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#### Abstract

It is generally believed that expanding superbubbles and mechanical feedback from massive stars trigger star formation, because there are numerous examples of superbubbles showing secondary star formation at their edges. However, while these systems show an age sequence, they do not provide strong evidence of a causal relationship. The W3/W4 Galactic star-forming complex suggests a threegeneration hierarchy: the supergiant shell structures correspond to the oldest generation; these triggered the formation of IC 1795 in W3, the progenitor of a molecular superbubble; which in turn triggered the current star-forming episodes in the embedded regions W3-North, W3-Main, and W3-OH. We present $U B V$ photometry and spectroscopic classifications for IC 1795 , which show an age of $3-5 \mathrm{Myr}$. This age is intermediate between the reported $6-20 \mathrm{Myr}$ age of the supergiant shell system, and the extremely young ages $\left(10^{4}-10^{5} \mathrm{yr}\right)$ for the embedded knots of ultracompact H II regions, W3-North, W3-Main, and W3-OH. Thus, an age sequence is indeed confirmed for the entire W3/W4 hierarchical system. This therefore provides some of the first convincing evidence that superbubble action and mechanical feedback are indeed a triggering mechanism for star formation.


Subject headings: stars: formation - ISM: bubbles - ISM: clouds - ISM: individual (W3, W4) ISM: structure - open clusters and associations: individual (IC 1795, IC 1805)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The shocks in expanding superbubbles and supernova remnants are widely believed to be a primary mechanism for triggering star formation. Although this mechanical feedback from massive stars cannot be the only catalyst for the gravitational collapse of molecular clouds, there are numerous examples of superbubbles that show young, star-forming regions at their edges. In the Large Magellanic Cloud, superbubble systems like N11 (Walborn \& Parker 1992), N44 (Oey \& Massey 1995), and N51 D (Oey \& Smedley 1998) all show young OB associations, typically with ages $\lesssim 3 \mathrm{Myr}$, on the outer edges of the shells, while associations that are somewhat older, typically by a few Myr, are responsible for the formation of the shells themselves.

However, it is important to distinguish between sequential star formation and triggered star formation. Studies of the stellar populations in systems like the above examples conclusively demonstrate that the star formation is sequential, but it is much more difficult to demonstrate a causal relationship. For any star formation that takes place in two adjacent molecular clouds, or even subregions of the same cloud, if the superbubble from the older region grows to impact the younger region, the resulting configuration will show a younger nodule on the edge of an older one. Thus, although they are suggestive of triggering, two-
generation systems do not constitute strong evidence that it is actually taking place.

On the other hand, a hierarchical system of three or more generations would provide much stronger evidence of a causal relationship. An example of superbubbletriggered star formation over three generations should show the oldest shell with a younger superbubble at its edge, which in turn shows even younger star formation on its edge. Such a scenario is extremely unlikely to be coincidental, sequential star formation. In what follows, we identify the W3/W4 Galactic star-forming complex as the first example of three-generation, hierarchical triggered star formation. Thus this offers much more concrete support for the widely-held view that superbubble expansion triggers star formation.

## 2. THE W3/W4 COMPLEX

The W3/W4 complex is located in the Perseus arm of the Galaxy, at a distance of about 2.3 kpc (Massey et al. 1995a). W4 shows a nebular shell roughly $1^{\circ}$ in diameter, and it is also at the base of the well-known Perseus "chimney" that is seen in H I (Normandeau et al. 1996). Dennison et al. (1997) find that the "chimney" is the lower section of an elongated, but closed, shell that extends $\sim 230$ pc above the Galactic plane and is visible in $\mathrm{H} \alpha$ (Figure 1). Most recently, Reynolds et al. (2001)
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Fig. 1.- $\mathrm{H} \alpha$ image of the $\sim 1300-\mathrm{pc}$ superbubble that is blowing out above the Galactic plane from the W4 region (image from Dennison et al. 1997).


