistance, Astronomer and Telescope Scientist Rev. Richard P. Boyle, S.J. for patiently training us to use the VATT and for including us in minor planet discovery observations, Chris Johnson (VATT Facilities Management and Maintenance) for many consultations that enabled us to resume observations, Michael Franz (VATT Instrumentation) and Summer Franks (VATT Software Engineer) for on-site troubleshooting assistance, and Gary Gray (VATT Facilities Management and Maintenance) for everything from telescope balance to building water support, without whom we would have been lost.

This material is based upon work supported by the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program (GRFP) under grant No. 2018258765. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. The authors acknowledge support from the NASA Solar System Observations program (grant

80NSSC19K0869, PI Hsieh) and grant 80NSSC18K1006 (PI: Trujillo).

Computational analyses were run on Northern Arizona University’s Monsoon computing cluster, funded by Arizona’s Technology and Research Initiative Fund (TRIF). This work was made possible in part through the State of Arizona Technology and Research Initiative Program. World Coordinate System (WCS) corrections facilitated by the *Astrometry.net* software suite (Lang et al., 2010).

This research has made use of data and/or services provided by the International Astronomical Union (IAU)’s Minor Planet Center (MPC). This research has made use of NASA’s Astrophysics Data System. This research has made use of The Institut de Mécanique Céleste et de Calcul des Éphémérides (IMCCE) SkyBoT Virtual Observatory tool (Berthier et al., 2006). This work made use of the **FTOOLS** software package hosted by the NASA Goddard Flight Center High Energy Astrophysics Science Archive Research Center. Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (SAO) Deep Space Nine (DS9): This research has made use of **SAOImageDS9**, developed by Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (Joye, 2006). World Coordinate System (WCS) validation was facilitated with VizieR catalog queries (Ochsenbein et al., 2000) of the Gaia Data Release (DR) 2 (Collaboration et al., 2018a) and the Sloan Digital Sky Survey Data Release Nine (SDSS DR-9) (Ahn et al., 2012) catalogs. This work made use of AstOrb, the Lowell Observatory Asteroid Orbit Database *astorbDB* (Bowell et al., 1994; Moskovitz et al., 2021). This work made use of the **astropy** software package (Robitaille et al., 2013).

Based on observations at Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory (CTIO), NSF’s NOIRLab (NOIRLab Prop. ID 2019A-0305; PI: A. Drlica-Wagner, NOIRLab Prop. ID 2013A-0327; PI: A. Rest), which is managed by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy (AURA) under a cooperative agreement with the National Science Foundation. This project used data obtained with the Dark Energy Camera (DECam), which was constructed by the Dark Energy Survey (DES) collaboration. Funding for the DES Projects has been provided by the US Department of Energy, the US National Science Foundation, the Ministry of Science and Education of Spain, the Science and Technology Facilities Council of the United Kingdom, the Higher Education Funding Council for England, the National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics at the University of Chicago, Center for Cosmology and Astro-Particle Physics at the Ohio State University, the Mitchell Institute for Fundamental Physics and Astronomy at Texas A&M University, Financiadora de Estudos e Projetos, Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico and the Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Collaborating Institutions in the Dark Energy Survey. The Collaborating Institutions are Argonne National Laboratory, the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Cambridge, Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas, Medioambientales y Tecnológicas–Madrid,

the University of Chicago, University College London, the DES-Brazil Consortium, the University of Edinburgh, the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH) Zürich, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Institut de Ciències de l'Espai (IEEC/CSIC), the Institut de Física d'Altes Energies, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München and the associated Excellence Cluster Universe, the University of Michigan, NSF's NOIRLab, the University of Nottingham, the Ohio State University, the OzDES Membership Consortium, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Portsmouth, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) National Accelerator Laboratory, Stanford University, the University of Sussex, and Texas A&M University.

These results made use of the Lowell Discovery Telescope (LDT) at Lowell Observatory. Lowell is a private, non-profit institution dedicated to astrophysical research and public appreciation of astronomy and operates the LDT in partnership with Boston University, the University of Maryland, the University of Toledo, Northern Arizona University (NAU) and Yale University. The Large Monolithic Imager (LMI) was built by Lowell Observatory using funds provided by the National Science Foundation (NSF) (AST-1005313).

Very Large Telescope (VLT) Survey Telescope (VST) OMEGACam (Arnaboldi et al., 1998; Kuijken et al., 2002; Kuijken, 2011) data were originally acquired as part of the Kilo-Degree Survey (KIDS) (de Jong et al., 2015).

The Pan-STARRS1 Surveys (PS1) and the PS1 public science archive have been made possible through contributions by the Institute for Astronomy, the University of Hawaii, the Pan-STARRS Project Office, the Max-Planck Society and its participating institutes, the Max Planck Institute for Astronomy, Heidelberg and the Max Planck Institute for Extraterrestrial Physics, Garching, The Johns Hopkins University, Durham University, the University of Edinburgh, the Queen's University Belfast, the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, the Las Cumbres Observatory Global Telescope (LCOGT) Network Incorporated, the National Central University of Taiwan, the Space Telescope Science Institute, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under Grant No. NNX08AR22G issued through the Planetary Science Division of the NASA Science Mission Directorate, the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant No. AST-1238877, the University of Maryland, Eotvos Lorand University (ELTE), the Los Alamos National Laboratory, and the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation.

Based on observations obtained with MegaPrime/MegaCam, a joint project of Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope (CFHT) and Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique (CEA)/Département d'Astrophysique, de physique des Particules, de physique Nucléaire et de l'Instrumentation Associée (DAPNIA), at the CFHT which is operated by the National Research Council (NRC) of Canada, the Institut National des Sciences de l'Univers of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) of France, and the University of Hawaii. The observations at the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope (CFHT) were performed with care and respect from

the summit of Maunakea which is a significant cultural and historic site.

Magellan observations made use of the IMACS instrument (Dressler et al., 2011).

This research has made use of the NASA/Infrared Processing and Analysis Center (IPAC) Infrared Science Archive (IRSA), which is funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and operated by the California Institute of Technology.

8.10.1 Facilities

Astro Data Archive, Blanco (DECam), CFHT (MegaCam), Gaia, Gemini-South (GMOS-S), IRSA, LDT (LMI), Magellan: Baade (TSIP), PO:1.2m (PTF, ZTF), PS1, Sloan, VATT (VATT4K), VST (OmegaCAM)

8.10.2 Software

`astropy` (Robitaille et al., 2013), `astrometry.net` (Lang et al., 2010), `FTOOLS`⁵, `IAS15` integrator (Rein & Spiegel, 2015), `JPL Horizons` (Giorgini et al., 1996), `Matplotlib` (Hunter, 2007), `NumPy` (Harris et al., 2020), `pandas` (McKinney, 2010; Reback et al., 2022), `REBOUND` (Rein & Liu, 2012; Rein et al., 2019), `SAOImageDS9` (Joye, 2006), `SciPy` (Virtanen et al., 2020), `Siril`⁶, `SkyBot` (Berthier et al., 2006), `termcolor`⁷, `tqdm` (da Costa-Luis et al., 2022), `Vizier` (Ochsenbein et al., 2000)

⁵<https://heasarc.gsfc.nasa.gov/ftools/>

⁶<https://siril.org>

⁷<https://pypi.org/project/termcolor>




Figure 8.2: 282P heliocentric distance (top), observability (middle) and temperature (bottom), from 2012 through 2024. **Top:** activity detections (triangles) are marked as positive (filled red) and negative (unfilled blue) detections and as either inbound (▼) or outbound (▲). Observations are cataloged in Table 8.1. **Middle:** Our observability metric for Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory (CTIO), site code 807 (yellow dashed line) and the Lowell Discovery Telescope (LDT), site code G37 (blue dashed line), depicting the number of hours 282P was observable ($> 15^\circ$ between sunset and sunrise) during a given UT observing date. Opposition events and conjunctions result in concurrent maxima and minima, respectively. Also indicated are perihelion (orange q) and aphelion (blue Q) passages. **Bottom:** Modeled temperature by date for the thermophysical extremes: a “flat slab” ($\chi = 1$, top line), and an isothermal body ($\chi = 4$, bottom line).




Figure 8.3: Results from dynamical integration of 282P orbital clones. For all plots, time $t = 0$ corresponds to UT 2022 January 21. Jovian and Saturnian close encounters prevent accurate orbital parameter determination outside $-180 \lesssim t \lesssim 300$ yrs, given known orbital uncertainties. **(a)** Orbital diagram for 282P and nearby planets. **(b)** Semi-major axis a evolution. **(c)** Eccentricity e evolution. **(d)** Inclination i evolution.




Figure 8.4: Additional results from dynamical integration of 282P orbital clones. For each plot, time $t = 0$ is UT 2022 January 21. Close encounters with Jupiter and Saturn are so significant that orbital elements cannot be accurately determined before/after $-180 \lesssim t \lesssim 300$ yrs, given orbital uncertainties. **(a)** Distance between Jupiter and 282P as a function of time. Indicated Hill radii provide references for the degree of orbit alteration imparted by a close encounter. For reference, the semi-major axes of two Jovian moons are shown: Callisto, the outermost Galilean satellite, and Sinope (Nicholson, 1914), a likely captured (Grav et al., 2003) distant irregular and retrograde Jovian moon. **(b)** Distance between Saturn and 282P as a function of time. The semi-major axis of the irregular Saturnian moon Phoebe, believed to be captured through close encounter (Johnson & Lunine, 2005; Jewitt & Haghighipour, 2007), is given for reference. **(c)** Heliocentric distance r evolution. **(d)** Tisserand parameter with respect to Jupiter T_J (Equation 8.2), where the horizontal orange line representing $T_J = 3$ indicates the widely-adopted boundary between comet-like and asteroid-like orbits.




Figure 8.5: The orbital motion of minor planets (blue lines) as seen in the reference frame corotating with Jupiter (orange lines at right edge of plots). (a) MBC (7968) Elst-Pizarro (133P). (b) JFC 67P/Churyumov-Gerasimenko (previously visited by the ESA Rosetta Spacecraft). (c) Centaur (2060) Chiron (95P). (d) (153) Hilda, the namesake of the Hilda dynamical class, in the 3:2 interior mean-motion resonance with Jupiter. (e) Quasi-Hilda 246P/NEAT, also designated 2010 V₂ and 2004 F₃. (f) Our object of study, 282P, in its Quasi-Hilda orbit.

8.11 Appendix

Table 8.1: Table of Observations

Fig. ^a	Act. ^b	Obs. Date ^c	Source	N^d	Exp. [s] ^e	Filter(s)	V^f	r [au] ^g	STO [°] ^h	ν [°] ⁱ	% $_{Q \rightarrow q}^j$	Note ^k
8.1e	Y	04 Feb 2011	PS1	2	40	r	19.7	4.26	3.3	258.1	84%	1
		16 Feb 2012	PS1	1	45	i	19.3	3.69	8.9	306.4	95%	1
		24 Feb 2012	PS1	1,1	43, 40	g, r	19.2	3.68	6.9	307.6	95%	1
		26 Feb 2012	PS1	2	40	r	19.2	3.67	6.3	307.9	96%	1
		28 Mar 2012	MegaPrime	2	120	r	18.9	3.64	3.2	312.6	96%	2
8.1f	Y	05 Jul 2012	OmegaCAM	4	240	i	20.1	3.54	16.1	328.0	98%	3
		14 Apr 2013	PS1	2	45	i	19.3	3.47	12.8	14.9	99%	1
		22 Apr 2013	PS1	2	30	z	19.2	3.47	11.1	16.3	99%	1
		05 May 2013	DECam	2	150	r	19.5	3.48	12.9	318.4	97%	4
		15 May 2013	PS1	1	43	g	18.8	3.48	5.2	20.1	99%	1
8.1g	Y	13 Jun 2013	MegaPrime	10	120	r	18.8	3.50	4.9	24.8	99%	5
		03 Aug 2013	PS1	2	80,60	y, z	19.6	3.54	15.3	33.0	98%	1
		11 Jun 2014	PS1	2	45	i	20.0	3.95	12.5	78.1	90%	1
		14 Aug 2014	PS1	3	45	i	19.4	4.05	3.3	86.1	88%	1
		15 Aug 2014	PS1	4	45	i	19.4	4.04	3.5	86.2	88%	1
8.1a	Y	04 Jan 2021	ZTF	1	30	r	20.0	3.63	15.7	312.5	96%	6
		07 Jan 2021	ZTF	1	30	g	20.0	3.63	15.7	312.9	96%	6
		09 Jan 2021	ZTF	1	30	r	20.0	3.62	15.7	313.2	96%	6
		14 Mar 2021	DECam	1	90	i	18.9	3.55	6.1	323.1	98%	7
		17 Mar 2021	DECam	1	90	i	18.9	3.55	5.2	323.6	98%	7
8.1b	Y	31 Mar 2021	QHY600	1	2160	UV/IR	18.5	3.54	0.7	325.9	98%	8
		04 Apr 2021	CDS-5D	1	1500	(none)	18.5	3.54	0.5	326.4	98%	9
		07 Mar 2022	IMACS	5	10	WB4800-7800	20.0	3.48	16.3	22.3	99%	10
		21 May 2022	LDT	3	90	VR, i	19.1	3.54	8.3	34.4	98%	11
		07 Jun 2022	GMOS-S	6,6,6	120	g, r, i	18.8	3.56	3.8	37.2	98%	12

^aFigure showing the image. ^bActivity identified in image(s). ^cUT date of observation. ^dNumber of images. ^eExposure time. ^fApparent V -band magnitude (Horizons). ^gHeliocentric distance. ^hSun-target-observer angle. ⁱTrue anomaly. ^jPercentage to perihelion q from aphelion Q , defined by $\%_{r \rightarrow q} = \left(\frac{Q-r}{Q-q} \right) \cdot 100\%$. ^kNote number.

Notes: 1: PS1 is the Panoramic Survey Telescope and Rapid Response System (Pan-STARRS) One. 2: Prop. ID 12AH16, PI Wainscoat. 3: Prop. ID 177.A-3016(D), PI Kuijken. 4: Dark Energy Camera (DECam); Prop. ID 2013A-0327, PI Rest. 5: Prop. ID 13AH09, PI Wainscoat. 6: Zwicky Transient Facility (ZTF); Prop. ID 1467501130115, PI Kuikarni; data acquired through ZTF Alert Stream service (Patterson et al., 2019). 7: Prop. ID 2019A-0305, PI Drlica-Wagner. 8: Michael Jäger (Weißkirchen, Austria). QHY600 charge-coupled device (CCD) on a 14" Newtonian. 9: Roland Fichtl (Engelhardtberg, Germany). Central DS brand modified cooled Canon 5D Mark III on a 0.4 m $f/2.5$ Newtonian; <http://www.dieholzhaeusler.de/astro/comets/0282P.htm>. 10: Inamori-Magellan Areal Camera and Spectrograph (IMACS); PI Trujillo. 11: Inamori-Magellan Areal Camera and Spectrograph (IMACS); PI Trujillo. 12: Gemini Multi-Object Spectrograph (GMOS); Prop. ID GS-2022A-DD-103, PI Chandler.

Table 8.2: Equipment and Archives

Instrument	Telescope	Pixel Scale ["/pix]	Location	AstroArchive	ESO	SSOIS	STScI	IRSA
DECam	4.0 m Blanco	0.263	Cerro Tololo, Chile	S,R		S		
GMOS-S	8.1 m Gemini South	0.080	Cerro Pachón, Chile					
IMACS	6.5 m Baade	0.110	Las Campanas, Chile					
OmegaCAM	2.6 m VLT Survey	0.214	Cerro Paranal, Chile		R	S		
GigaPixel	1.8 m Pan-STARRS1	0.258	Haleakalā, Hawaii			S	R	
LMI	4.3 m LDT	0.120	Happy Jack, Arizona					
MegaPrime	3.6 m CFHT	0.185	Mauna Kea, Hawaii			S,R		
PTF/CFHT12K	48" Samuel Oschin	1.010	Mt. Palomar, California					S,R
ZTF Camera	48" Samuel Oschin	1.012	Mt. Palomar, California					S,R
VAT74K CCD	1.8 m VAT7	0.188	Mt. Graham, Arizona					

R indicates repository for data retrieval. S indicates search capability.
AstroArchive: NSF National Optical and Infrared Laboratory (NOIRLab) [AstroArchive \(https://astroarchive.noirlab.edu\)](https://astroarchive.noirlab.edu).
EuroArchive: European Space Organization (ESO): European Space Organization (<https://archive.eso.org>).
IRSA: NASA/CalTech IRSA (<https://irsa.ipac.caltech.edu>).
PTF: The Palomar Transient Factory (PTF). SSOIS: The Solar System Object Information Search (SSOIS) (Gwyn et al. 2012b, <https://www.cadc-ccda.hia-ihp.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/en/ssois/>).
STScI: Space Telescope Science Institute (STScI): <https://www.stsci.edu/>.

Table 8.3: 282P/(323137) 2003 BM80 Data

Parameter	Value	Source
Designations	(323137), 2003 BM ₈₀ , 2003 FV ₁₁₂ , 282P	JPL SBDB, MPC
Discovery Date	2003 January 31	JPL SBDB, MPC
Discovery Observer(s)	LINEOS	JPL SBDB, MPC
Discovery Observatory	Lowell Observatory	JPL SBDB, MPC
Discovery Site	Anderson Mesa Station, Arizona	JPL SBDB, MPC
Discovery Site Code	688	MPC
Activity Discovery Date	2013 June 12	CBET 3559 (Bolin et al., 2013b)
Activity Discoverer(s)	Bryce Bolin, Larry Denneau, Peter Veres	CBET 3559 (Bolin et al., 2013b)
Orbit Type	Quasi-Hilda Object (QHO)	this work
Diameter	$D = 3.4 \pm 0.4$ km	Harris & Lagerros (2002)
Absolute V -band Magnitude	$H = 13.63$	MPC (MP0648742)
Geometric Albedo	Unknown	Snodgrass et al. (2011)
Assumed Geometric Albedo	4%	
Rotation Period	Unknown	
Orbital Period	$P = 8.732 \pm (2.174 \times 10^{-7})$ yr	JPL SBDB
Semi-major Axis	$a = 4.240 \pm (7.039 \times 10^{-8})$ au	JPL SBDB
Perihelion Distance	$q = 3.441 \pm (3.468 \times 10^{-7})$ au	JPL SBDB
Aphelion Distance	$Q = 5.039 \pm (8.366 \times 10^{-8})$ au	JPL SBDB
Eccentricity	$e = 0.188 \pm (7.790 \times 10^{-8})$	JPL SBDB
Inclination	$i = 5.812^\circ \pm (1.166^\circ \times 10^{-5})$	JPL SBDB
Argument of Perihelion	$\omega = 217.626^\circ \pm (7.816^\circ \times 10^{-5})$	JPL SBDB
Longitude of Ascending Node	$\Omega = 9.297^\circ \pm (5.974^\circ \times 10^{-5})$	JPL SBDB
Mean Anomaly	$M = 9.979^\circ \pm (3.815^\circ \times 10^{-5})$	JPL SBDB
Tisserand Parameter w.r.t. Jupiter	$T_J = 2.99136891 \pm (3.73 \times 10^{-8})$	this work
Orbital Solution Date	2021 October 8	JPL SBDB

Notes: Central Bureau for Electronic Telegrams (CBET) ^a. Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) Small Body Database (SBDB) is the NASA JPL Small Body Database ^b. MPC is the Minor Planet Center ^c.

^a<http://www.cbat.eps.harvard.edu>

^bhttps://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/tools/sbdb_lookup.html

^c<https://minorplanetcenter.net>

Chapter 9

Overall Discussion

In order to help fill key knowledge gaps about solar system volatiles, such as where volatiles are found throughout the solar system, we set out to find objects like active asteroids and active Centaurs, bodies that display cometary properties such as tails and comae even though they are not classified as comets. In furtherance of this goal we designed and launched a Citizen Science project, *Active Asteroids*, that carries out an outreach program of public engagement while concurrently identifying new members of known and unknown active minor planet classes. Before and after launch, *Active Asteroids* has led to discoveries ranging from identifying new active asteroids to uncovering new epochs of activity associated with known active objects. Some of these discoveries are in this dissertation, while others will be the subject of future investigations by our team.

Prior to constructing the Citizen Science project, we carried out a proof-of-concept (Chapter 4) that demonstrated the suitability of Dark Energy Camera (DECam) data for identifying activity emanating from minor planets. First we created a pipeline, Hunting for Activity in Repositories with Vetting-Enhanced Search Techniques (HARVEST), that extracts small thumbnail images centered on a known solar system object. Without *a priori* knowledge of which object was shown in each thumbnail image, we visually examined all 15,600 thumbnails we had extracted from 35,640 Flexible Image Transport System (FITS) files. Of the 11,703 unique minor planets visible in the thumbnails, three were previously identified as active asteroids. However, (1) Ceres and (779) Nina have not been observed to be visibly active from Earth. The third, (62412) 2000 SY₁₇₈ (Sheppard & Trujillo, 2015), we successfully identified as active in a thumbnail image (Figure 4.5). This one in 11,703 occurrence rate agreed with other works that estimated activity takes place in approximately one in ten thousand asteroids (Jewitt et al., 2015c; Hsieh et al., 2015a).

My National Science Foundation (NSF) Graduate Research Fellowship Program (GRFP) proposal was selected for funding and we expanded the HARVEST pipeline to work with all publicly available DECam archival image data. We implemented a vetting scheme to exclude images that, for example, did not probe faintly enough to detect activity. Figure 9.1 shows the distribution on sky of the ~ 18 million automatically




Figure 9.1: The distribution in each square degree on sky of the roughly 18 million automatically vetted thumbnail images HARVEST produced.

vetted thumbnail images in the HARVEST database.

In 2019 January asteroid (6478) Gault was observed to be active (Smith et al., 2019). We made use of HARVEST to find additional images of Gault in DECam archival data. We discovered Gault had been active during two prior orbits: 2013 and 2016. We introduced a new metric, observability, to help identify potential biases by describing the number of hours an object is observable at a specific location for a given UT observing date. Notably, Gault’s activity appeared unrelated to heliocentric distance (Chapter 5.7), indicating the activity was probably not caused by volatile sublimation.

Gault is a core member of the Phocaea family (Knežević & Milani, 2003), a group of predominantly (75%) S-type asteroids (Carvano et al., 2001). S-type asteroids are composed primarily of non-primitive, desiccated silica (DeMeo et al., 2009), material highly unlikely to harbor volatile substances. The majority of active asteroids found to date (see Table 4.1) have been composed of primitive materials (e.g., C-type, which are carbonaceous and volatile-rich), amenable to sublimation-driven activity associated with perihelion passage (Hsieh et al., 2018b). Very few (around four, or $\sim 20\%$) known active asteroids are S-type, and their activity is thought to be caused by impact, such as (596) Scheila (Bodewits et al., 2011; Jewitt et al., 2011b), or rotational instability, as with 311P/PanSTARRS, (Jewitt et al., 2013a), rather than sublimation (Hsieh et al., 2018a).

Given the combination of (1) Gault’s probable desiccated S-type spectral class, (2) rotational breakup as the likely activity mechanism (Moreno et al., 2019; Ye et al., 2019b,a; Kleyna et al., 2019), and (3) our discovery of recurrent activity, we proposed that Gault is a new type of active asteroid, one that is persistently active because of spin-up induced rotational instability. We also identified Gault as the first active asteroid with recurrent and sustained activity throughout its orbit. We anticipated that Gault would

remain active for some time, and although it did not catastrophically disintegrate (cf. Moreno et al. (2019)), Gault became inactive in 2020 (Devogèle et al., 2021) and has remained so through at least 7 January 2022.

During ongoing Citizen Science project preparations we found indicators suggestive of activity in thumbnails of Centaur 2014 OG₃₉₂ (Figure 6.5). We carried out an observing campaign that confirmed the presence of activity based on a result stemming from the HARVEST pipeline. We uncovered archival images of 2014 OG₃₉₂ that indicated it had been active for more than two years, effectively ruling out stochastic events (e.g., impact).

We introduced a new technique that synthesizes sublimation modeling with dynamical modeling to help estimate which molecules are most likely responsible for activity. My simple sublimation model is not intended to account for the complex behaviors of ice mixtures (Grundy & Stansberry, 2000) or amorphous–crystalline ice transitions (Jewitt, 2009), rather it treats bodies as airless and uniformly covered in a single species of ice. We found carbon dioxide and/or ammonia most likely to be sublimating, while other surface species would have sublimated completely over its 13 kyr to 1.8 Myr dynamical lifetime (carbon monoxide, molecular nitrogen, methane), or were unable to appreciably sublimate at all (water, methanol).

Colors we measured from our observations revealed that 2014 OG₃₉₂ was about one magnitude redder than the Sun in the visible spectrum and, with a $B-R$ color of 1.64 ± 0.4 , the object is considered a red Centaur (Peixinho et al., 2020). However, both species we identified as likely to be responsible for sublimation (carbon dioxide, ammonia) are spectrally neutral in visible wavelengths, as many ices are, indicating the involvement of an as-yet unidentified reddening agent. The Trans-Neptunian objects (TNOs) also have an unknown reddening agent (Boehnhardt et al., 2001). We computed a new absolute magnitude of $H \approx 11.3$, fainter than previously reported by about 0.5 magnitudes. This H value indicates a diameter of ~ 20 km, assuming a slope $G = 0.15$ as is typical for a dark surface (Bowell et al., 1989). We measured a coma mass of roughly $\sim 2.4 \times 10^{15}$ g, assuming a grain density of 1 g/cm³, 1 mm grain radii, and an albedo of $A = 0.1$.

In 2021 July, prior to launching the *Active Asteroids* Citizen Science project, activity was discovered coming from (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ (Fitzsimmons et al., 2021). We conducted an archival investigation (described in Chapters 3.3.1 and 7.3) and located 81 images (spanning 31 observations) in which the object was positively identifiable. From these we found a single image (Figure 7.1) from UT 2016 July 22 that clearly showed the object had been active during this orbit. Our analysis indicated that (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ is most likely a member of the Main-belt Comets (MBCs) because of (1) the recurrent nature of its activity, (2) its orbit with the Main Asteroid Belt, and (3) its likely C-type spectral class (Hsieh et al., 2021b).

Along with my archival investigation we introduced a tail angle measurement tool, wedge photometry, that may also be used for activity detection. We showed the tail orientation of (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃ was in close agreement with the anti-Solar and anti-Motion vectors (coincident at the time) as computed by Jet

Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) Horizons.

We launched the Citizen Science project *Active Asteroids*¹, a NASA Partner², on 31 August 2022. The initial subject set of $\sim 18,000$ thumbnail images was completely classified by volunteers within days of launch. Although we did produce statistical evidence that volunteers could identify activity based on the training set, discoveries of activity from objects not yet known to be active came to light within 24 hours of launch.

One example, 2015 TC₁ (Figure 3.5), is a Jupiter Family Comet (JFC). We had coincidentally observed this object previously with the twin 8.5 m Large Binocular Telescope (LBT) on 2021 April 4 (Prop. ID AZ-2021A-506, PI Oldroyd). Observations were carried out in poor weather conditions and the object was not near perihelion, and we did not find any conclusive evidence of activity. The next perihelion passage for 2015 TC₁ takes place in 2022 December and, per the JPL Small Body Database (SBDB), the object will have an especially close (0.1 au) approach to Jupiter in November 2145.




Figure 9.2: **Left:** This image of JFC 2017 QN₈₄ (green dashed arrow), originally taken 2017 December 23 (Prop. ID 2017B-0307, PI Sheppard), was flagged as active by 14 of 15 *Active Asteroids* (<http://activeasteroids.net>) volunteers. **Right:** this comparison image, from an image captured on 2017 December 24 (Prop. ID 2017B-0307, PI Sheppard), shows that there is no comparable object or extended feature (e.g., a galaxy) that could be mistaken for the activity visible in the image on the left (orange arrows).

Another example of a Citizen Science-informed discovery was activity emanating from 2017 QN₈₄ (Figure 9.2). 14 of 15 volunteers classified a thumbnail of this JFC as showing activity. Unfortunately, this was the only image available of the object, which makes identifying activity more challenging. However, as seen in Figure 9.2, a comparison image (technique described in Chapter 3.1.10) indicated that a chance diffuse

¹<http://activeasteroids.net>

²<https://science.nasa.gov/citizenscience>




Figure 9.3: Agreement between the percentage of Citizen Scientists that identified a thumbnail as showing activity, and my own measure of how active an object appears in an image. Zero represents complete agreement, negative numbers indicates a high fraction of volunteers identified a thumbnail as active as compared to my score, and positive numbers indicate that my activity score was higher than the fraction of volunteers who classified the image as showing activity.

background object was not responsible for the observed activity. The object had just completed its 2017 perihelion passage, and it was relatively bright at $V \approx 20$.

We are currently investigating other potentially active minor planets. Here we mention both anticipated and unexpected impediments to confirming the presence of activity are worth mentioning here. As described above, (1) not all images have unambiguous activity, and (2) there may only be a single image with activity indicators. Moreover, (3) some objects may not be observable (i.e., below the horizon at night). (4) Objects may be very faint, and thus difficult or impossible to observe even with the largest telescopes; this is especially problematic for detecting comae and tails which may appear several magnitudes fainter than the nucleus. (5) An object may now be far from perihelion and, consequently, less likely to be active; depending on the object’s orbit and time elapsed from the thumbnail image, it may take years or decades for an object to again approach perihelion. (6) Objects with poorly constrained orbits may be lost by the time we identify activity and set out to observe the object. (7) A candidate may be transiting a rich area on sky (e.g., the Milky Way), potentially for months, effectively preventing activity detection and hampering study of the object. (8) Objects with strong activity indicators may still not meet the “new comet” Minor Planet Center (MPC) requirements, as described in Chapter 2.7.1.

We plan to derive many useful data products from the *Active Asteroids* project. For example, a training dataset stems from the images we classified for the project training set (Chapter 3.2.5). This dataset will have two dimensions: (1) my own scores (described in Chapter 3.2.5), and (2) high numbers (> 1000) of




Figure 9.4: The two components (green dashed and solid orange arrows) of Trans-Neptunian object (TNO) 2012 KU₅₀ are fully resolved in this 600 s VR filter DECam image from UT 2014 March 27 (Prop. ID 2014A-0479, PI Sheppard).

volunteer classifications (because training data are classified many times). Another data product will contain classification statistics accompanying all images submitted for examination. These types of products will be of use for surveys such as the Legacy Survey of Space and Time (LSST) (Vera C. Rubin Observatory LSST Solar System Science Collaboration et al., 2021). For example, an outstanding need is for tools capable of automatically detecting activity, especially for petabyte-scale datasets (Kelley et al., 2021b). Machine learning (ML)-assisted activity detection tools can be trained using products resulting from our own classifications as well as those of Citizen Science volunteers (Breivik et al., 2022), though it is worth mentioning that the quality of the data are important to the effectiveness of ML-based algorithms (Kuminski et al., 2014). Figure 9.3 shows relative agreement between the two systems (expert inspection, Section 3.2.5) and the fraction of volunteers that classified a training thumbnail as active.

An avenue of inquiry stemming from *Active Asteroids* preparations unexpectedly supplementing of our original science goals is the discovery of companions to minor planets, including TNOs and Jupiter Trojans. TNO binaries are of special interest because they hold potential clues to the formation of the trans-Neptunian region and the solar system as a whole. At present we are preparing a paper about one such discovery (Chandler et al., 2021a) made during project preparations, that of TNO 2012 KU₅₀ (Figure 9.4). Companions are readily distinguishable in DECam data, especially for widely separated objects in good seeing conditions. Binaries are especially prominent in image sequences of a given object, thus one potential avenue to facilitate companion discovery would be a Citizen Science workflow that presents animated Graphic Interchange Format (GIF) files to volunteers and asks if they see a co-moving companion to the object at the center of

the images.

9.1 Project Status and Assessment

9.1.1 Volatile Distribution

Here we consider the present-day volatile distribution and delivery of water to Earth. This is by no means meant to be an exhaustive review or in-depth investigation; rather, this section serves as a rough guide. A word of caution: as stated in Chapter 2, the purpose of this dissertation and project is to discover more active objects to enable meaningful study of active objects as populations; at present, the numbers remain low (see Section 9.1.2.2). As an example, the 1 in 10,000 occurrence rate of active objects in the Asteroid Belt has been extrapolated from studies as small as $\sim 10,000$ minor planets (Chandler et al., 2018), less than 1% of the Asteroid Belt population.

9.1.1.1 Terrestrial Water Origins

We start by considering the total mass of water on Earth today, $M_{W,\oplus}$. We can roughly estimate this quantity via

$$M_{W,\oplus} \approx M_{W,\text{accretion}} + M_{W,\text{delivered}} - M_{W,\text{lost}}, \quad (9.1)$$

where $M_{W,\text{accretion}}$ is the mass of water on Earth that formed *in situ* during accretion, $M_{W,\text{lost}}$ is the mass of water lost from Earth (due to, for example, a large-scale impact event such as the one that formed the Moon), and the delivered water mass $M_{W,\text{delivered}}$, described by

$$M_{W,\text{delivered}} \approx \sum_{s=1}^{s=n} N_s \cdot \frac{4}{3} \pi (\bar{r}_s)^3 \cdot \bar{\rho}_s \cdot \bar{f}_{s,W} \cdot f_{s,\text{impact}}, \quad (9.2)$$

where, for a given source class s (e.g., comets, asteroids), N_s is the number of objects, $\bar{r}_s$ is the average radius, $\bar{\rho}_s$ is the average density, $\bar{f}_{s,W}$ is the average fraction of material that is water, and $f_{s,\text{impact}}$ the fraction of those objects that impacted Earth through present-day. A more robust treatment would take into account the size, mass, and compositional distributions through time for each of these elements, but these are very poorly known and they are outside the scope of this dissertation.

Our efforts focus primarily on active body populations as volatile sources (N_s), so for the purpose of a broad examination of an active body class let us only consider the modern Asteroid Belt. Modern Earth holds around $5 \times 10^{-4} M_{\oplus}$ of water (e.g., Morbidelli et al. 2000 and references therein), where $1 M_{\oplus} \approx 6 \times 10^{24}$ kg. The most massive active asteroid, (1) Ceres, is also the most massive body in the Asteroid Belt, with a mass

of $1.6 \times 10^{-4} M_{\oplus}$. If active asteroids are composed of 50% water (probably a very generous estimate), then the mass of water on Ceres would be $M_{W,Ceres} \approx 0.8 \times 10^{-4} M_{\oplus}$. The mass of water on Earth could be measured as $M_{W,\oplus} \approx 6 M_{W,Ceres}$. Considering the hypothesized population of ~ 100 active asteroids ($\sim 1/10,000$ of the > 1 km population), for them to contain enough water to account for all of modern Earth’s water they would each need to be roughly 6% the mass of Ceres. These bodies would be comparable in size to (10) Hygeia (~ 300 km diameter), the fourth largest asteroid in the solar system. To date the vast majority of recurrently active sublimation-driven active asteroids have diameters < 10 km (e.g., 133P/Elst-Pizarro at 3.8 km; Hsieh et al. 2009a), with the notable exception of (1) Ceres. This calculation, while rudimentary, nevertheless leaves little doubt that the active asteroids alone cannot at present hold enough water to supply all of the terrestrial water found on Earth today. However, active asteroids may have played a more significant role in the past given its much larger (150 to 250 times) population in the primordial solar system (Bottke et al., 2005) .