Fig. 2.- Grayscale of the W3 region from the DSS, overlaid by CO contours from the FCRAO CO survey.
identify an even larger loop that is $\sim 1300 \mathrm{kpc}$ above the Galactic plane, of which the Dennison et al. superbubble is the lower section. For all of these shell features, the W4 region is located at the Galactic plane apex. At the center of the W4 shell is the OB association IC 1805.

W3 (Figure 2) is a smaller H II region, $\sim 30^{\prime}(20 \mathrm{pc})$ in diameter, on the northwest edge of the W4 shell. As a thermal radio source, W3 subdivides into a complex with three dominant knots of ultracompact H II regions: W3-Main, W3-North, and W3-OH. As seen in Figure 2, these knots are embedded in a shell of molecular gas that surrounds the OB association IC 1795. The young, continuum radioemitting cluster NGC 896 is seen against the western edge of the CO shell.

The configuration of the larger Perseus chimney/superbubble and smaller IC 1795/W3 superbubble are strongly suggestive of a three-generation system of hierarchical triggered star formation. That scenario would imply that the Perseus chimney/superbubble, formed by the first generation, triggered the formation of IC 1795 as the second generation, and its superbubble in turn triggered the W3 embedded star-forming regions W3-Main, W3-North, and W3-OH, thereby constituting the third generation. If this model is correct, it should be reflected by a corresponding age sequence. In this study, we evaluate the ages of the associated stellar populations for these three putative generations, based on both new data for IC 1795 and studies in the literature.

## 3. IC 1795

Since IC 1795 represents the intermediate, second generation of stars in the complex, strong constraints on its age are necessary to test the model of hierarchical triggering of star formation. To date, the only published studies of the stellar population in IC 1795 are based on photographic and photoelectric studies by Ogura \& Ishida (1976) and Sato (1970). We have therefore carried out a new investigation based on modern CCD photometry and spectroscopic observations. While our intent was to examine IC 1795 in detail, we also obtained stellar data for the wider W3 region shown in Figure 3; these data are presented in the Appendix.

### 3.1. Photometric observations

$U B V$ imaging was obtained on 1999 October 6-9 at the $84-\mathrm{cm}$ telescope of the Observatorio Astronómico Nacional at San Pedro Mártir (SPM), Baja California Norte, México. We used a $1024 \times 1024$ SITe CCD binned $2 \times 2$, which gave $0.85^{\prime \prime}$ pixels and an instantaneous field of view of $7^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime}$. The seeing was typically around $2^{\prime \prime}$ and the sky was clear. IC 1795 was imaged in four pointings, with $\mathrm{BD}+61411$ in each corner of the CCD. NGC 896 and W3Main were imaged in one pointing each, and W3-North was imaged in three pointings. Our $U$-band mosaic of the entire region is shown in Figure 3. At each pointing, we obtained exposures of 600 seconds in $V, 900$ seconds in $B$, and 1200 seconds in $U$, along with shorter 10 and 100 second images in each filter. Each image was corrected for bias offset and was then divided by a twilight flat field. Variance between the flat fields obtained each nights and direct measurements of a grid stars suggest that the flat
fields are good to about $0.5 \% \mathrm{rms}$.
We observed roughly 15 Landolt (1983) standards each night over a range of airmass and color. Instrumental magnitudes were determined by synthetic aperture photometry with a $17^{\prime \prime}$ star aperture and a sky annulus with inner and outer diameters of $34^{\prime \prime}$ and $51^{\prime \prime}$. We determined the transformation between the instrumental and standard systems by fitting all of the $\sim 60$ observations simultaneously, with a separate linear extinction coefficient for each night, but a single set of color coefficients and zero points. Linear color transformations were adequate for $B$ and $V$, but the data required a quadratic color transformation for $U$. The RMS residuals were $2.1 \%$ in $U$ and $1.5 \%$ in $B$ and $V$.