9.1.2 Citizen Science Project

The NASA Partner project *Active Asteroids* was launched on the Citizen Science platform Zooniverse on 2022 August 31. Here we discuss the overall status of the project, make some rough estimates about what the project can deliver based on performance thus far, and consider potential enhancements to the project.

9.1.2.1 Thumbnail Classification Rate and Completeness

As of this writing, classifications have taken place at approximate rates varying between 12,000 classifications/day and 120,000 classifications/day. The exact cause of the variation is as-yet undetermined, but factors may include media coverage, social media activity (e.g., tweets from ActiveAsteroids), time of year (e.g., summer break), and timing of electronic newsletters to project volunteers. Our goal is to increase participation over time, and we hope the upcoming publications stemming from the project, including peer-reviewed journal articles and press releases, will help. Meanwhile we assess completeness making use of the aforementioned rates.

Time to Complete Existing Thumbnails At present HARVEST has produced about 18 million algorithmically vetted thumbnail images. Given each thumbnail is examined by 15 volunteers, the total number of classifications needed to examine the entire dataset is $15 \times 1.8 \times 10^7 = 2.7 \times 10^8$ classifications. At the maximum rate (120,000 classifications/day) this works out to 2,250 days, or about six years.

Staying Current DECam started operations in 2012 September, and data are released regularly through the National Optical and Infrared Laboratory (NOIRLab) AstroArchive. The average number of vetted thumbnails produced per day is ~ 5000 , averaged over all dates, not just dates the telescope acquired data. It is worth noting that, in addition to normal weather and engineering telescope time losses, corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19) restrictions led to telescope shutdown for an extended period in 2020, thus reducing the overall average data output. At the maximum classification rate (120,000 classifications/day), it would require 15 hours of volunteer classifications per day stay current.

Time to Completion and Staying Current Considering **Staying Current** would require 15 hours/day at the maximum classification rate, only nine hours (0.375 days) remain daily for classifying the existing data pool, or $120,000 \text{ classifications/day} \times 0.375 = 45,000 \text{ classifications/day}$. Each image is classified 15 times, so the rate in images/day is 3000. To classify all 18 million thumbnails at this rate would require >16 years. Afterwards, the project would be able to stay current with DECam output at 75,000 classifications/day, lower than the maximum classification rate seen to date.

Triage Options Parameters used to select thumbnails for Citizen Science classification (Section 3.2.4.1) begin with constraining ranges of Δ_{mag} , the number of magnitudes fainter an exposure probes than the apparent magnitude of the minor planet (recall $\Delta_{\text{mag}} = V_{\text{JPL}} - V_{\text{ITC}}$, with V_{JPL} the Horizons-provided apparent V -band magnitude for the object and V_{ITC} the V -band magnitude depth we computed for the exposure; Section 3.1.4.2). The number of existing and new thumbnails needing classification can be reduced significantly by altering this parameter alone. For example, requiring $\Delta_{\text{mag}} < -2$ (instead of the default $\Delta_{\text{mag}} < -1$) reduces the number of thumbnails to be classified from 18 million to 16 million. Requiring $\Delta_{\text{mag}} < -3$ lowers the number of thumbnails for classification to 9 million, a 50% reduction in the classification workload as compared to the original 18 million thumbnails. This action would exacerbate the existing bias towards observing bright objects which, in turn, favors images of objects close to perihelion and disfavors distant objects such as Centaurs. For example, assuming the typical magnitude limit of DECam is $\sim V = 23$ (Chapter 4), requiring $\Delta_{\text{mag}} < -3$ results in images showing objects brighter than $V = 20$.

Table 9.1 shows the impact of applying different optimization parameters to the HARVEST-produced thumbnail images as well as rough estimates for implications for the LSST. The number of vetted images in the HARVEST dataset is roughly 16 million as of these calculations. Applying a $\Delta_{\text{mag}} < -3$ constraint reduces the number of images by a factor of two, and likewise if we only allow thumbnail images showing objects at or above 80% of the distance from aphelion to perihelion $\%_{q \rightarrow Q}$ (Section 6.2). To illustrate potential benefits of additional screening tools, a hypothetical factor of ten improvement is shown for Wedge

Table 9.1: Classification Rates and Potential Optimizations

This Work								
Description	N_{current}	$t_{\text{current,min}}$ [days]	$t_{\text{current,ave}}$ [days]	N_{daily}	$t_{\text{daily,min}}$ [days]	$t_{\text{daily,ave}}$ [days]	$t_{\text{all,min}}$ [days]	$t_{\text{all,ave}}$ [days]
Vetted	1.57E+7	1960	23500	4300	0.54	6.51 ^b	4280	∞
$\Delta_{\text{mag}} < -2$	1.11E+7	1380	16600	3073	0.384	4.61 ^b	2250	∞
$\Delta_{\text{mag}} < -3$	6.10E+6	763	9150	1693	0.212	2.54 ^b	967	∞
$\%_{q \rightarrow Q} \geq 80\%$	2.16E+6	270	3240	600	0.075	0.9	292	32500
Wedge Phot. ^a	2.16E+5	27	324	60	7.50E-03	0.09	27	356
Mach. Learn. ^a	2.16E+3	0.27	3	0.60	7.50E-05	0.0009	0.27	3.25

LSST			
Description	N_{daily}	$t_{\text{daily,min}}$ [days]	$t_{\text{daily,ave}}$ [days]
LSST baseline	1.36E+7	1700 ^b	20400 ^b
HARVEST Vetting	4.08E+6	510 ^b	6120 ^b
$\Delta_{\text{mag}} < -2$	2.89E+6	361 ^b	4330 ^b
$\Delta_{\text{mag}} < -3$	1.59E+6	199 ^b	2386 ^b
$\%_{q \rightarrow Q} \geq 80\%$	5.65E+5	71 ^b	846 ^b
Wedge Phot. ^a	5.65E+5	7 ^b	85 ^b
Mach. Learn. ^a	5.65E+3	0.1	0.8

N_{current} indicates the number of DECam images in the HARVEST-produced database. Daily indicates the average number of thumbnail images produced on a daily basis. Minimum (min) and average (ave) values estimated based on peak (120,000) and mean (10,000) classifications per day, respectively. Vetted: the number of DECam thumbnail images after vetting by the Hunting for Activity in Repositories with Vetting-Enhanced Search Techniques (HARVEST) pipeline (Section 3.1). Δ_{mag} is how faint an exposure probes versus the apparent magnitude of the object (Section 3.1.4.2); relative brightness of the object in contrast with the overall exposure depth increases in the negative direction. ^aNot easily implemented. ^bWill never catch up. Hypothetical application of the Wedge Photometry is a technique that searches for tails (Section 7.1). Hypothetical application of machine learning (ML)-based activity detection technique. The baseline number of Legacy Survey of Space and Time (LSST) thumbnails per night, estimated from an average of 8,000 minor planets per field, with 1,700 fields per night, depending on final cadence selection.

Photometry (Section 7.1) application, and a factor of $100\times$ improvement for an as yet undeveloped ML-based activity detection tool. Even at our average classification rate of 10,000 classifications/day, the entire DECam dataset would be processed and current in ~ 3.25 days.

A hypothetical scenario for LSST is also shown in Table 9.1. Although the final cadence has yet to be confirmed, we compute a baseline number of thumbnails from $\sim 1,700$ fields imaged per night with an average of $\sim 8,000$ minor planets per field (Ivezić et al., 2019) as $1400 \text{ fields/night} \cdot 8000 \text{ objects/field} = 1.36 \times 10^7$ thumbnail images per night. HARVEST has an approximate 70% reduction in thumbnail images following our vetting routines, which still leaves over 45 million minor planets imaged per night. The only scenario in which the Citizen Scientists can keep up with the LSST is if the classifications are kept at the rate of 120,000 classifications/night and all of the hypothetical vetting tools provide a combined $1,000\times$ reduction in the number of thumbnail images needing examination over this work. It is important to note that classification should commence immediately because it will be highly impractical to “catch up” after LSST has started acquiring data. It is also worth remembering that all times are dependent on classification rates, thus improvements would result from increased participation in the Citizen Science project.

Human Lifetimes Classification requires time contributed by human volunteers, so we take care to optimize the time spent on our project (e.g., excluding thumbnails with an object we compute to be too faint to identify activity; Section 3.1.4.2). One measure of how much time is required for a given task is *human lifetimes*, which is 73.4 years as of 2019 (World Health Organization, 2019), or $\sim 4 \times 10^7$ s. Classifications take, on average, 4.7 s per thumbnail. Assuming very generously that each person is awake and classifying for 2/3 of their day, and classifies for 70 years of their life, then

$$\frac{70 \text{ yr}}{\text{life}} \cdot \frac{5 \text{ classifications}}{\text{s}} \cdot \frac{365 \text{ d}}{1 \text{ yr}} \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{24 \text{ hr}}{\text{d}} \cdot \frac{60 \text{ min}}{\text{hr}} \cdot \frac{60 \text{ s}}{\text{min}} \approx \frac{10^8 \text{ classifications}}{\text{life}}, \quad (9.3)$$

or roughly 100 million classifications per lifetime. Via Table 9.1, *Active Asteroids* DECam data could be completed in ~ 0.1 lifetimes (7 yr). However, LSST in the same HARVEST vetted state would require, on average, ~ 0.03 lifetimes per day to classify all of the thumbnail images. Given the nominal survey duration for LSST is 10 years (3,650 days), over 120 human lifetimes would be required to classify all of the HARVEST vetted thumbnail images. Even with the $\Delta_{\text{mag}} < -3$ and $\%_{q \rightarrow Q} \geq 80\%$ filters applied, the LSST data would still require 16 lifetimes (at 565,000 thumbnails/day for 10 years) without the as-yet unimplemented Wedge Photometry and/or ML filters.

9.1.2.2 Active Asteroid Detection Rate and Completeness

As discussed in Chapter 2, the occurrence rate of activity among asteroids (due to any cause) is estimated to be very roughly around 1 in 10,000. Considering only the Asteroid Belt, there are roughly 1 million asteroids > 1 km in diameter (e.g., Tedesco & Desert 2002). This suggests there should be roughly 100 active asteroids in the Asteroid Belt alone. As of this writing about 20 have been observed with visual evidence of activity, so there should be about 80 undiscovered active asteroids in the Asteroid Belt.

Thus far *Active Asteroids* volunteers have discovered one previously unknown active asteroid (paper in preparation) out of the $\sim 78,000$ Asteroid Belt objects examined. While this seems to be a rate lower than 1 in 10,000, we have (so far) provided images of objects without selecting for proximity to perihelion passage, so it is likely one or more active objects have been examined but during their presumably quiescent period near aphelion. If we continue to provide images unbiased with respect to orbital position, then volunteers would need to examine 6.2 million thumbnails before identifying 80 active asteroids. Given current classification rates (Section 9.1.2.1) we intend to start prioritizing objects near perihelion passage, so we expect the detection frequency to increase.

9.1.2.3 Project Plans

A large number of discoveries stem from the *Active Asteroids* project and HARVEST pipeline, such as four published peer-reviewed publications thus far, one article currently in review, and three additional manuscripts are in preparation. These results make it clear the project is successful and should continue. Moreover, the public engagement aspect of the project should not be overlooked, with over 6,000 volunteers participating to date. As discussed in Section 9.1.2.1, the project could use additional participation to achieve completeness sooner, but adjusting thumbnail selection parameters can help in the interim. HARVEST has already been upgraded to incorporate other instrument archives, such as the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope (CFHT) MegaPrime. It is evident that additional selection criteria are necessary to further filter the thumbnail images selected for *Active Asteroids* in order to keep the quantity viable with current classification rates.

One possible way to enhance thumbnail selection for Citizen Scientist examination would be to introduce additional automated detection techniques that identify possible activity and, in combination, result in an activity likelihood score. This will require combining existing detection techniques, such as point spread function (PSF) analysis (Section 2.7), Wedge Photometry (Section 7.3.3), and ML-based image recognition informed by classification data from *Active Asteroids*. Without this additional activity likelihood vetting, projects that produce massive amounts of data, such as LSST, will not be able to benefit fully from Citizen

Science projects like *Active Asteroids*.

It is worth noting that the project did take several years to develop, and that involvement by this author and others were critical to project success. The vast majority of work on the HARVEST pipeline, the Citizen Science project, the follow-up archival and telescope observations, are analyses performed by one individual (this author), with assistance provided by at least one additional member of the science team (Section 3.2) at any given time. For ongoing operations, project moderators (Section 3.2.3) play a key role in interfacing with volunteers through online forums. Citizen Science project development required additional efforts and involved one additional person (Jay Kueny), and development of an analysis pipeline to optimize classification data evaluation was carried out by another individual (Will Burris). The high volume of *Active Asteroids* discoveries warrants additional full-time commitment by at least one more person, bringing the number of full-time dedicated individuals needed to run the project efficiently to at least two. More would be necessary if, for example, development of new methods are needed.

9.1.2.4 Next Steps

The multi-pronged approach to finding and characterizing active solar system bodies presented in this work has proven effective and continues to yield results. Discoveries stemming from the *Active Asteroids* project arise each time we upload a new subject set, with seven batches completed as of this writing. At an activity occurrence rate of roughly one in 10,000 asteroids, there should be around 100 active asteroids in the Asteroid Belt. We hope to double the number of known active asteroids within the next two years by finding an additional 30 active asteroids. This will allow for a more comprehensive study of active bodies, thus enabling the small body community to draw meaningful conclusions about the solar system volatile distribution, the potential volume of volatiles held within each reservoir, and the implications for the origin of terrestrial water. Anyone who can see images on an internet-connected device can participate in *Active Asteroids* by visiting <http://activeasteroids.net>.

Chapter 10

Acronyms

API Application Programming Interface

ARO Atmospheric Research Observatory

ASU Arizona State University

ASU Arizona Statue University

AURA Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy

AstOrb Asteroid Orbital Elements Database

BLT Barry Lutz Telescope

CADC Canadian Astronomy Data Centre

CASU Cambridge Astronomy Survey Unit

CATCH Comet Asteroid Telescopic Catalog Hub

CBET Central Bureau for Electronic Telegrams

CCD charge-coupled device

CEA Commissariat a l'Energes Atomique

CFHT Canada France Hawaii Telescope

CFHT Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope

CNRS Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique

COVID-19 corona virus disease 2019

CTIO Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory

DAPNIA Département d'Astrophysique, de physique des Particules, de physique Nucléaire et de l'Instrumentation Associée

DART Double Asteroid Redirection Test

DCT Discovery Channel Telescope

DDT Director's Discretionary Time

DECam Dark Energy Camera

DESTINY+ Demonstration and Experiment of Space Technology for INterplanetary voYage with Phaethon fLyby and dUst Science

DES Dark Energy Survey

DiRAC Data Intensive Research in Astrophysics & Cosmology

DPRC Disability Program Resource Center

DR Data Release

DS9 Deep Space Nine

Dec Declination

ELTE Eotvos Lorand University

ESA European Space Agency

ESO European Space Organization

ETC exposure time calculator

FAQ Frequently Asked Questions

FITS Flexible Image Transport System

FOV field of view

GEODSS Ground-Based Electro-Optical Deep Space Surveillance

GIF Graphic Interchange Format

GMOS Gemini Multi-Object Spectrograph

GRFP Graduate Research Fellowship Program

HARVEST Hunting for Activity in Repositories with Vetting-Enhanced Search Techniques

HPC High Performance Computing

HSC Hyper Suprime-Cam

IAS15 Integrator with Adaptive Step-size control, 15th order

IAU International Astronomical Union

IMACS Inamori-Magellan Areal Camera and Spectrograph

IMB inner Main-belt

IMCCE Institut de Mécanique Céleste et de Calcul des Éphémérides

INT Isaac Newton Telescopes

IPAC Infrared Processing and Analysis Center

IP Internet Protocol

IRSA Infrared Science Archive

ITC integration time calculator

JAXA Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency

JD Julian Date

JFC Jupiter Family Comet

JPL Jet Propulsion Laboratory

KBO Kuiper Belt object

KIDS Kilo-Degree Survey

KOA Keck Observatory Archive

KPNO Kitt Peak National Observatory

LBCB Large Binocular Camera Blue

LBCR Large Binocular Camera Red

LBT Large Binocular Telescope

LCO Los Cumbres Observatory

LCOGT Las Cumbres Observatory Global Telescope

LDT Lowell Discovery Telescope

LINEAR Lincoln Near-Earth Asteroid Research

LMI Large Monolithic Imager

LONEOS Lowell Observatory Near-Earth-Object Search

LSST Legacy Survey of Space and Time

MBC Main-belt Comet

MGIO Mount Graham International Observatory

ML machine learning

MMB middle Main-belt

MOST Moving Object Search Tool

MPC Minor Planet Center

NASA National Aeronautics and Space Administration

NAU Northern Arizona University

NEAT Near-Earth Asteroid Tracking

NEA near-Earth asteroid

NEO near-Earth object

NIHTS Near-Infrared High-Throughput Spectrograph

NOAO National Optical Astronomy Observatory

NOIRLab National Optical and Infrared Laboratory

NRC National Research Council

NSF National Science Foundation

OMBA outer main-belt asteroid

OMB outer Main-belt

OSIRIS-REx Origins, Spectral Interpretation, Resource Identification, Security, Regolith Explorer

PAC Physics and Astronomy Club

PANSTARRS Panoramic Survey Telescope and Rapid Response System

PI Principal Investigator

PNG Portable Network Graphics

PS1 Panoramic Survey Telescope and Rapid Response System 1

PSF point spread function

PSI Planetary Science Institute

PTF Palomar Transient Factory

Pan-STARRS Panoramic Survey Telescope and Rapid Response System

QHA Quasi-Hilda Asteroid

QHC Quasi-Hilda Comet

QHO Quasi-Hilda Object

RA Right Ascension

SAFARI Searching Asteroids For Activity Revealing Indicators

SAO Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory

SBDB Small Body Database

SDSS DR-9 Sloan Digital Sky Survey Data Release Nine

SDSS Sloan Digital Sky Survey

SDSU San Diego State University

SFSU San Francisco State University

SLAC Stanford Linear Accelerator Center

SMOKA Subaru Mitaka Okayama Kiso Archive

SNR signal to noise ratio

SOAR Southern Astrophysical Research Telescope

SOFIA Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy

SQL Structured Query Language

SSOIS Solar System Object Information Search

STScI Space Telescope Science Institute

SwRI Southwestern Research Institute

TNO Trans-Neptunian object

TRIF Technology and Research Initiative Fund

TSIP Telescope System Instrumentation Program

UA University of Arizona

UCB University of Colorado Boulder

UCLA University of California Los Angeles

UCSD University of California San Diego

UCSF University of California San Francisco

UT Universal Time

UW University of Washington

VATT Vatican Advanced Technology Telescope

VIRCam VISTA InfraRed Camera

VISTA Visible and Infrared Survey Telescope for Astronomy

VLT Very Large Telescope

VST Very Large Telescope (VLT) Survey Telescope

WCS World Coordinate System

WFC Wide Field Camera

WIRCam Wide-field Infrared Camera

WISE Wide-field Infrared Survey Explorer

YORP Yarkovsky–O’Keefe–Radzievskii–Paddack

ZTF Zwicky Transient Facility

Bibliography

- Agarwal, J., Jewitt, D., Mutchler, M., Weaver, H., & Larson, S. 2017, *A Binary Main-Belt Comet*, *Nature*, 549, 357, doi: 10.1038/nature23892
- Agarwal, J., Jewitt, D., & Weaver, H. 2013, *Dynamics of Large Fragments in the Tail of Active Asteroid P/2010 A2*, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 769, 46, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/769/1/46
- Agarwal, J., Jewitt, D., Weaver, H., Mutchler, M., & Drahus, M. 2012, *Dynamics of Large Fragments in Active Asteroid P/2010 A2*, *Asteroids*, 1667, 6247
- Agarwal, J., Jewitt, D., Weaver, H., Mutchler, M., & Larson, S. 2016, *Hubble and Keck Telescope Observations of Active Asteroid 288p/300163 (2006 Vw139)*, *Astronomical Journal*, 151, 12, doi: 10.3847/0004-6256/151/1/12
- A’Hearn, M. F., & Feldman, P. D. 1992, *Water Vaporization on Ceres*, *Icarus*, 98, 54, doi: 10.1016/0019-1035(92)90206-m
- A’Hearn, M. F., Schleicher, D. G., Millis, R. L., Feldman, P. D., & Thompson, D. T. 1984, *Comet Bowell 1980b*, *The Astronomical Journal*, 89, 579, doi: 10.1086/112497
- Ahn, C. P., Alexandroff, R., Allende Prieto, C., et al. 2012, *The Ninth Data Release of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey: First Spectroscopic Data from the SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey*, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 203, 21, doi: 10.1086/170838
- Akhlaghi, M., & Ichikawa, T. 2015, *Noise-Based Detection and Segmentation of Nebulous Objects*, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 220, 1, doi: 10.1086/170838
- Alexander, C. M. O. 2017, *The Origin of Inner Solar System Water*, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series A*, 375, 20150384, doi: 10.1098/rsta.2015.0384
- Alfvén, H. 1969, *Asteroidal Jet Streams*, *Astrophysics and Space Science*, 4, 84, doi: 10.1007/BF00651264
- Andrews, D. G., Bonner, K. D., Butterworth, A. W., et al. 2015, *Defining a Successful Commercial Asteroid Mining Program*, *Acta Astronautica*, 108, 106, doi: 10.1016/j.actaastro.2014.10.034
- Ansdell, M., Meech, K. J., Hainaut, O., et al. 2014, *Refined Rotational Period, Pole Solution, and Shape Model for (3200) Phaethon*, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 793, 50, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/793/1/50
- Arnaboldi, M., Capaccioli, M., Mancini, D., et al. 1998, *VST: VLT Survey Telescope.*, *The Messenger*, 93, 30
- Baba, H., Yasuda, N., Ichikawa, S.-I., et al. 2002a, *Development of the Subaru-Mitaka-Okayama-Kiso Archive System*, *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XI*, ASP Conference Proceedings, 281, 298
- . 2002b, *Development of the Subaru-Mitaka-Okayama-Kiso Archive System*, *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XI*, 281, 298
- Babadzhanov, P. B., Kokhirova, G. I., & Obruchov, Y. V. 2015, *Extinct Comets and Asteroid-Meteoroid Complexes*, *Solar System Research*, 49, 165, doi: 10.1134/S0038094615030016
- Bacci, P., Tesi, L., & Fagioli, G. 2017a, *(457175) 2008 GO₉₈*, *Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams*, 4418

- Bacci, P., Tesi, L., Fagioli, G., et al. 2015, *Comet P/2015 M2 (Panstarrs)*, Minor Planet Electronic Circulars, 2015-N46
- Bacci, P., Maestripieri, M., Tesi, L., et al. 2017b, *A/2017 U1*, Minor Planet Electronic Circ., 2017-U185
- Bagnulo, S., Tozzi, G. P., Boehnhardt, H., Vincent, J. B., & Muinonen, K. 2010, *Polarimetry and Photometry of the Peculiar Main-Belt Object 7968 = 133P/Elst-Pizarro*, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 514, A99, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/200913339
- Battams, K., & Watson, A. 2009, *(3200) Phaethon*, *IAU Circ.*, 9054, 3
- Batygin, K., Adams, F. C., Brown, M. E., & Becker, J. C. 2019, *The Planet Nine Hypothesis*, *Physics Reports-Review Section of Physics Letters*, 805, 1
- Bell, C. 2017, *(457175) 2008 GO₉₈*, *Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams*, 4418
- Berthier, J., Vachier, F., Thuillot, W., et al. 2006, *SkyBoT*, a New VO Service to Identify Solar System Objects
- Bertin, E., & Arnouts, S. 1996, *SExtractor: Software for Source Extraction.*, *Astronomy and Astrophysics Supplement*, 117, 393, doi: 10.1051/aas:1996164
- . 2010, *SExtractor: Source Extractor*, *Astrophysics Source Code Library*, ascl:1010.064
- Bertin, E., Gabriel, C., Arviset, C., Ponz, D., & Solano, E. 2006, *Automatic Astrometric and Photometric Calibration with SCAMP*
- Betzler, A. S., Almeida, R. S., Cerqueira, W. J., et al. 2015, *Photometric Observations of (1026) Ingrid*, *The Astronomer's Telegram*, 8117
- Birtwhistle, P. 2017, *(457175) 2008 GO₉₈*, *Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams*, 4418
- Birtwhistle, P., Ryan, W. H., Sato, H., Beshore, E. C., & Kadota, K. 2010, *Comet P/2010 A2 (LINEAR)*, *Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams*, 2114, 1
- Blackburn, J. K., Shaw, R. A., Payne, H. E., & Hayes, J. J. E. 1995, *FTOOLS: A FITS Data Processing and Analysis Software Package*
- Bodewits, D., Kelley, M. S., Li, J. Y., et al. 2011, *Collisional Excavation of Asteroid (596) Scheila*, *Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 733, L3, doi: ArtnL310.1088/2041-8205/733/1/L3
- Boehnhardt, H., Schulz, R., Tozzi, G. P., Rauer, H., & Sekanina, Z. 1996, *Comet P/1996 N2 (Elst-Pizarro)*, *International Astronomical Union Circular*, 6495, 2
- Boehnhardt, H., Sekanina, Z., Fiedler, A., et al. 1998, *Impact-Induced Activity of the Asteroid-Comet P/1996N2 Elst-Pizarro: Yes or No?*, *Highlights of Astronomy Vol. 11A*, 11, 233
- Boehnhardt, H., Tozzi, G. P., Birkle, K., et al. 2001, *Visible and Near-IR Observations of Transneptunian Objects - Results from ESO and Calar Alto Telescopes*, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 378, 653, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361:20011212
- Bolin, B., Kleyana, J., Denneau, L., & Wainscoat, R. 2013a, *Comet P/2013 R3 (Catalina-Panstarrs)*, *Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams*, 3658, 2
- Bolin, B., Denneau, L., Veres, P., et al. 2013b, *Comet P/2003 BM₈₀ = (323137) 2003 BM₈₀*, *Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams*, 3559, 1
- Borisov, G. 2019, *MPEC 2019-R106 : COMET C/2019 Q4 (Borisov)*, *Minor Planet Electronic Circulars*
- Bottke, W. F., Durda, D. D., Nesvorný, D., et al. 2005, *The Fossilized Size Distribution of the Main Asteroid Belt*, *Icarus*, 175, 111, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2004.10.026

- Bottke, W. F., Moorhead, A. V., Connolly, H. C., et al. 2020, *Meteoroid Impacts as a Source of Bennu's Particle Ejection Events*, Journal of Geophysical Research (Planets), 125, e06282, doi: 10.1029/2019JE006282
- Bottke, W. F. J., Vokrouhlický, D., Rubincam, D. P., & Nesvorný, D. 2006, *The Yarkovsky and Yorp Effects: Implications for Asteroid Dynamics*, Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 34, 157, doi: 10.1146/annurev.earth.34.031405.125154
- Bowell, E., Buie, M. W., & Picken, H. 1992, *(4015) 1979 VA = Comet Wilson-Harrington (1949 III)*, IAU Circ., 5586, 1
- Bowell, E., Hapke, B., Domingue, D., et al. 1989, *Application of Photometric Models to Asteroids*, Asteroids II, 524
- Bowell, E., Muinonen, K., & Wasserman, L. H. 1994, *A Public-Domain Asteroid Orbit Database*, Symposium-International ...
- Breivik, K., Connolly, A. J., Ford, K. E. S., et al. 2022, *From Data to Software to Science with the Rubin Observatory LSST*, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2208.02781. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.02781>
- Bryssinck, E. 2017, *(457175) 2008 GO₉₈*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 4418
- Busarev, V. V., Barabanov, S. I., & Puzin, V. B. 2016, *Material Composition Assessment and Discovering Sublimation Activity on Asteroids 145 Adeona, 704 Interamnia, 779 Nina, and 1474 Beira*, Solar System Research, 50, 281, doi: 10.1134/S003809461604002X
- Busarev, V. V., Makalkin, A. B., Vilas, F., Barabanov, S. I., & Scherbina, M. P. 2018, *New Candidates for Active Asteroids: Main-belt (145) Adeona, (704) Interamnia, (779) Nina, (1474) Beira, and near-Earth (162,173) Ryugu*, Icarus, 304, 83, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2017.06.032
- Busarev, V. V., Petrova, E. V., Irsmbabetova, T. R., Shcherbina, M. P., & Barabanov, S. I. 2021, *Simultaneous Sublimation Activity of Primitive Asteroids Including (24) Themis and (449) Hamburga: Spectral Signs of an Exosphere and the Solar Activity Impact*, Icarus, 369, 114634, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2021.114634
- Campins, H., de León, J., Morbidelli, A., et al. 2013, *The Origin of Asteroid 162173 (1999 Ju₃)*, The Astronomical Journal, 146, 26, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/146/2/26
- Campins, H., Hargrove, K., Pinilla-Alonso, N., et al. 2010, *Water Ice and Organics on the Surface of the Asteroid 24 Themis*, Nature, 464, 1320, doi: 10.1038/nature09029
- Carusi, A., Kresak, L., Perozzi, E., & Valsecchi, G. B. 1987, *High-Order Librations of Halley-Type Comets*, Astronomy and Astrophysics, 187, 899
- Carusi, A., Kresák, Ľ., & Valsecchi, G. B. 1996, *Comet Taxonomy*, Completing the Inventory of the Solar System, 107, 173, doi: 10.1007/BF00671499
- Carvano, J. M., Lazzaro, D., Mothé-Diniz, T., Angeli, C. A., & Florczak, M. 2001, *Spectroscopic Survey of the Hungaria and Phocaea Dynamical Groups*, Icarus, 149, 173, doi: 10.1006/icar.2000.6512
- Chamberlin, A. B., McFadden, L.-A., Schulz, R., Schleicher, D. G., & Bus, S. J. 1996, *4015 Wilson-Harrington, 2201 Oljato, and 3200 Phaethon: Search for CN Emission*, Icarus, 119, 173, doi: 10.1006/icar.1996.0009
- Chambers, J. E. 1999, *A Hybrid Symplectic Integrator That Permits Close Encounters between Massive Bodies*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 304, 793, doi: 10.1046/j.1365-8711.1999.02379.x
- Chambers, K. C., Magnier, E. A., Metcalfe, N., et al. 2016, *The Pan-STARRS1 Surveys*, arXiv.org, astro-ph.IM, arXiv:1612.05560

- Chandler, C. O., Curtis, A. M., Mommert, M., Sheppard, S. S., & Trujillo, C. A. 2018, *SAFARI: Searching Asteroids for Activity Revealing Indicators*, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 130, 114502, doi: 10.1088/1538-3873/aad03d
- Chandler, C. O., Kueny, J., Gustafsson, A., et al. 2019, *Six Years of Sustained Activity in (6478) Gault*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 877, L12, doi: 10/gg3qw6
- Chandler, C. O., Kueny, J. K., Trujillo, C. A., Trilling, D. E., & Oldroyd, W. J. 2020, *Cometary Activity Discovered on a Distant Centaur: A Nonaqueous Sublimation Mechanism*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 892, L38, doi: 10/gg36xz
- Chandler, C. O., Trujillo, C. A., Grundy, W. M., et al. 2021a, *(554099) 2012 KU50*, Central Bureau for Astronomical Telegrams, 5075
- Chandler, C. O., Trujillo, C. A., & Hsieh, H. H. 2021b, *(248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams
- . 2021c, *Recurrent Activity from Active Asteroid (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃: A Main-belt Comet*, The Astrophysical Journal, 922, L8, doi: 10/gnmckw
- . 2021d, *(248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃*, Central Bureau for Astronomical Telegrams
- Chapman, C. R., Mosher, J. A., & Simmons, G. 1970, *Lunar Cratering and Erosion from Orbiter 5 Photographs*, Journal of Geophysical Research (1896-1977), 75, 1445, doi: 10.1029/JB075i008p01445
- Chesley, S. R., Ostro, S. J., Vokrouhlický, D., et al. 2003, *Direct Detection of the Yarkovsky Effect by Radar Ranging to Asteroid 6489 Golevka*, Science, 302, 1739, doi: 10.1126/science.1091452
- Choi, Y. J., Weissman, P. R., & Polishook, D. 2006, *(60558) 2000 EC₉₈*, IAU Circ., 8656, 2
- Cikota, S., Ortiz, J. L., Cikota, A., Morales, N., & Tancredi, G. 2014, *A Photometric Search for Active Main Belt Asteroids*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 562, A94, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201321679
- Cochran, W. D., Cochran, A. L., & Barker, E. S. 1986, *Spectroscopy of Asteroids in Unusual Orbits.*, in Proceedings of the International Meeting (Uppsala, Sweden: Astronomiska Observatoriet), 181–185
- Collaboration, D. E. S., Abbott, T., Abdalla, F. B., et al. 2016, *The Dark Energy Survey: More than Dark Energy - an Overview*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 460, 1270, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stw641
- Collaboration, G., Brown, A. G. A., Vallenari, A., et al. 2018a, *Gaia Data Release 2. Summary of the Contents and Survey Properties*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 616, A1, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201833051
- . 2018b, *Gaia Data Release 2. Summary of the Contents and Survey Properties*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 616, A1, doi: 10/gd8rrf
- Connors, M., Russell, C. T., & Lai, H. R. 2016, *The Unusual Asteroid 2201 Oljato: Origins and Possible Debris Trail*, Planetary and Space Science, 123, 16, doi: 10.1016/j.pss.2015.11.017
- Cox, J., Oh, E. Y., Simmons, B., & Lintott, C. 2015, *Defining and Measuring Success in Online Citizen Science: A Case Study of Zooniverse Projects*, Computing in Science and Engineering, doi: 10.1109/MCSE.2015.65
- Cunningham, L. E. 1950, *Periodic Comet Wilson-Harrington (1949g)*, IAU Circ., 1250, 3
- da Costa-Luis, C., Larroque, S. K., Altendorf, K., et al. 2022, *Tqdm: A Fast, Extensible Progress Bar for Python and CLI*, Zenodo, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.6412640
- de Jong, J. T. A., Verdoes Kleijn, G. A., Boxhoorn, D. R., et al. 2015, *The First and Second Data Releases of the Kilo-Degree Survey*, Astronomy and Astrophysics, 582, A62, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201526601