We selected stars by eye in each 600 second $V$ image, as these were by far the deepest images. We then performed synthetic aperture photometry on each image using an $8.5^{\prime \prime}$ diameter star aperture and a sky annulus with inner and outer diameters of $34^{\prime \prime}$ and $51^{\prime \prime}$. Aperture corrections between $8.5^{\prime \prime}$ and $17^{\prime \prime}$ diameter apertures were determined for each image. We then calculated the standard magnitude for each star and its uncertainty, taking into account read noise and photon noise in the star and sky apertures, flat-field uncertainties, and transformation uncertainties. Since we had three ( 10 second, 100 second, and $600 / 900 / 1200$ second) images in each band, we selected the unsaturated measurement with the lowest uncertainty. Our complete set of new $U B V$ photometry is presented in the Appendix, Table 2.

We compared our data with photometry reported by Ogura \& Ishida (1976) and Sato (1970). The Ogura \& Ishida measurements are mostly based on iris photometry of photographic plates, calibrated to a subset of photoelectric data, while those of Sato are photoelectric. Figure 4 shows the comparison of our modern data to these earlier studies. There is a large scatter in the photometric differences for both, with a large systematic pattern seen in the comparison to the data of Ogura \& Ishida as function of magnitude. The differences cannot be explained with the published information. One might suspect a non-linearity in the detector, but thorough annual "health checks" of this CCD performed every year since 2000 have failed to find any evidence for such a problem. We note that Figure 4 shows that the photometry from these previous studies also appear to be inconsistent with each other.

### 3.2. Spectroscopic observations

Spectroscopic observations of candidates for the earliesttype stars were obtained with the 2.1-m telescope at SPM during the nights of 1999 October $15-17$. We used the 600 line $\mathrm{mm}^{-1}$ grating on the Boller \& Chivens spectrograph and Thomson $2048 \times 2048$ CCD, yielding a useable wavelength coverage of about $3500-5900 \AA$ at spatial and spectral resolutions of about $3 \AA$ and $1.3^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{px}^{-1}$, respectively. The stars observed spectroscopically were selected from the wider region around IC 1795, not just in the central region that we imaged in $U B V$. The spectroscopic candidates were the bluest by their reddening-free $Q$ values $(Q \lesssim-0.3)$ and brightest $(V \lesssim 15)$ as reported by Ogura \& Ishida (1976) and Sato (1970).

The spectroscopic data were reduced with the IRAF ${ }^{2}$ software. The raw data were bias-subtracted and then flat-
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Fig. 3.- $U$-band mosaic of the W3 region, with stars having new $U$-band photometry identified, for $U<18$. The circle shows the IC 1795 region for which the H-R diagram was constructed.


Fig. 4.- Photometric differences of our photometry with those of Ogura \& Ishida (1976; top) and Sato (1970; bottom), as a function of magnitude.
fielded using the quartz lamp calibration images. Owing to a problem with the sky frames, an illumination correction was only applied to data taken on 1999 October 15. During aperture extraction, the local background was evaluated for every set of 10 rows in the chip and subtracted; since this was straightforward, the lack of an explicit illumination correction is considered unimportant. The spectra were extracted following standard procedures by fitting the trace along the dispersion and applying wavelength calibrations from He-Ne-Ar arc lamp observations taken during each night.

The twenty stars with spectroscopic observations were independently classified by KK and MSO, with agreement generally within one spectral subtype, and differences resolved upon reinspection. O and early B-type stars were classified according to the criteria of Walborn \& Fitzpatrick (1990). Our observations of spectroscopic standards aided in classifying the stars.