- de la Fuente Marcos, C., de la Fuente Marcos, R., Licandro, J., et al. 2021, *The Active Centaur 2020 MK4*, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 649, A85, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/202039117
- de Val-Borro, M., Rezac, L., Hartogh, P., et al. 2012, *An Upper Limit for the Water Outgassing Rate of the Main-Belt Comet 176P/LINEAR Observed with Herschel/HIFI*, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 546, L4, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201220169
- Deen, S., & Weryk, R. 2020, *MPEC 2020-N22: RETRACTION OF 2011 UH413 and 2013 QQ95*, *Minor Planet Electronic Circulars*
- Degewij, J., Williams, J. G., Cruikshank, D. P., et al. 1980, 1979 VA: Physical Parameters of a Possible Cometary Nucleus.
- DeMeo, F. E., Klesman, A. J., Slivan, S. M., & Bus, S. J. 2009, *An Extension of the Bus Asteroid Taxonomy into the Near-Infrared*, *Icarus*, 202, 160, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2009.02.005
- Devogèle, M., Ferrais, M., Jehin, E., et al. 2021, *(6478) Gault: Physical Characterization of an Active Main-Belt Asteroid*, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 505, 245, doi: 10/gm25xw
- Dey, A., Schlegel, D. J., Lang, D., et al. 2019, *Overview of the DESI Legacy Imaging Surveys*, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 157, 168, doi: 10/gmg6sw
- Di Ruscio, A., Fienga, A., Durante, D., et al. 2020, *Analysis of Cassini Radio Tracking Data for the Construction of INPOP19a: A New Estimate of the Kuiper Belt Mass*, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 640, A7, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/202037920
- Dickson, D. 1978, *Congress Approves Solar Power Satellites-and Asteroid Mining*, *Nature*, 274, 3, doi: 10.1038/274003a0
- Drahus, M., Waniak, W., Tendulkar, S., et al. 2015, *Fast Rotation and Trailing Fragments of the Active Asteroid P/2012 F5 (Gibbs)*, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 802, L8, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/802/1/L8
- Drake, A. J., Djorgovski, S. G., Mahabal, A., et al. 2009, *First Results from the Catalina Real-Time Transient Survey*, *Astrophysical Journal*, 696, 870, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/696/1/870
- Dressler, A., Bigelow, B., Hare, T., et al. 2011, *IMACS: The Inamori-Magellan Areal Camera and Spectrograph on Magellan-Baade*, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 123, 288, doi: 10.1086/658908
- Dumitru, B. A., Birlan, M., Popescu, M., & Nedelcu, D. A. 2017, *Association between Meteor Showers and Asteroids Using Multivariate Criteria*, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 607, A5, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201730813
- Elliot, J. L., Dunham, E. W., Bosh, A. S., et al. 1989, *Pluto's Atmosphere*, *Icarus*, 77, 148, doi: 10.1016/0019-1035(89)90014-6
- Elst, E. W., Pizarro, O., Pollas, C., et al. 1996, *Comet P/1996 N2 (Elst-Pizarro)*, *IAU Circ.*, 6456, 1
- Epifani, E. M., Perna, D., Dotto, E., et al. 2017, *Nucleus of the Active Centaur C/2011 P2 (PANSTARRS)*, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 597, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201628405
- Fatka, P., Moskovitz, N. A., Pravec, P., et al. 2022, *Recent Formation and Likely Cometary Activity of Near-Earth Asteroid Pair 2019 PR2-2019 QR6*, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 510, 6033, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stab3719
- Fernández, Y. R., McFadden, L. A., Lisse, C. M., Helin, E. F., & Chamberlin, A. B. 1997, *Analysis of POSS Images of Comet-Asteroid Transition Object 107P/1949 W1 (Wilson-Harrington)*, *Icarus*, 128, 114, doi: 10.1006/icar.1997.5728

- Ferrin, I. 2006, *Secular Light Curves of Comets, II: 133P/Elst-Pizarro, an Asteroidal Belt Comet*, Icarus, 185, 523, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2006.07.005
- Ferrín, I., Hamanowa, H., Hamanowa, H., et al. 2012, *The 2009 Apparition of Methuselah Comet 107P/Wilson–Harrington: A Case of Comet Rejuvenation?*, Planetary and Space Science, 70, 59, doi: 10.1016/j.pss.2012.05.022
- Fitzsimmons, A., Erasmus, N., Thirouin, A., Hsieh, H. H., & Green, D. 2021, (248370) 2005 QN173, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams
- Fitzsimmons, A., & Weryk, R. 2022, *CBAT 5137: COMET P/2022 C4 = P/2010 LK.36 = P/2016 MD = P/2016 PM.1 (WISE-PANSTARRS)*, Central Bureau for Astronomical Telegrams
- Forgan, D. H., & Elvis, M. 2011, *Extrasolar Asteroid Mining as Forensic Evidence for Extraterrestrial Intelligence*, International Journal of Astrobiology, 10, 307, doi: 10.1017/S1473550411000127
- Fray, N., & Schmitt, B. 2009, *Sublimation of Ices of Astrophysical Interest: A Bibliographic Review*, Planetary and Space Science, Volume 57, Issue 14-15, p. 2053-2080., 57, 2053, doi: 10/fpj3rx
- Gajdos, S., Vilagi, J., Naves, R., et al. 2005, *Comet P/2005 S2 (Skiff)*, Minor Planet Electronic Circulars, 2005-T26
- Garradd, G. J., McNaught, R. H., Meyer, M., Herald, D., & Marsden, B. G. 2008, *Comet P/2008 R1 (Garradd)*, Minor Planet Electronic Circ.
- Gault, D. E., Hoerz, F., Brownlee, D. E., & Hartung, J. B. 1974, *Mixing of the Lunar Regolith.*, Lunar and Planetary Science Conference Proceedings, 3, 2365
- Gehrels, T. 1981, *Faint Comet Searching*, Icarus, 47, 518, doi: 10.1016/0019-1035(81)90200-1
- Gibbs, A. R., Sarneczky, K., Scotti, J. V., et al. 2011a, *Comet P/2011 C2 (Gibbs)*, International Astronomical Union Circular, 9199, 1
- Gibbs, A. R., & Sato, H. 2014, *Comet P/2014 S4 (Gibbs)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 3991
- Gibbs, A. R., Tornero, S. F., & Williams, G. V. 2011b, *Comet P/2011 S1 (Gibbs)*, International Astronomical Union Circular, 9234, 1
- Gibbs, A. R., Sato, H., Ryan, W. H., et al. 2012, *Comet P/2012 F5 (Gibbs)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 3069, 1
- Gibson, Jr., E. K. 1974, *Inorganic Gas Release Studies and Thermal Analysis Investigations on Carbonaceous Chondrites*, Meteoritics, 9, 343
- Gil-Hutton, R., & Garcia-Migani, E. 2016, *Comet Candidates among Quasi-Hilda Objects*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 590, A111, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201628184
- Gilbert, A. M., & Wiegert, P. A. 2009, *Searching for Main-Belt Comets Using the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope Legacy Survey*, Icarus, 201, 714, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2009.01.011
- . 2010, *Updated Results of a Search for Main-Belt Comets Using the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope Legacy Survey*, Icarus, 210, 998, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2010.07.016
- Gimeno, G., Roth, K., Chiboucas, K., et al. 2016, *On-Sky Commissioning of Hamamatsu CCDs in GMOS-S*, Proceedings of the SPIE, 9908, 99082S, doi: 10.1117/12.2233883
- Giorgini, J. D. 2015, *Status of the JPL Horizons Ephemeris System*, IAU General Assembly, 22, 2256293
- Giorgini, J. D., Yeomans, D. K., Chamberlin, A. B., et al. 1996, *JPL's On-Line Solar System Data Service*, American Astronomical Society, 28, 25.04

- Gladman, B., Kavelaars, J. J., Petit, J.-M., et al. 2001, *The Structure of the Kuiper Belt: Size Distribution and Radial Extent*, *The Astronomical Journal*, 122, 1051, doi: 10.1086/322080
- Glassmeier, K.-H., Boehnhardt, H., Koschny, D., Kührt, E., & Richter, I. 2007, *The Rosetta Mission: Flying Towards the Origin of the Solar System*, *Space Science Reviews*, 128, 1, doi: 10.1007/s11214-006-9140-8
- Grav, T., Holman, M. J., Gladman, B. J., & Aksnes, K. 2003, *Photometric Survey of the Irregular Satellites*, *Icarus*, 166, 33, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2003.07.005
- Green, D. W. E. 2005, *Comets 165P/2000 B4, 166P/2001 T4, and 167P/2004 PY42*, *International Astronomical Union Circular*, 8552
- Greenberg, R., Geissler, P., Hoppa, G., et al. 1998, *Tectonic Processes on Europa: Tidal Stresses, Mechanical Response, and Visible Features*, *Icarus*, 135, 64, doi: 10.1006/icar.1998.5986
- Grundy, W. M., & Stansberry, J. A. 2000, *Solar Gardening and the Seasonal Evolution of Nitrogen Ice on Triton and Pluto*, *Icarus*, 148, 340, doi: 10.1006/icar.2000.5986
- Gwyn, S. D. J., Hill, N., & Kavelaars, J. J. 2012a, *SSOS: A Moving-Object Image Search Tool for Asteroid Precovery*, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 124, 579, doi: 10.1086/668888
- . 2012b, *SSOS: A Moving-Object Image Search Tool for Asteroid Precovery*, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 124, 579, doi: 10.1086/668888
- Haghighipour, N. 2009, *Dynamical Constraints on the Origin of Main Belt Comets*, *Meteoritics & Planetary Science*, 44, 1863, doi: 10.1111/j.1945-5100.2009.tb01995.x
- Hahn, G., & Rickman, H. 1985, *Asteroids in Cometary Orbits*, *Icarus*, 61, 417, doi: 10.1016/0019-1035(85)90134-4
- Hainaut, O. R., Kley, N., Sarid, G., et al. 2012, *P/2010 A2 LINEAR. I. An Impact in the Asteroid Main Belt*, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 537, A69, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201118147
- Hainaut, O. R., Boehnhardt, H., Snodgrass, C., et al. 2014, *Continued Activity in P/2013 P5 PANSTARRS. Unexpected Comet, Rotational Break-up, or Rubbing Binary Asteroid?*, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 563, A75, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201322864
- Hamilton, D. P., & Burns, J. A. 1992, *Orbital Stability Zones about Asteroids II. The Destabilizing Effects of Eccentric Orbits and of Solar Radiation*, *Icarus*, 96, 43, doi: 10.1016/0019-1035(92)90005-R
- Hamilton, V. E., Simon, A. A., Christensen, P. R., et al. 2019, *Evidence for Widespread Hydrated Minerals on Asteroid (101955) Bennu*, *Nature Astronomy*, 3, 332, doi: 10.1038/s41550-019-0722-2
- Hanuš, J., Delbo, M., Vokrouhlický, D., et al. 2016, *Near-Earth Asteroid (3200) Phaethon: Characterization of Its Orbit, Spin State, and Thermophysical Parameters*, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 592, A34, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201628666
- Harris, A. W., & Harris, A. W. 1997, *On the Revision of Radiometric Albedos and Diameters of Asteroids*, *Icarus*, 126, 450, doi: 10.1006/icar.1997.5555
- Harris, A. W., & Lagerros, J. S. V. 2002, *Asteroids in the Thermal Infrared*, *Asteroids III*, 205
- Harris, C. R., Millman, K. J., van der Walt, S. J., et al. 2020, *Array Programming with NumPy*, *Nature*, 585, 357, doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2
- Harris, D. L. I. 1950, *Comet Notes: Comet 1949 g (Wilson-Harrington); Comet 1939 IV (Väisälä)*, *Popular Astronomy*, 58, 93
- Hasnain, Z., Lamb, C. A., & Ross, S. D. 2012, *Capturing Near-Earth Asteroids around Earth*, *Acta Astronautica*, 81, 523, doi: 10.1016/j.actaastro.2012.07.029

- Hayne, P. O., & Aharonson, O. 2015, *Thermal Stability of Ice on Ceres with Rough Topography*, Journal of Geophysical Research-Planets, 120, 1567, doi: 10.1002/2015je004887
- Helin, E. F. 1981, *The Discovery of an Unusual Apollo Asteroid (1979 Va)*, Mercury, 10
- Helin, E. F., & Gaffey, M. J. 1980, *1979-Va, a Possible Carbonaceous Asteroid*, Meteoritics, 15, 299
- Hergenrother, C. W., Adam, C. D., Chesley, S. R., & Lauretta, D. S. 2020, *Introduction to the Special Issue: Exploration of the Activity of Asteroid (101955) Bennu*, Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 125, e2020JE006549, doi: 10.1029/2020JE006549
- Hill, G. W. 1878, *Researches in the Lunar Theory*, American Journal of Mathematics, 1, 5, doi: 10.2307/2369430
- Hill, R. E., Bolin, B., Kleyna, J., et al. 2013, *Comet P/2013 R3 (Catalina-Panstarrs)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 3658, 1
- Hirabayashi, M., Scheeres, D. J., Sánchez, D. P., & Gabriel, T. 2014, *Constraints on the Physical Properties of Main Belt Comet P/2013 R3 from Its Breakup Event*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 789, L12, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/789/1/L12
- Hirayama, K. 1918, *Groups of Asteroids Probably of Common Origin*, Astronomical Journal, 31, 185, doi: 10.1086/104299
- Holvorcem, P. R., Schwartz, M., Sato, H., Stevens, B. L., & Williams, G. V. 2013, *Comet C/2013 C2 (Tenagra)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 3417, 1
- Hook, I. M., Jørgensen, I., Allington-Smith, J. R., et al. 2004, *The Gemini-North Multi-Object Spectrograph: Performance in Imaging, Long-Slit, and Multi-Object Spectroscopic Modes*, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 116, 425, doi: 10.1086/425
- Horner, J., & Lykawka, P. S. 2010, *The Neptune Trojans - a New Source for the Centaurs?*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 402, 13, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15702.x
- Hsieh, H. H. 2009, *The Hawaii Trails Project: Comet-Hunting in the Main Asteroid Belt*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 505, 1297, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/200912342
- . 2014, *The Nucleus of Main-Belt Comet P/2010 R2 (La Sagra)*, Icarus, 243, 16, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2014.08.033
- . 2018, *Surface Brightness Limits*, Personal Communication
- Hsieh, H. H., Chavez, J., & 2017. 2017a, *Comet 259P/Garradd*, Central Bureau for Astronomical Telegrams
- Hsieh, H. H., Denneau, L., & Wainscoat, R. 2011a, *Comet P/2006 VW_139 = (300163) 2006 VW_139*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 2920, 1
- Hsieh, H. H., Fitzsimmons, A., Novaković, B., Denneau, L., & Heinze, A. N. 2021a, *The Transient Jupiter Trojan-like Orbit of P/2019 LD2 (ATLAS)*, Icarus, 354, 114019, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2020.114019
- Hsieh, H. H., Ishiguro, M., Lacerda, P., & Jewitt, D. 2011b, *Physical Properties of Main-belt Comet 176P/LINEAR*, The Astronomical Journal, 142, 29, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/142/1/29
- Hsieh, H. H., & Jewitt, D. 2005, *Search for Activity in 3200 Phaethon*, The Astrophysical Journal, 624, 1093, doi: 10.1086/429250
- . 2006a, *A Population of Comets in the Main Asteroid Belt*, Science, 312, 561, doi: 10.1126/science.1125150
- . 2006b, *Active Asteroids: Mystery in the Main Belt*, Asteroids, Comets, Meteors, Proceedings of the 229th Symposium of the International Astronomical Union, 229, 425, doi: 10.1017/S1743921305006897

- Hsieh, H. H., Jewitt, D., & Fernández, Y. R. 2009a, *Albedos of Main-Belt Comets 133P/Elst-Pizarro and 176P/LINEAR*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 694, L111, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/694/2/L111
- Hsieh, H. H., Jewitt, D., & Ishiguro, M. 2009b, *Physical Properties of Main-Belt Comet P/2005 U1 (Read)*, The Astronomical Journal, 137, 157, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/137/1/157
- Hsieh, H. H., Jewitt, D., Lacerda, P., Lowry, S. C., & Snodgrass, C. 2010, *The Return of Activity in Main-Belt Comet 133P/Elst-Pizarro*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 403, 363, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.16120.x
- Hsieh, H. H., Jewitt, D., & Pittichová, J. 2006, *Comet P/1999 RE₇₀ = (118401)*, IAU Circ., 8704, 3
- Hsieh, H. H., Jewitt, D. C., & Fernández, Y. R. 2004, *The Strange Case of 133P/Elst-Pizarro: A Comet among the Asteroids*, The Astronomical Journal, 127, 2997, doi: 10.1086/383208
- Hsieh, H. H., Meech, K. J., & Pittichová, J. 2011c, *Main-Belt Comet 238P/Read Revisited*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 736, L18, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/736/1/L18
- Hsieh, H. H., Novaković, B., Kim, Y., & Brasser, R. 2018a, *Asteroid Family Associations of Active Asteroids*, The Astronomical Journal, 155, 96, doi: 10.3847/1538-3881/aaa5a2
- Hsieh, H. H., & Sheppard, S. S. 2015, *The Reactivation of Main-Belt Comet 324P/La Sagra (P/2010 R₂)*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters, 454, L81, doi: 10.1093/mnrasl/slv125
- Hsieh, H. H., Yang, B., & Haghighipour, N. 2012a, *Optical and Dynamical Characterization of Comet-like Main-belt Asteroid (596) Scheila*, The Astrophysical Journal, 744, 9, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/744/1/9
- Hsieh, H. H., Yang, B., Haghighipour, N., et al. 2012b, *Observational and Dynamical Characterization of Main-belt Comet P/2010 R₂ (La Sagra)*, The Astronomical Journal, 143, 104, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/143/5/104
- . 2012c, *Discovery of Main-belt Comet P/2006 VW₁₃₉ by Pan-STARRS₁*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 748, L15, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/748/1/L15
- Hsieh, H. H., Kaluna, H. M., Novaković, B., et al. 2013, *Main-Belt Comet P/2012 T₁ (PANSTARRS)*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 771, L1, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/771/1/L1
- Hsieh, H. H., Denneau, L., Fitzsimmons, A., et al. 2014, *Search for the Return of Activity in Active Asteroid 176P/LINEAR*, The Astronomical Journal, 147, 89, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/147/4/89
- Hsieh, H. H., Denneau, L., Wainscoat, R. J., et al. 2015a, *The Main-Belt Comets: The Pan-STARRS₁ Perspective*, Icarus, 248, 289, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2014.10.031
- Hsieh, H. H., Hainaut, O., Novaković, B., et al. 2015b, *Sublimation-Driven Activity in Main-Belt Comet 313p/Gibbs*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 800, L16, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/800/1/L16
- Hsieh, H. H., Ishiguro, M., Kim, Y., et al. 2017b, *The Reactivations of Main-Belt Comets 238P/READ, 259P/Garradd, and 288P/(300163) 2006 VW₁₃₉*, American Astronomical Society, 49, 305.10
- . 2018b, *The 2016 Reactivations of the Main-belt Comets 238P/Read and 288P/(300163) 2006 VW₁₃₉*, The Astronomical Journal, 156, 223, doi: 10.3847/1538-3881/aae528
- Hsieh, H. H., Chandler, C. O., Denneau, L., et al. 2021b, *Physical Characterization of Main-belt Comet (248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃*, The Astrophysical Journal, 922, L9, doi: 10/gnmckx
- Hui, M.-T., Farnocchia, D., & Micheli, M. 2019, *C/2010 U₃ (Boattini): A Bizarre Comet Active at Record Heliocentric Distance*, The Astronomical Journal, 157, 162, doi: 10.3847/1538-3881/ab0e09
- Hui, M.-T., & Jewitt, D. 2015, *Archival Observations of Active Asteroid 313p/Gibbs*, The Astronomical Journal, 149, 134, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/149/4/134

- . 2017, *Non-Gravitational Acceleration of the Active Asteroids*, The Astronomical Journal, 153, 80, doi: 10.3847/1538-3881/153/2/80
- Hui, M.-T., Jewitt, D., & Du, X. 2017, *Split Active Asteroid P/2016 J1 (PANSTARRS)*, The Astronomical Journal, 153, 141, doi: 10.3847/1538-3881/aa6039
- Hui, M. T., & Li, J. 2017, *Resurrection of (3200) Phaethon in 2016*, Astronomical Journal, 153, 23, doi: 10.3847/1538-3881/153/1/23
- Hunter, J. D. 2007, *Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment*, Computing in Science & Engineering, 9, 90, doi: 10.1109/MCSE.2007.55
- Husarik, M. 2012, *Relative Photometry of the Possible Main-Belt Comet (596) Scheila after an Outburst*, Contributions of the Astronomical Observatory Skalnaté Pleso, 42, 15
- Ishiguro, M., Ham, J.-B., Tholen, D. J., et al. 2011a, *Search for the Comet Activity of 107P/(4015) Wilson-Harrington during 2009/2010 Apparition*, The Astrophysical Journal, 726, 101, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/726/2/101
- Ishiguro, M., Hanayama, H., Hasegawa, S., et al. 2011b, *Observational Evidence for an Impact on the Main-belt Asteroid (596) Scheila*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 740, L11, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/740/1/L11
- . 2011c, *Interpretation of (596) Scheila's Triple Dust Tails*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 741, L24, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/741/1/L24
- Ivezić, Ž., Kahn, S. M., Tyson, J. A., et al. 2019, *LSST: From Science Drivers to Reference Design and Anticipated Data Products*, The Astrophysical Journal, 873, 111, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ab042c
- Iwata, T., Kawakatsu, Y., Murakami, G., et al. 2016, *Studies on Solar System Explorations Using DESTINY: The Demonstration and Experiment of Space Technology for Interplanetary Voyage*, Transactions of the Japan Society for Aeronautical and Space Sciences, Aerospace Technology Japan, 14, 111, doi: 10.2322/tastj.14.Pk_111
- Jakubík, M., & Neslušan, L. 2015, *Meteor Complex of Asteroid 3200 Phaethon: Its Features Derived from Theory and Updated Meteor Data Bases*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 453, 1186, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stv1643
- Jedicke, R. 2008, *Pan-STARRS: First Solar System Results*, Asteroids, 1405, 8301
- Jester, S., Schneider, D. P., Richards, G. T., et al. 2005, *The Sloan Digital Sky Survey View of the Palomar-Green Bright Quasar Survey*, The Astronomical Journal, 130, 873, doi: 10/cjr8b7
- Jewitt, D. 2005, *A First Look at the Damocloids*, Astronomical Journal, 129, 530, doi: 10.1086/426328
- . 2009, *The Active Centaurs*, The Astronomical Journal, 137, 4296, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/137/5/4296
- . 2012, *The Active Asteroids*, The Astronomical Journal, 143, 66, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/143/3/66
- . 2014, *The Active Asteroids*, Asteroids
- Jewitt, D., Agarwal, J., Li, J., et al. 2014a, *Disintegrating Asteroid P/2013 R3*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 784, L8, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/784/1/L8
- . 2017, *Anatomy of an Asteroid Breakup: The Case of P/2013 R3*, The Astronomical Journal, 153, 223, doi: 10.3847/1538-3881/aa6a57
- Jewitt, D., Agarwal, J., Peixinho, N., et al. 2015a, *A New Active Asteroid 313P/Gibbs*, The Astronomical Journal, 149, 81, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/149/2/81
- Jewitt, D., Agarwal, J., Weaver, H., Mutchler, M., & Larson, S. 2013a, *The Extraordinary Multi-tailed Main-belt Comet P/2013 P5*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 778, L21, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/778/1/L21

- . 2015b, *Episodic Ejection from Active Asteroid 311P/PANSTARRS*, The Astrophysical Journal, 798, 109, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/798/2/109
- Jewitt, D., Agarwal, J., Weaver, H., et al. 2016, *Hubble Space Telescope Observations of Active Asteroid 324P/La Sagra*, The Astronomical Journal, 152, 77, doi: 10.3847/0004-6256/152/3/77
- Jewitt, D., Annis, J., & Soares-Santos, M. 2010a, *Comet P/2010 A2 (LINEAR)*, IAU Circ., 9109, 3
- Jewitt, D., & Haghighipour, N. 2007, *Irregular Satellites of the Planets: Products of Capture in the Early Solar System*, Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics, 45, 261, doi: 10.1146/annurev.astro.44.051905.092459
- Jewitt, D., Hsieh, H., & Agarwal, J. 2015c, *The Active Asteroids*, Asteroids IV, 221, doi: 10.2458/azu_uapress_9780816532131-ch012
- Jewitt, D., & Hsieh, H. H. 2022, *The Asteroid-Comet Continuum*, arXiv, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2203.01397
- Jewitt, D., Ishiguro, M., & Agarwal, J. 2013b, *Large Particles in Active Asteroid P/2010 A2*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 764, L5, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/764/1/L5
- Jewitt, D., Ishiguro, M., Weaver, H., et al. 2014b, *Hubble Space Telescope Investigation of Main-belt Comet 133P/Elst-Pizarro*, The Astronomical Journal, 147, 117, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/147/5/117
- Jewitt, D., & Kim, Y. 2020, *Outbursting Quasi-Hilda Asteroid P/2010 H2 (Vales)*, The Planetary Science Journal, 1, 77, doi: 10/gm25xv
- Jewitt, D., Kim, Y., Luu, J., et al. 2019, *Episodically Active Asteroid 6478 Gault*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 876, L19, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ab1be8
- Jewitt, D., & Li, J. 2010, *Activity in Geminid Parent (3200) Phaethon*, The Astronomical Journal, 140, 1519, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/140/5/1519
- Jewitt, D., Li, J., & Agarwal, J. 2013c, *The Dust Tail of Asteroid (3200) Phaethon*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 771, L36, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/771/2/L36
- Jewitt, D., Li, J., Agarwal, J., et al. 2015d, *Nucleus and Mass Loss from Active Asteroid 313P/Gibbs*, The Astronomical Journal, 150, 76, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/150/3/76
- Jewitt, D., Stuart, J. S., & Li, J. 2011a, *Pre-Discovery Observations of Disrupting Asteroid P/2010 A2*, Astronomical Journal, 142, 28, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/142/1/28
- Jewitt, D., Weaver, H., Agarwal, J., Mutchler, M., & Drahus, M. 2010b, *A Recent Disruption of the Main-Belt Asteroid P/2010A2*, Nature, 467, 817, doi: 10.1038/nature09456
- Jewitt, D., Weaver, H., Mutchler, M., Larson, S., & Agarwal, J. 2011b, *Hubble Space Telescope Observations of Main-Belt Comet (596) Scheila*, Astrophysical Journal Letters, 733, L4, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/733/1/L4
- Jewitt, D., Weaver, H., Mutchler, M., et al. 2018, *The Nucleus of Active Asteroid 311P/(2013 P5) PANSTARRS*, The Astronomical Journal, 155, 231, doi: 10.3847/1538-3881/aabdee
- Jewitt, D., Yang, B., & Haghighipour, N. 2009, *Main-Belt Comet P/2008 R1 (Garradd)*, The Astronomical Journal, 137, 4313, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/137/5/4313
- Johnson, T. V., & Lunine, J. I. 2005, *Saturn's Moon Phoebe as a Captured Body from the Outer Solar System*, Nature, 435, 69, doi: 10.1038/nature03384
- Joye, W. A. 2006, *New Features of SAOImage DS9*, in Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XV ASP Conference Series, Vol. 351, 574–
- Joye, W. A., & Mandel, E. 2003, *New Features of SAOImage DS9*, Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XII ASP Conference Series, 295, 489

- Kargel, J. S. 1994, *Metalliferous Asteroids as Potential Sources of Precious Metals*, Journal of Geophysical Research-Planets, 99, 21129, doi: Doi10.1029/94je02141
- Kasuga, T., & Jewitt, D. 2008, *Observations of 1999 YC and the Breakup of the Geminid Stream Parent*, Astronomical Journal, 136, 881, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/136/2/881
- Keller, S. C., Schmidt, B. P., Bessell, M. S., et al. 2007, *The SkyMapper Telescope and The Southern Sky Survey*, Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia, 24, 1, doi: 10.1071/AS07001
- Kelley, M. S. P., Bolin, B. T., Buzzi, L., et al. 2021a, *(248370) 2005 QN₁₇₃*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams
- Kelley, M. S. P., Hsieh, H. H., Chandler, C. O., et al. 2021b, *Community Challenges in the Era of Petabyte-Scale Sky Surveys*, Planetary Science and Astrobiology Decadal Survey 2023-2032 white paper e-id. 495; Bulletin of the American Astronomical Society, 53, 495, doi: 10/gntkhq
- Kerr, R. A. 1985, *Could an Asteroid Be a Comet in Disguise?: Two Asteroids of the Inner Solar System Are Strong Candidates for Once-Active Comets That Now Masquerade as Inert Hunks of Rock*, Science, 227, 930, doi: 10.1126/science.227.4689.930
- Kim, J., Ishiguro, M., Hanayama, H., et al. 2012, *Multiband Optical Observation of the P/2010 A2 Dust Tail*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 746, L11, doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/746/1/L11
- Kim, Y., Ishiguro, M., & Lee, M. G. 2017a, *New Observational Evidence of Active Asteroid P/2010 A2: Slow Rotation of the Largest Fragment*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 842, L23, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/aa7944
- Kim, Y., Ishiguro, M., Michikami, T., & Nakamura, A. M. 2017b, *Anisotropic Ejection from Active Asteroid P/2010 A2: An Implication of Impact Shattering on an Asteroid*, The Astronomical Journal, 153, 228, doi: 10.3847/1538-3881/aa69bb
- Kleyna, J., Hainaut, O. R., & Meech, K. J. 2013, *P/2010 A2 LINEAR. II. Dynamical Dust Modelling*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 549, A13, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201118428
- Kleyna, J., Meech, K. J., & Hainaut, O. R. 2012, *Faint Moving Object Detection, and the Low Signal-to-Noise Recovery of Main Belt Comet P/2008 R1 Garradd*, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 124, 1083, doi: 10.1086/668253
- Kleyna, J. T., Hainaut, O. R., Meech, K. J., et al. 2019, *The Sporadic Activity of (6478) Gault: A YORP-driven Event?*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 874, L20, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ab0f40
- Knežević, Z., Astronomy, A. M. C. M. a. D., & 2000. 2000, *Synthetic Proper Elements for Outer Main Belt Asteroids*, Springer, 78, 17, doi: 10.1023/A:1011187405509
- Knežević, Z., & Milani, A. 2003, *Proper Element Catalogs and Asteroid Families*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 403, 1165, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361:20030475
- Kossacki, K. J., & Szutowicz, S. 2012, *Main Belt Comet P/2008 R1 Garradd: Duration of Activity*, Icarus, 217, 66, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2011.10.005
- Kowal, C. T., & Gehrels, T. 1977, *Slow-Moving Object Kowal*, International Astronomical Union Circular, 3129, 1
- Kowal, C. T., Liller, W., & Chaisson, L. J. 1977, *1977 UB*, International Astronomical Union Circular, 3147, 1
- Kowalski, R. A., Birtwhistle, P., Sato, H., et al. 2016, *COMET C/2016 Q4 (KOWALSKI)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 4314
- Krasinsky, G. A., Pitjeva, E. V., Vasilyev, M. V., & Yagudina, E. I. 2002, *Hidden Mass in the Asteroid Belt*, Icarus, 158, 98, doi: 10.1006/icar.2002.6837

- Kresák, L. 1972, *Jacobian Integral as a Classificational and Evolutionary Parameter of Interplanetary Bodies*, Bulletin of the Astronomical Institutes of Czechoslovakia, 23, 1
- Kronk, G. W. 1999, *Cometography: A Catalog of Comets, Volume 1: Ancient-1799* (Cambridge University Press)
- Kuijken, K. 2011, *OmegaCAM: ESO's Newest Imager*, The Messenger, 146, 8
- Kuijken, K., Bender, R., Cappellaro, E., et al. 2002, *OmegaCAM: The 16k×16k CCD Camera for the VLT Survey Telescope*, The Messenger, 110, 15
- Kuminski, E., George, J., Wallin, J., & Shamir, L. 2014, *Combining Human and Machine Learning for Morphological Analysis of Galaxy Images*, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 126, 959, doi: 10.1086/678977
- Küppers, M., O'Rourke, L., Bockelée-Morvan, D., et al. 2014, *Localized Sources of Water Vapour on the Dwarf Planet (1)Ceres*, Nature, 505, 525, doi: 10.1038/nature12918
- Laher, R. R., Gorjian, V., Rebull, L. M., et al. 2012, *Aperture Photometry Tool*, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 124, 737, doi: 10/gg3d22
- Landis, M. E., Byrne, S., Schörghofer, N., et al. 2017, *Conditions for Sublimating Water Ice to Supply Ceres' Exosphere*, Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 122, 1984, doi: 10.1002/2017JE005335
- Lang, D., Hogg, D. W., Mierle, K., Blanton, M., & Roweis, S. 2010, *Astrometry.Net: Blind Astrometric Calibration of Arbitrary Astronomical Images*, Astronomical Journal, 139, 1782, doi: 10.1088/0004-6256/139/5/1782
- Larsen, J. A., Roe, E. S., Albert, C. E., et al. 2007, *The Search for Distant Objects in the Solar System Using Spacewatch*, The Astronomical Journal, 133, 1247, doi: 10.1086/511155
- Larson, S., Brownlee, J., Hergenrother, C., & Spahr, T. 1998, *The Catalina Sky Survey for NEOs*, American Astronomical Society, 30, 12.P14
- Larson, S., Kowalski, R., Sato, H., Yoshimoto, K., & Nakano, S. 2010, *(596) Scheila*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 2583, 1
- Lauretta, D. S., Hergenrother, C. W., Chesley, S. R., et al. 2019, *Episodes of Particle Ejection from the Surface of the Active Asteroid (101955) Bennu*, Science, 366, 3544, doi: 10.1126/science.aay3544
- Le Corre, L., Sanchez, J. A., Reddy, V., et al. 2018, *Ground-Based Characterization of Hayabusa2 Mission Target Asteroid 162173 Ryugu: Constraining Mineralogical Composition in Preparation for Spacecraft Operations*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 475, 614, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stx3236
- Lee, C.-H. 2019, *Early Detection of (6478) Gault's New Tail*, The Astronomer's Telegram, 2468
- Levison, H. F. 1996, *Comet Taxonomy*, Completing the Inventory of the Solar System, Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Proceedings, 107, 173
- Levison, H. F., & Duncan, M. J. 1994, *The Long-Term Dynamical Behavior of Short-Period Comets*, Icarus, 108, 18, doi: 10/bng69z
- Lewicki, C., Diamandis, P., Anderson, E., Voorhees, C., & Mycroft, F. 2013, *Planetary Resources—The Asteroid Mining Company*, New Space, 1, 105, doi: 10/gg28cf
- Li, J., & Jewitt, D. 2013, *Recurrent Perihelion Activity in (3200) Phaethon*, Astronomical Journal, 145, 154, doi: 10/gg28ch
- Li, J.-Y., Reddy, V., Nathues, A., et al. 2016, *Surface Albedo and Spectral Variability of Ceres*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 817, L22, doi: 10/ggzsfj