### 3.3. H-R Diagram

We focused on the stellar population of IC 1795, taken to be the stars within a $5^{\prime}$-radius, circular region centered at $02^{h} 26^{m} 15 .^{s} 0,+62^{\circ} 02^{\prime} 00 .^{\prime \prime} 0$ (J2000.0) (Figure 3). The stellar effective temperatures $T_{\text {eff }}$ and bolometric corrections (BCs) were estimated for the stars with spectral classifications using the calibrations of Chlebowski \& Garmany (1991) for O stars and Humphreys \& McElroy (1984) for B stars. For the dominant, bright star BD +61411 (ID number $2001=$ OI 89) we adopt spectral type O6.5 V((f)) from Mathys (1989). For blue stars (reddening-corrected $B-V<-0.22$ or $Q<-0.6$ ) without direct spectroscopic classifications, but having good photometry with formal errors in $V, B-V$, and $U-B$ less than $0.03,0.05$, and 0.05 , respectively, we estimated $\log T_{\text {eff }}$ from the reddening-free parameter $Q=(U-B)-0.72(B-V)$ using the relations of Massey et al. (1995b). These authors also derive a relation between the BC and $\log T_{\text {eff }}$, which we then used to obtain the BCs for these stars. The remaining stars have poorer photometry, and for these we estimated log $T_{\text {eff }}$ using only the reddening-corrected $(B-V)_{0}$, from the relation also given by Massey et al. (1995b). We used a fixed value for the color excess of $E(B-V)=1.25$, which is the median value for the stars with spectroscopic classifications. The same relation between BC and $\log T_{\text {eff }}$ was then applied to obtain the bolometric corrections.

With the bolometric corrections in hand, we then computed the bolometric magnitudes, as usual correcting for extinction and distance, as $M_{\mathrm{bol}}=V-A_{V}+\mathrm{BC}+\mathrm{DM}$. Hanson \& Clayton (1993) determine $A_{V}=2.9 E(B-V)$ for the neighboring region IC 1805, so we adopt this relation between the total to selective extinction. Likewise, we adopt the distance modulus $\mathrm{DM}=11.85(2.3 \mathrm{kpc})$ derived by Massey et al. (1995a) for IC 1805, a value consistent with the distance adopted in past studies of the W3 complex.

Figures $5 a$ and $b$ show the $B-V$ vs $V$ and $U-B$ vs $V$ color-magnitude diagrams for IC 1795, respectively, while Figure 6 shows the resulting $M_{\text {bol }}$ vs $T_{\text {eff }}$ H-R diagram. Stars 1053 (OI 42), 2004 (OI 86), and 10003 (OI 40) were omitted since their spectral types revealed them to be foreground F and G dwarfs. Solid symbols represent stars placed on the basis of spectroscopic classifications; asterisks represent the stars with good photometry that
are placed by their $Q$ values; and crosses represent the remainder of the data, placed by their $(B-V)_{0}$ colors alone. Isochrones for 3, 4, and 5 Myr are overplotted in Figure 6, from Schaller et al. (1992) for solar metallicity. From Figure 6 , we infer an age of $3-5 \mathrm{Myr}$ for IC 1795 . Data for the individual stars in IC 1795 are presented in Table 1: The first two columns give ID numbers assigned by this work and Ogura \& Ishida (1976), respectively, columns 3 and 4 give the celestial coordinates for epoch J2000.0, and columns 5-10 list the $V, B$, and $U$ magnitudes with corresponding formal (non-systematic) uncertainties. Column 11 gives our spectral classification for stars that were observed spectroscopically.

## 4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We now return to the question of hierarchical triggered star formation in the entire W3/W4 complex.

The age of the $230-\mathrm{pc}$ Perseus chimney/superbubble feature is somewhat problematic. Dennison et al. (1997) roughly estimate it to be $6-10 \mathrm{Myr}$ old, while Basu et al. (1999) find a much younger age of $\sim 2.5 \mathrm{Myr}$, from a more detailed semi-analytic investigation. Basu et al. solve simultaneously for the age and scale height of the ambient gas, and it is important to note that this young age estimate is largely due to the surprisingly small, 25pc , Galactic scale height of the ambient gas that they find. Reynolds et al. (2001) argue that the largest, 1300-pc loop associated with the region requires at least $10-20 \mathrm{Myr}$ to form.

The stellar population at the center of W4, at the apex of the chimney/superbubble system, is extremely young. The central OB association, IC 1805, is around $1-3$ Myr old, as determined by Massey et al. (1995a) from a detailed study including spectral classifications of the earliest-type stars. This age is consistent with that determined for the wider population, Cas OB6 / OCl 352 (e.g., Normandeau et al. 1996; Mathys 1987; Llorente de Andrès et al. 1982).

Dennison et al. (1997) suggest that an earlier generation of star formation, preceding the birth of IC 1805, was responsible for forming the 230-pc Perseus superbubble. Indeed, Carpenter et al. (2000) independently suggest the existence of an older star-forming episode to explain the large number and distribution of molecular cloudlets and globules scattered in the wider W4 area. They speculate that these molecular globules are the remnants of a giant molecular cloud that was dispersed by the photodissociation, stellar winds, and supernovae of the resulting star-forming region.

IC 1805, at the center of W4, represents a more recent generation. The young, $1-3 \mathrm{Myr}$ age found by Basu et al. (1999) for the Dennison superbubble is consistent with the age of IC 1805, suggesting that this association is responsible for that shell. The unusually small scale height that is linked to this young age by Basu et al. is also beautifully consistent with the existence of an earlier generation and earlier superbubble in the same region, which would have cleared out much of the ambient ISM, in particular across Galactic latitude. This naturally points to the larger, 1300-pc shell reported by Reynolds et al. (2001), that they estimate to be $10-20 \mathrm{Myr}$ old. Note that if a normal ISM scale height is assumed, the age of the Dennison superbubble would be older, around $6-10$


FIG. 5.- Color-magnitude diagrams for IC 1795. Solid symbols and asterisks show, respectively, stars with spectroscopic classifications and reliable reddening-free $Q$ values; crosses show the remainder, lower-quality data (see text). Star 3041 (OI 109; the second-brightest star) is heavily reddened and appears displaced relative to the locus of the other stars.


Fig. 6.- H-R diagram for IC 1795. Solid, asterisk, and cross symbols show stars with $T_{\text {eff }}$ and $M_{\text {bol }}$ estimated from, respectively, spectroscopic classifications, reddening-free $Q$ values, and $(B-V)_{0}$ only. Isochrones for 3,4 , and 5 Myr from Schaller et al. (1992) are overplotted as labeled.