- Liang-liang, Y., Jiang-hui, J., & Su, W. 2014, *Investigation of Thermal Inertia and Surface Properties for Near-earth Asteroid (162173) 1999 JU₃*, Chinese Astronomy and Astrophysics, 38, 317, doi: 10/gg28cn
- Licandro, J., Campins, H., Mothe-Diniz, T., Pinilla-Alonso, N., & de Leon, J. 2007, *The Nature of Comet-Asteroid Transition Object (3200) Phaethon*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 461, 751, doi: 10/d5txvm
- Licandro, J., Campins, H., Tozzi, G. P., et al. 2011, *Testing the Comet Nature of Main Belt Comets. The Spectra of 133P/Elst-Pizarro and 176P/LINEAR*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 532, A65, doi: 10/b45htc
- Licandro, J., Campins, H., Kelley, M., et al. 2009, *Spitzer Observations of the Asteroid-Comet Transition Object and Potential Spacecraft Target 107P (4015) Wilson-Harrington*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 507, 1667, doi: 10/c3xrc2
- Lilly, E., Weryk, R., Micheli, M., & Woodworth, D. 2015, *Comet C/2015 J2 (Panstarrs)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 4100, 1
- Lintott, C. J., Schawinski, K., Slosar, A., et al. 2008, *Galaxy Zoo: Morphologies Derived from Visual Inspection of Galaxies from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 389, 1179, doi: 10/f7m
- Liu, P. Y., & Ip, W. H. 2019, *An Investigation on the Origin of Centaurs' Color-Inclination Relation*, Astrophysical Journal, 880, 71, doi: 10/gg28cw
- Lowry, S. C., Fitzsimmons, A., Pravec, P., et al. 2007, *Direct Detection of the Asteroidal YORP Effect*, Science, 316, 272, doi: 10/d45hpk
- Luna, R., Satorre, M. Á., Santonja, C., & Domingo, M. 2014, *New Experimental Sublimation Energy Measurements for Some Relevant Astrophysical Ices*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 566, A27, doi: 10/gg28c6
- MacLennan, E. M., & Hsieh, H. H. 2012, *The Nucleus of Main-belt Comet 259P/Garradd*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 758, L3, doi: 10/gg28db
- Mainzer, A., Read, M. T., Scottii, J. V., Ryan, W. H., & Ryan, E. V. 2010, *Comet P/2009 WJ₅₀ 5La Sagra*., IAU Circ., 9117, 1
- Mainzer, A. K., Bauer, J. M., Cutri, R. M., et al. 2019, *NEOWISE Diameters and Albedos V2.0*, NASA Planetary Data System, doi: 10/gm25z4
- Masi, G. 2017, *(457175) 2008 GO₉₈*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 4418
- Masiero, J., Jedicke, R., Ďurech, J., et al. 2009, *The Thousand Asteroid Light Curve Survey*, Icarus, 204, 145, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2009.06.012
- Maury, A., de Vanssay, J. B., Soulier, J. F., et al. 2019, *(6478) Gault*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 4597
- McCord, T. B., Castillo-Rogez, J., & Rivkin, A. 2011, *Ceres: Its Origin, Evolution and Structure and Dawn's Potential Contribution*, Space Science Reviews, 163, 63, doi: 10.1007/s11214-010-9729-9
- McFadden, L. A., Cochran, A. L., Barker, E. S., Cruikshank, D. P., & Hartmann, W. K. 1993, *The Enigmatic Object 2201 Oljato - Is It an Asteroid or an Evolved Comet?*, Journal of Geophysical Research (ISSN 0148-0227), 98, 3031, doi: 10/bn8nvf
- McKay, A. J., Bodewits, D., & Li, J.-Y. 2017, *Observational Constraints on Water Sublimation from 24 Themis and 1 Ceres*, Icarus, 286, 308, doi: 10/f9wnpf
- McKinney, W. 2010, *Data Structures for Statistical Computing in Python*, in Python in Science Conference, Austin, Texas, 56–61

- McNeill, A., Fitzsimmons, A., Jedicke, R., et al. 2016, *Brightness Variation Distributions among Main Belt Asteroids from Sparse Light-Curve Sampling with Pan-STARRS 1*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 459, 2964, doi: 10/f8v8sc
- Meech, K. J., & Belton, M. J. S. 1990, *The Atmosphere of 2060 Chiron*, Astronomical Journal, 100, 1323, doi: 10/c39fzh
- Meech, K. J., Yang, B., Keane, J., et al. 2014, *C/2013 P2 Pan STARRS - The Manx Comet*, American Astronomical Society, DPS meeting #46, 46, 200.02
- Micheli, M., Tholen, D. J., Primak, N., et al. 2013, *Comet P/2013 P5 (Panstarrs)*, Minor Planet Electronic Circ.
- Micheli, M., Farnocchia, D., Meech, K. J., et al. 2018, *Non-Gravitational Acceleration in the Trajectory of 1I/2017 U1 ('Oumuamua)*, Nature, 559, 223, doi: 10/crkk
- Milani, A., Carpino, M., Hahn, G., & Nobili, A. M. 1989, *Dynamics of Planet-Crossing Asteroids: Classes of Orbital Behavior Project SPACEGUARD*, Icarus, 78, 212, doi: 10.1016/0019-1035(89)90174-7
- Miles, R. 2016, *Discrete Sources of Cryovolcanism on the Nucleus of Comet 29P/Schwassmann-Wachmann and Their Origin*, Icarus, 272, 387, doi: 10/gg28ff
- Mommert, M. 2017, *PHOTOMETRYPIPELINE: An Automated Pipeline for Calibrated Photometry*, Astronomy and Computing, 18, 47, doi: 10/gg28fm
- Mommert, M., Polishook, D., & Moskovitz, N. A. 2018, *CBET 4502: 20180329 : (3552) Don Quixote*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams
- Mommert, M., Hora, J. L., Harris, A. W., et al. 2014, *The Discovery of Cometary Activity in Near-Earth Asteroid (3552) Don Quixote*, The Astrophysical Journal, 781, 25, doi: 10/gg28fq
- Morbidelli, A., Comets and Their Reservoirs: Current Dynamics and Primordial Evolution. 2008, in Saas-Fee Advanced Course 35: Trans-Neptunian Objects and Comets (Springer), 132
- Morbidelli, A., Chambers, J., Lunine, J. I., et al. 2000, *Source Regions and Time Scales for the Delivery of Water to Earth*, Meteoritics & Planetary Science, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 1309-1320 (2000)., 35, 1309, doi: 10.1111/j.1945-5100.2000.tb01518.x
- Morbidelli, A., & Nesvorný, D. 2020, *Kuiper Belt: Formation and Evolution* (Elsevier), 25–59, doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-816490-7.00002-3
- Moreno, F., Cabrera-Lavers, A., Vaduvescu, O., Licandro, J., & Pozuelos, F. 2013, *The Dust Environment of Main-Belt Comet P/2012 T1 (PANSTARRS)*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 770, L30, doi: 10/gg28ft
- Moreno, F., Lara, L. M., Licandro, J., et al. 2011a, *The Dust Environment of Main-Belt Comet P/2010 R2 (La Sagra)*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 738, L16, doi: 10/fjgcpn
- Moreno, F., Licandro, J., Álvarez-Iglesias, C., Cabrera-Lavers, A., & Pozuelos, F. 2014, *Intermittent Dust Mass Loss from Activated Asteroid P/2013 P5 (PANSTARRS)*, The Astrophysical Journal, 781, 118, doi: 10/gg28fv
- Moreno, F., Licandro, J., & Cabrera-Lavers, A. 2012, *A Short-duration Event as the Cause of Dust Ejection from Main-Belt Comet P/2012 F5 (Gibbs)*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 761, L12, doi: 10/gg28fw
- Moreno, F., Licandro, J., Cabrera-Lavers, A., & Pozuelos, F. J. 2016a, *Dust Loss from Activated Asteroid P/2015 X6*, The Astrophysical Journal, 826, 137, doi: 10/gg28fz
- . 2016b, *Early Evolution of Disrupted Asteroid P/2016 G1 (PANSTARRS)*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 826, L22, doi: 10/gg28fx

- Moreno, F., Licandro, J., Mutchler, M., et al. 2017, *Disrupted Asteroid P/2016 G1. II. Follow-up Observations from the Hubble Space Telescope*, The Astronomical Journal, 154, 248, doi: 10/gg28f2
- Moreno, F., Licandro, J., Tozzi, G. P., et al. 2010, *Water-Ice-Driven Activity on Main-Belt Comet P/2010 A2 (LINEAR)?*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 718, L132, doi: 10/d9wv63
- Moreno, F., Licandro, J., Ortiz, J. L., et al. 2011b, *(596) Scheila in Outburst: A Probable Collision Event in the Main Asteroid Belt*, The Astrophysical Journal, 738, 130, doi: 10/dnk4jg
- Moreno, F., Jehin, E., Licandro, J., et al. 2019, *Dust Properties of Double-Tailed Active Asteroid (6478) Gault*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 624, L14, doi: 10/gg28fs
- Moskovitz, N., Burt, B., Schottland, R., et al. 2021, *The Astorb Database at Lowell Observatory*, AAS Division of Planetary Science meeting #53, id. 101.04, 53, 101.04
- Moskovitz, N., Schottland, R., Burt, B., Bailen, M., & Wasserman, L. 2018, *Astorb at Lowell Observatory: A Comprehensive System to Enable Asteroid Science*, American Astronomical Society, 50, 408.08
- Moskovitz, N., Schottland, R., Burt, B., et al. 2019, *Modernizing Lowell Observatory's Astorb Database*, EPSC-DPS Joint Meeting 2019, 2019, EPSC
- Nakano, S. 1986, *(1026) Ingrid*, IAU Circ., 4281, 1
- Nakano, S., Skiff, B. A., Van Ness, M. E., & Bolin, B. 2014, *Comet P/2003 S10 = P/2014 S4 (Gibbs)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 4003, 1
- Nathues, A., Hoffmann, M., Schaefer, M., et al. 2015, *Sublimation in Bright Spots on (1) Ceres*, Nature, 528, 237, doi: 10/f74fc4
- Nathues, A., Platz, T., Thangjam, G., et al. 2017a, *Evolution of Occator Crater on (1) Ceres*, The Astronomical Journal, 153, 112, doi: 10/gg28f8
- Nathues, A., Platz, T., Hoffmann, M., et al. 2017b, *Oxo Crater on (1) Ceres: Geological History and the Role of Water-ice*, The Astronomical Journal, 154, 84, doi: 10/gg28f7
- Nathues, A., Schmedemann, N., Thangjam, G., et al. 2020, *Recent Cryovolcanic Activity at Occator Crater on Ceres*, Nature Astronomy, 4, 794, doi: 10.1038/s41550-020-1146-8
- Neslušan, L., Ivanova, O., Husarik, M., Svoren, J., & Krisandova, Z. S. 2016, *Dust Productivity and Impact Collision of the Asteroid (596) Scheila*, Planetary and Space Science, 125, 37, doi: 10/f8pvc9
- Nicholson, S. B. 1914, *Discovery of the Ninth Satellite of Jupiter*, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 26, 197, doi: 10.1086/122336
- Nimmo, F., Spencer, J. R., Pappalardo, R. T., & Mullen, M. E. 2007, *Shear Heating as the Origin of the Plumes and Heat Flux on Enceladus*, Nature, 447, 289, doi: 10.1038/nature05783
- Nomen, J., Birtwhistle, P., Holmes, R., Foglia, S., & Scotti, J. V. 2010, *Comet P/2010 R2 (La Sagra)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 2459, 1
- Novaković, B., Hsieh, H. H., & Cellino, A. 2012, *P/2006 VW139: A Main-Belt Comet Born in an Asteroid Collision?*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 424, 1432, doi: 10/gg28gg
- Novaković, B., Hsieh, H. H., Cellino, A., Micheli, M., & Pedani, M. 2014, *Discovery of a Young Asteroid Cluster Associated with P/2012 F5 (Gibbs)*, Icarus, 231, 300, doi: 10/gg28gh
- Ochsenbein, F., Bauer, P., & Marcout, J. 2000, *The VizieR Database of Astronomical Catalogues*, Astronomy and Astrophysics Supplement, 143, 23, doi: 10/fb95hg
- Ohtsuka, K., Arakida, H., Ito, T., Yoshikawa, M., & Asher, D. J. 2008, *Apollo Asteroid 1999 YC: Another Large Member of the PGC?*, Meteoritics & Planetary Science, 43, A121

- Ohtsuka, K., Nakato, A., Nakamura, T., et al. 2009, *Solar-Radiation Heating Effects on 3200 Phaethon*, Publications of the Astronomical Society of Japan, 61, 1375, doi: 10/ggw3dx
- Ohtsuka, K., Sekiguchi, T., Kinoshita, D., et al. 2006, *Apollo Asteroid 2005 UD: Split Nucleus of (3200) Phaethon?*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 450, L25, doi: 10/ddp5b4
- O’Leary, B. 1977, *Mining the Apollo and Amor Asteroids*, Science, 197, 363, doi: 10/bcx5bz
- Oort, J. H. 1950, *The Structure of the Cloud of Comets Surrounding the Solar System and a Hypothesis Concerning Its Origin*, Bulletin of the Astronomical Institutes of the Netherlands, 11, 91
- O’Rourke, L., Snodgrass, C., de Val-Borro, M., et al. 2013, *Determination of an Upper Limit for the Water Outgassing Rate of Main-belt Comet P/2012 T1 (PANSTARRS)*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 774, L13, doi: 10/gg28gn
- Osip, D. J., Campins, H., & Schleicher, D. G. 1995, *The Rotation State of 4015-Wilson-Harrington - Revisiting Origins for the near-Earth Asteroids*, Icarus, 114, 423, doi: 10/bnm6bq
- Oterma, L. 1942, *NEW COMET OTERMA (1942 b)*, Bureau Central Astronomique de l’Union Astronomique Internationale, 900
- Ozaki, N., Yamamoto, T., Gonzalez-Franquesa, F., et al. 2022, *Mission Design of DESTINY+: Toward Active Asteroid (3200) Phaethon and Multiple Small Bodies*, Acta Astronautica, 196, 42, doi: 10.1016/j.actaastro.2022.03.029
- Patterson, M. T., Bellm, E. C., Rusholme, B., et al. 2018, *The Zwicky Transient Facility Alert Distribution System*, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 131, 018001, doi: 10.1088/1538-3873/aae904
- . 2019, *The Zwicky Transient Facility Alert Distribution System*, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 131, 018001, doi: 10.1088/1538-3873/aae904
- Peixinho, N., Thirouin, A., Tegler, S. C., et al. 2020, *From Centaurs to Comets - 40 Years*, The Trans-Neptunian Solar System, 307, doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-816490-7.00014-X
- Perna, D., Barucci, M. A., Ishiguro, M., et al. 2017, *Spectral and Rotational Properties of Near-Earth Asteroid (162173) Ryugu, Target of the Hayabusa2 Sample Return Mission*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 599, L1, doi: 10/gg28hc
- Perozzi, E., Rossi, A., & Valsecchi, G. B. 2001, *Basic Targeting Strategies for Rendezvous and Flyby Missions to the Near-Earth Asteroids*, Planetary and Space Science, 49, 3, doi: 10/d4ht59
- Piazzi, G. 1801, *Risultati Delle Osservazioni Della Nuova Stella Scoperta Il Di’ 1. Gennaio All’Osservatorio Reale Di Palermo*, doi: 10.3931/e-rara-8730
- Pitjeva, E. V., & Pitjev, N. P. 2018, *Masses of the Main Asteroid Belt and the Kuiper Belt from the Motions of Planets and Spacecraft*, Astronomy Letters, 44, 554, doi: 10.1134/S1063773718090050
- Pittichová, J., & Chesley, S. R. 2010, *Comet P/2005 U1 = 2010 N2 (Read)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 2394, 1
- Pozuelos, F. J., Cabrera-Lavers, A., Licandro, J., & Moreno, F. 2015, *On the Dust Environment of Main-Belt Comet 313P/Gibbs*, The Astrophysical Journal, 806, 102, doi: 10/gg28hp
- Pravdo, S., Helin, E. F., Hicks, M., & Lawrence, K. 2001, *Comet C/2001 T4 (NEAT)*, International Astronomical Union Circular, 7738, 1
- Pravdo, S. H., Rabinowitz, D. L., Helin, E. F., et al. 1999, *The Near-Earth Asteroid Tracking (NEAT) Program: An Automated System for Telescope Control, Wide-Field Imaging, and Object Detection*, The Astronomical Journal, 117, 1616, doi: 10.1086/300769

- Prettyman, T. H., Yamashita, N., Toplis, M. J., et al. 2017, *Extensive Water Ice within Ceres' Aqueously Altered Regolith: Evidence from Nuclear Spectroscopy*, *Science*, 355, 55, doi: 10/bv3z
- Prialnik, D., & Rosenberg, E. D. 2009, *Can Ice Survive in Main-Belt Comets? Long-term Evolution Models of Comet 133P/Elst-Pizarro*, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters*, 399, L79, doi: 10/cnz3rm
- Rayman, M. D., & Varghese, P. 2001, *The Deep Space 1 Extended Mission*, *Acta Astronautica*, 48, 693, doi: 10/bdgzdq
- Read, M. T., Bressi, T. H., Gehrels, T., Scotti, J. V., & Christensen, E. J. 2005, *Comet P/2005 U1 (Read)*, *IAU Circ.*, 8624, 1
- Read, M. T., & Scotti, J. V. 2005, *Comet P/2005 T3 (Read)*, *International Astronomical Union Circular*, 8614, 2
- Reback, J., jbrockmendel, McKinney, W., et al. 2022, *Pandas-Dev/Pandas: Pandas 1.4.2*, *Zenodo*, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.6408044
- Rein, H., & Liu, S.-F. 2012, *REBOUND: An Open-Source Multi-Purpose N-body Code for Collisional Dynamics*, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 537, A128, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201118085
- Rein, H., & Spiegel, D. S. 2015, *IAS15: A Fast, Adaptive, High-Order Integrator for Gravitational Dynamics, Accurate to Machine Precision over a Billion Orbits*, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 446, 1424, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stu2164
- Rein, H., Hernandez, D. M., Tamayo, D., et al. 2019, *Hybrid Symplectic Integrators for Planetary Dynamics*, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 485, 5490, doi: 10/gksdwc
- Rennilson, J. J., & Criswell, D. R. 1974, *Surveyor Observations of Lunar Horizon-Glow*, *Moon*, 10, 121, doi: 10.1007/BF00655715
- Rivkin, A. S., Asphaug, E., & Bottke, W. F. 2014, *The Case of the Missing Ceres Family*, *Icarus*, 243, 429, doi: 10/f6p4kv
- Rivkin, A. S., & Emery, J. P. 2010, *Detection of Ice and Organics on an Asteroidal Surface*, *Nature*, 464, 1322, doi: 10/d8j7cb
- Robitaille, T. P., Tollerud, E. J., Greenfield, P., et al. 2013, *Astropy: A Community Python Package for Astronomy*, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 558, A33, doi: 10/gfvntd
- Romanishin, W., Tegler, S. C., Boattini, A., De Luise, F., & Di Paola, A. 2005, *COMET C/2004 PY42 (CINEOS)*, *Central Bureau for Astronomical Telegrams*, 8545
- Roth, L. 2018, *Constraints on Water Vapor and Sulfur Dioxide at Ceres: Exploiting the Sensitivity of the Hubble Space Telescope*, *Icarus*, 305, 149, doi: 10/gc6dnz
- Roth, L., Ivchenko, N., Retherford, K. D., et al. 2016, *Constraints on an Exosphere at Ceres from Hubble Space Telescope Observations*, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43, 2465, doi: 10/f3rqmp
- Rousselot, P., Dumas, C., & Merlin, F. 2011, *Near-Infrared Spectroscopy of 133P/Elst-Pizarro*, *Icarus*, 211, 553, doi: 10/cpdv5q
- Russell, C. T., Aroian, R., Arghavani, M., & Nock, K. 1984, *Interplanetary Magnetic Field Enhancements and Their Association with the Asteroid 2201 Oljato*, *Science*, 226, 43, doi: 10/dqw9q2
- Russell, C. T., Raymond, C. A., Ammannito, E., et al. 2016, *Dawn Arrives at Ceres: Exploration of a Small, Volatile-Rich World*, *Science*, 353, 1008, doi: 10/ggrdbr
- Ryabova, G. O. 2012, *On the Possible Ejection of Meteoroids from Asteroid (3200) Phaethon in 2009*, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 423, 2254, doi: 10/gg28h7