Table 1
Photometry and Spectral Types for IC 1795

| ID | OI | RA(J2000.0) | Dec(J2000.0) | V | $V$ err | $B$ | $B$ err | $U$ | $U$ err | Sp Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1007 | 112 | 02:26:41.31 | +61:59:24.2 | 14.318 | 0.001 | 15.256 | 0.001 | 15.299 | 0.002 | B1-2 V |
| 1008 |  | 02:26:34.63 | +61:59:10.6 | 15.312 | 0.001 | 16.947 | 0.003 | 17.753 | 0.011 |  |
| 1009 |  | 02:26:38.45 | +61:59:26.2 | 18.138 | 0.013 | 19.585 | 0.028 | 20.080 | 0.120 |  |
| $1010^{\text {a }}$ | . . | 02:26:40.83 | +61:58:11.7 | 17.233 | 0.005 | 18.736 | 0.011 | 18.000 | 0.023 |  |
| 1011 |  | 02:26:34.54 | +61:58:16.6 | 18.124 | 0.013 | 20.069 | 0.042 | 20.883 | 0.235 |  |
| 1034 |  | 02:26:26.63 | +61:57:41.9 | 17.292 | 0.006 | 18.705 | 0.013 | 19.298 | 0.055 |  |
| 1035 |  | 02:26:27.21 | +61:58:14.4 | 17.278 | 0.006 | 19.260 | 0.018 | 20.356 | 0.147 |  |
| 1036 |  | 02:26:21.67 | +61:57:55.0 | 16.840 | 0.004 | 18.199 | 0.008 | 18.951 | 0.039 |  |
| 1037 |  | 02:26:16.89 | +61:57:47.9 | 15.778 | 0.002 | 16.913 | 0.004 | 17.313 | 0.010 |  |
| 1038 |  | 02:26:17.89 | +61:57:25.3 | 17.691 | 0.008 | 19.148 | 0.018 | 20.382 | 0.150 |  |
| 1039 |  | 02:26:09.30 | +61:57:32.1 | 17.434 | 0.006 | 18.826 | 0.013 | 19.659 | 0.073 |  |
| 1040 |  | 02:26:10.50 | +61:58:02.0 | 16.733 | 0.004 | 18.212 | 0.008 | 18.624 | 0.030 |  |
| 1045 |  | 02:25:47.67 | +61:58:12.6 | 14.184 | 0.001 | 15.076 | 0.001 | 15.491 | 0.003 |  |
| 1046 |  | 02:25:56.53 | +61:58:01.9 | 17.430 | 0.006 | 18.875 | 0.014 | 19.693 | 0.083 |  |
| 1047 |  | 02:26:00.88 | +61:58:15.9 | 17.550 | 0.008 | 19.079 | 0.019 | 19.514 | 0.075 |  |
| 1048 |  | 02:26:04.52 | +61:58:26.8 | 16.986 | 0.006 | 19.140 | 0.020 | 20.827 | 0.254 |  |
| 1049 |  | 02:26:05.86 | +61:58:46.6 | 14.939 | 0.001 | 16.410 | 0.002 | 16.643 | 0.006 |  |
| 1050 |  | 02:26:07.08 | +61:58:41.7 | 17.712 | 0.008 | 19.269 | 0.019 | 20.507 | 0.163 |  |
| 1051 |  | 02:25:58.48 | +61:58:49.5 | 17.481 | 0.008 | 19.047 | 0.019 | 19.816 | 0.095 |  |
| 1052 |  | 02:25:46.07 | +61:59:10.6 | 17.624 | 0.008 | 18.963 | 0.017 | 19.462 | 0.072 |  |
| $1053{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 42 | 02:25:46.12 | +61:59:45.2 | 14.447 | 0.001 | 15.602 | 0.001 | 16.180 | 0.004 | G3 V |
| 1054 | . . | 02:25:51.04 | +61:59:54.3 | 16.872 | 0.004 | 18.790 | 0.012 | 19.558 | 0.062 | $\ldots$ |
| 1059 |  | 02:25:59.35 | +62:01:09.4 | 18.190 | 0.021 | 20.167 | 0.058 | 22.365 | 1.224 |  |
| 1061 |  | 02:26:03.27 | +61:59:36.1 | 16.641 | 0.004 | 17.937 | 0.007 | 18.635 | 0.031 |  |
| 1062 |  | 02:26:04.96 | +61:59:40.1 | 17.873 | 0.010 | 19.902 | 0.034 | 21.290 | 0.348 |  |
| 1063 |  | 02:26:06.20 | +61:59:19.2 | 17.871 | 0.010 | 19.329 | 0.022 | 19.643 | 0.076 | $\cdots$ |