- Sarli, B. V., Horikawa, M., Yam, C. H., Kawakatsu, Y., & Yamamoto, T. 2017, *DESTINY+ Trajectory Design to (3200) Phaethon*, The Journal of the Astronautical Sciences, 37, 6, doi: 10/gg28jh
- Sato, H. 2017, (457175) 2008 GO₉₈, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 4418
- Satō, I., Buie, M., Maley, P. D., et al. 2014, *A 3-D Shape Model of (704) Interamnia from Its Occultations and Lightcurves*, International Journal of Astronomy and Astrophysics, 4, 91, doi: 10/gg28jj
- Schirmer, M. 2013, *THELI: Convenient Reduction of Optical, Near-infrared, and Mid-infrared Imaging Data*, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 209, 21, doi: 10/gf8n35
- Schmadel, L. D., & Union, I. A. 2003, Dictionary of Minor Planet Names (Berlin ; New York : Springer)
- Schorghofer, N. 2008a, *Lifetime of Ice on Main Belt Asteroids*, Astrophysical Journal, 682, 697, doi: 10/br2vgb
- . 2008b, *The Lifetime of Ice on Main Belt Asteroids*, The Astrophysical Journal, 682, 697, doi: 10/br2vgb
- . 2016, *Predictions of Depth-to-Ice on Asteroids Based on an Asynchronous Model of Temperature, Impact Stirring, and Ice Loss*, Icarus, 276, 88, doi: 10/gg3zgg
- Schröder, S. E., Mottola, S., Carsenty, U., et al. 2017, *Resolved Spectrophotometric Properties of the Ceres Surface from Dawn Framing Camera Images*, Icarus, 288, 201, doi: 10.1016/j.icarus.2017.01.026
- Schwassmann, A., & Wachmann, A. A. 1927, *NEW COMET.*, Bureau Central Astronomique de l'Union Astronomique Internationale Observatoire de Copenhague, 171
- Seargent, D. A. J. 2017, *Weird Comets and Asteroids* (Cham: Springer)
- Seligman, D., Laughlin, G., & Batygin, K. 2019, *On the Anomalous Acceleration of 1I/2017 U1 'Oumuamua*, The Astrophysical Journal, 876, L26, doi: 10.3847/2041-8213/ab0bb5
- Sesar, B., Stuart, J. S., Ivezić, Ž., et al. 2011, *Exploring the Variable Sky with LINEAR. I. Photometric Recalibration with the Sloan Digital Sky Survey*, The Astronomical Journal, 142, 190, doi: 10/fxdjms
- Sheppard, S. S., & Trujillo, C. 2015, *Discovery and Characteristics of the Rapidly Rotating Active Asteroid (62412) 2000 SY178 in the Main Belt*, The Astronomical Journal, 149, 44, doi: 10/gg28j3
- . 2016, *New Extreme Trans-Neptunian Objects: Toward a Super-Earth in the Outer Solar System*, The Astronomical Journal, 152, 221, doi: 10/gg28j4
- Shi, J., Ma, Y., Liang, H., & Xu, R. 2019, *Research of Activity of Main Belt Comets 176P/LINEAR, 238P/Read and 288P/(300163) 2006 VW139*, Scientific Reports, 9, 5492, doi: 10/gfxsfk
- Shi, J. C., & Ma, Y. H. 2015, *CCD Photometry of Active Centaur 166P/2001 T₄ (NEAT)*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 454, 3635, doi: 10/gg28j5
- Sierks, H., Barbieri, C., Lamy, P. L., et al. 2015, *On the Nucleus Structure and Activity of Comet 67P/Churyumov-Gerasimenko*, Science, 347, aaa1044, doi: 10.1126/science.aaa1044
- Skiff, B. A., Van Ness, M. E., Johnson, J. A., et al. 2014, *Comet P/2014 S₄ = 2003 S10 (Gibbs)*, Minor Planet Electronic Circ.
- Smith, K. W., Denneau, L., Vincent, J. B., Weryk, R., & Hale, A. 2019, (6478) Gault, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 4594
- Snodgrass, C., Fitzsimmons, A., Lowry, S. C., & Weissman, P. 2011, *The Size Distribution of Jupiter Family Comet Nuclei*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 414, 458, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.18406.x
- Snodgrass, C., Yang, B., & Fitzsimmons, A. 2017a, *X-Shooter Search for Outgassing from Main Belt Comet P/2012 T₁ (Pan-STARRS)*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 605, A56, doi: 10/gg28kf

- Snodgrass, C., Tubiana, C., Vincent, J.-B., et al. 2010, *A Collision in 2009 as the Origin of the Debris Trail of Asteroid P/2010A2*, *Nature*, 467, 814, doi: 10/cjcj26
- Snodgrass, C., Agarwal, J., Combi, M., et al. 2017b, *The Main Belt Comets and Ice in the Solar System*, *The Astronomy and Astrophysics Review*, 25, 5, doi: 10/ggw3ff
- Snodgrass, C., Jones, G. H., Boehnhardt, H., et al. 2017c, *The Castalia Mission to Main Belt Comet 133P/Elst-Pizarro*, *Advances in Space Research*, 62, 1947, doi: 10/gg28kd
- Sollitt, L. S., Kroening, K., Malmstrom, R., Segura, T., & Spittler, C. 2009, *Mission Concepts to 4015 Wilson-Harrington*, *Lunar and Planetary Science Conference*, 40
- Sonnett, S., Kleya, J., Jedicke, R., & Masiero, J. 2011a, *Limits on the Size and Orbit Distribution of Main Belt Comets*, *Icarus*, 215, 534, doi: 10/d3vp56
- . 2011b, *Limits on the Size and Orbit Distribution of Main Belt Comets*, *Icarus*, 215, 534, doi: 10/d3vp56
- Sori, M. M., Byrne, S., Bland, M. T., et al. 2017, *The Vanishing Cryovolcanoes of Ceres*, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44, 1243, doi: 10.1002/2016GL072319
- Sosa Oyarzabal, A., Mammama, L., & Fernández, J. A. 2014, *A Photometric Search for Activity among Asteroids and Centaurs*, *Asteroids*
- Spencer, J. R., Pearl, J. C., Segura, M., et al. 2006, *Cassini Encounters Enceladus: Background and the Discovery of a South Polar Hot Spot*, *Science*, 311, 1401, doi: 10.1126/science.1121661
- Standage, T. 2000, *The Neptune File: A Story of Astronomical Rivalry and the Pioneers of Planet Hunting* (Walker)
- Stern, S. A., Bagenal, F., Ennico, K., et al. 2015, *The Pluto System: Initial Results from Its Exploration by New Horizons*, *Science*, 350, aad1815, doi: 10.1126/science.aad1815
- Stevenson, R., Kramer, E. A., Bauer, J. M., Masiero, J. R., & Mainzer, A. K. 2012, *Characterization of Active Main Belt Object P/2012 F5 (Gibbs): A Possible Impacted Asteroid*, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 759, 142, doi: 10/gg28kk
- Stokes, G. H., Evans, J. B., Viggh, H. E. M., Shelly, F. C., & Pearce, E. C. 2000, *Lincoln Near-Earth Asteroid Program (LINEAR)*, *Icarus*, 148, 21, doi: 10/dft93f
- Stoss, R. 2011, *J75 La Sagra Sky Survey*
- Sugita, S., Honda, R., Morota, T., et al. 2019, *The Geomorphology, Color, and Thermal Properties of Ryugu: Implications for Parent-Body Processes*, *Science*, 364, eaaw0422, doi: 10.1126/science.aaw0422
- Suzuki, H., Yamada, M., Kouyama, T., et al. 2018, *Initial Inflight Calibration for Hayabusa2 Optical Navigation Camera (ONC) for Science Observations of Asteroid Ryugu*, *Icarus*, 300, 341, doi: 10/gg28kr
- Swings, J. P. 1986, *Transactions of the International Astronomical Union, Volume XIXB: Proceedings of the Nineteenth General Assembly, Delhi 1985.*, *Transactions of the International Astronomical Union, Series B*, 19
- Tancredi, G. 2014, *A Criterion to Classify Asteroids and Comets Based on the Orbital Parameters*, *Icarus*, 234, 66, doi: 10/f5zszk
- Tedesco, E. F., & Desert, F.-X. 2002, *The Infrared Space Observatory Deep Asteroid Search*, *The Astronomical Journal*, 123, 2070, doi: 10.1086/339482
- Tegler, S. C., Bauer, J. M., Romanishin, W., & Peixinho, N. 2008, *Colors of Centaurs*, *The Solar System Beyond Neptune*, 105

- Tegler, S. C., Romanishin, W., & G. J. Consolmagno, S. J. 2016, *TWO COLOR POPULATIONS OF KUIPER BELT AND CENTAUR OBJECTS AND THE SMALLER ORBITAL INCLINATIONS OF RED CENTAUR OBJECTS*, The Astronomical Journal, 152, 210, doi: 10/gg28ks
- Thangjam, G., Hoffmann, M., Nathues, A., Li, J. Y., & Platz, T. 2016, *Haze at Occator Crater on Dwarf Planet Ceres*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 833, L25, doi: 10/gg28kx
- Tholen, D. J., Sheppard, S. S., & Trujillo, C. A. 2015a, *Evidence for an Impact Event on (493) Griseldis*, American Astronomical Society, 47, 414.03
- Tholen, D. J., Trujillo, C., & Sheppard, S. S. 2015b, *Comet C/2015 T5 (Sheppard-Tholen)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 4177
- Tisserand, F. 1896, *Mécanique Céleste*, Vol. IV (Paris: Gauthier-Villars)
- Todorović, N. 2018, *The Dynamical Connection between Phaethon and Pallas*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 475, 601, doi: 10/gg28k3
- Toth, I. 2000, *Impact-Generated Activity Period of the Asteroid 7968 Elst-Pizarro in 1996: Identification of the Asteroid 427 Galene as the Most Probable Parent Body of the Impactors*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 360, 375
- . 2006a, *The Quasi-Hilda Subgroup of Ecliptic Comets - an Update*, Astronomy and Astrophysics, Volume 448, Issue 3, March IV 2006, pp.1191-1196, 448, 1191, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361:20053492
- . 2006b, *Search for Comet-like Activity in Asteroid 7968 Elst-Pizarro and Limitation of Its Rotational Pole Orientation*, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 446, 333, doi: 10/ckwm9v
- Trilling, D. E., Robinson, T., Roegge, A., et al. 2017, *Implications for Planetary System Formation from Interstellar Object 1I/2017 U1 ('Oumuamua)*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 850, L38, doi: 10/gg28k6
- Trujillo, C. A., & Sheppard, S. S. 2014, *A Sedna-like Body with a Perihelion of 80 Astronomical Units*, Nature, 507, 471, doi: 10/s73
- Tsuda, Y., Yoshikawa, M., Abe, M., Minamino, H., & Nakazawa, S. 2013, *System Design of the Hayabusa 2—Asteroid Sample Return Mission to 1999 JU3*, Acta Astronautica, 91, 356, doi: 10/f48tvs
- Tu, L., Ip, W. H., & Wang, Y. C. 2014, *A Sublimation-driven Exospheric Model of Ceres*, Planetary and Space Science, 104, 157, doi: 10/f6wx5v
- Tubbiolo, A. F., Bressi, T. H., Wainscoat, R. J., et al. 2015, *Comet P/2015 X6 (Panstarrs)*, Minor Planet Electronic Circ., 2015-X180
- Urakawa, S., Okumura, S.-i., Nishiyama, K., et al. 2011, *Photometric Observations of 107P/Wilson-Harrington*, Icarus, 215, 17, doi: 10/cjc55x
- Vaghi, S. 1973a, *The Origin of Jupiter's Family of Comets*, Astronomy and Astrophysics, Vol. 24, p. 41 (1973), 24, 41
- . 1973b, *Orbital Evolution of Comets and Dynamical Characteristics of Jupiter's Family*, Astronomy and Astrophysics, Vol. 29, p. 85 (1973), 29, 85
- van Biesbroeck, G. 1951, *Comet Notes: Comet 1951 i (Wilson-Harrington)*, Popular Astronomy, 59, 491
- Vera C. Rubin Observatory LSST Solar System Science Collaboration, Jones, R. L., Bannister, M. T., et al. 2021, *The Scientific Impact of the Vera C. Rubin Observatory's Legacy Survey of Space and Time (LSST) for Solar System Science*, Planetary Science and Astrobiology Decadal Survey 2023-2032 white paper e-id. 236, Bulletin of the American Astronomical Society, 53, 236, doi: 10/gntcrf
- Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., et al. 2020, *SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python*, Nature Methods, 17, 261, doi: 10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2

- Wainscoat, R., Denneau, L., Hsieh, H., et al. 2011, *Comet C/2011 P2 (Panstarrs)*, International Astronomical Union Circular, 9225, 1
- Wainscoat, R., Hsieh, H., Denneau, L., et al. 2012, *Comet P/2012 T1 (Panstarrs)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 3252, 1
- Wainscoat, R., Veres, P., Micheli, M., et al. 2013, *Comet C/2013 P4 (Panstarrs)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 3638, 1
- Wainscoat, R. J., Micheli, M., & Forshay, P. 2017, *Comet P/2017 A2 = P/2011 A5 (Panstarrs)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 4341
- Wainscoat, R. J., Woodworth, D., Micheli, M., et al. 2016, *P/2016 J1 (Panstarrs)*, Minor Planet Electronic Circulars, 2016-J90
- Wang, X., Schwan, J., Hsu, H. W., Grün, E., & Horányi, M. 2016, *Dust Charging and Transport on Airless Planetary Bodies*, Geophysical Research Letters, 43, 6103, doi: 10.1002/2016GL069491
- Warner, B. D., & Stephens, R. D. 2018, *Lightcurve Analysis of Hilda Asteroids at the Center for Solar System Studies: 2017 July Through September*, The Minor Planet Bulletin (ISSN 1052-8091). Bulletin of the Minor Planets Section of the Association of Lunar and Planetary Observers, 45, 35
- Waszczak, A., Ofek, E. O., Aharonson, O., et al. 2013, *Main-Belt Comets in the Palomar Transient Factory Survey - I. The Search for Extendedness*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 433, 3115, doi: 10/f46fcm
- Watanabe, S., Hirabayashi, M., Hirata, N., et al. 2019, *Hayabusa2 Arrives at the Carbonaceous Asteroid 162173 Ryugu—A Spinning Top-Shaped Rubble Pile*, Science, 364, 268, doi: 10.1126/science.aav8032
- Watanabe, S.-i., Tsuda, Y., Yoshikawa, M., et al. 2017, *Hayabusa2 Mission Overview*, Space Science Reviews, 208, 3, doi: 10.1007/s11214-017-0377-1
- Weaver, H. A., A'Hearn, M. F., Arpigny, C., et al. 1995, *The Hubble Space Telescope (HST) Observing Campaign on Comet Shoemaker- Levy 9*, Science, 267, 1282, doi: 10.1126/science.7871424
- Weryk, R., Wainscoat, R. J., & wains. 2016, *COMET P/2016 G1 (PANSTARRS)*, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 1
- Whipple, F. L. 1983, *IAUC 3881: 1983 TB AND THE GEMINID METEORS; 1983 SA; KR Aur*, Central Bureau for Astronomical Telegrams, 3881
- Willmer, C. N. A. 2018, *The Absolute Magnitude of the Sun in Several Filters*, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 236, 47, doi: 10/ggsc7p
- Witze, A. 2015, *Bright Spots on Ceres Could Be Active Ice*, Nature, 519, 401, doi: 10/gg28m4
- Womack, M., Sarid, G., & Wierzbos, K. 2017, *CO in Distantly Active Comets*, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 129, 031001, doi: 10/gcw5ch
- World Health Organization. 2019, *WHO Methods and Data Sources for Life Tables 1990-2019*, Global Health Technical Papers
- Yang, B., & Hsieh, H. 2011, *Near-Infrared Observations of Comet-like Asteroid (596) Scheila*, The Astrophysical Journal, 737, L39, doi: 10/b46phg
- Ye, Q., Kelley, M. S. P., Bodewits, D., et al. 2019a, *Continued Activity of (6478) Gault*, The Astronomer's Telegram, 2450
- . 2019b, *Multiple Outbursts of Asteroid (6478) Gault*, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 874, L16, doi: 10/gg28nk

- Ye, Q.-Z. 2018, *Meteor Showers from Active Asteroids and Dormant Comets in Near-Earth Space: A Review*, Planetary and Space Science, 164, 7, doi: 10.1016/j.pss.2018.04.018
- Yoo, A. B., Jette, M. A., & Grondona, M., SLURM: Simple Linux Utility for Resource Management. 2003, in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 2862, Job Scheduling Strategies for Parallel Processing, ed. D. Feitelson, L. Rudolph, & U. Schwiegelshohn (Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg), 44–60
- Yoshimoto, K. 2017, (457175) 2008 GO₉₈, Central Bureau Electronic Telegrams, 4418