| $1064{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 02:26:10.09 | +61:59:35.0 | 17.791 | 0.009 | 19.363 | 0.022 | 16.960 | 0.015 |  |
| 1065 |  | 02:26:05.55 | +62:00:30.0 | 17.940 | 0.014 | 19.610 | 0.031 | 20.867 | 0.226 |  |
| 1069 | 92 | 02:26:18.80 | +61:59:52.9 | 15.182 | 0.001 | 16.264 | 0.002 | 16.467 | 0.005 |  |
| 1070 |  | 02:26:25.07 | +61:59:38.4 | 17.362 | 0.007 | 18.768 | 0.014 | 19.283 | 0.055 |  |
| 2001 | 89 | 02:26:34.41 | +62:00:42.6 | 10.137 | 0.000 | 11.102 | 0.001 | 10.943 | 0.000 | O6.5 V ((f)) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| 2002 | 87 | 02:26:31.43 | +62:01:06.7 | 15.532 | 0.002 | 16.630 | 0.003 | 17.009 | 0.007 |  |
| 2003 | 85 | 02:26:34.15 | +62:01:19.3 | 14.725 | 0.001 | 16.113 | 0.001 | 16.987 | 0.005 |  |
| $2004{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 86 | 02:26:36.47 | +62:01:11.9 | 13.968 | 0.001 | 15.044 | 0.001 | 15.458 | 0.002 | F8 V |
| $2005^{\text {a }}$ | . | 02:26:36.64 | +62:00:41.8 | 16.285 | 0.005 | 16.098 | 0.002 | 13.596 | 0.002 |  |
| 2006 | . . | 02:26:38.83 | +62:00:30.4 | 16.470 | 0.003 | 18.073 | 0.007 | 18.791 | 0.028 |  |
| 2007 | $\ldots$ | 02:26:29.62 | +62:00:19.1 | 17.768 | 0.011 | 19.380 | 0.021 | 20.486 | 0.146 | . . |
| 2008 |  | 02:26:26.17 | +62:00:32.5 | 17.708 | 0.012 | 19.395 | 0.028 | 20.611 | 0.174 |  |
| $2009{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 02:26:24.43 | +62:00:50.3 | 17.504 | 0.008 | 19.447 | 0.024 | 16.589 | 0.015 |  |
| 2010 | 90 | 02:26:22.89 | +62:00:37.1 | 15.383 | 0.002 | 16.896 | 0.003 | 17.326 | 0.009 | $\cdots$ |
| 2012 | 91 | 02:26:15.37 | +62:00:35.7 | 13.734 | 0.001 | 14.541 | 0.001 | 14.928 | 0.002 |  |
| 2013 | 60 | 02:26:09.59 | +62:00:58.3 | 14.425 | 0.001 | 15.404 | 0.001 | 15.689 | 0.003 | $\cdots$ |
| 2014 | 61 | 02:26:07.00 | +62:00:46.8 | 15.115 | 0.002 | 16.336 | 0.003 | 17.288 | 0.011 |  |
| 2016 | 59 | 02:26:01.91 | +62:01:12.2 | 15.438 | 0.001 | 16.451 | 0.002 | 16.739 | 0.005 | $\cdots$ |
| 2017 |  | 02:25:52.29 | +62:00:09.9 | 17.441 | 0.005 | 18.837 | 0.011 | 19.427 | 0.047 |  |
| 2019 | $\cdots$ | 02:25:46.88 | +62:01:09.2 | 16.185 | 0.002 | 17.437 | 0.004 | 18.118 | 0.016 | $\ldots$ |
| 2020 |  | 02:25:49.17 | +62:01:17.5 | 17.661 | 0.008 | 19.176 | 0.017 | 19.909 | 0.083 |  |
| 2021 | $\cdots$ | 02:25:52.16 | +62:01:28.9 | 15.939 | 0.002 | 17.360 | 0.003 | 18.015 | 0.015 |  |
| 2022 | 58 | 02:25:48.01 | +62:02:37.5 | 15.731 | 0.002 | 17.021 | 0.004 | 18.001 | 0.021 |  |
| 2023 | 57 | 02:26:01.55 | +62:02:54.5 | 14.518 | 0.001 | 15.391 | 0.002 | 15.561 | 0.004 | $\ldots$ |
| 2024 | . | 02:26:03.49 | +62:02:32.5 | 16.976 | 0.007 | 18.315 | 0.014 | 19.146 | 0.067 |  |
| 2025 | 56 | 02:26:07.28 | +62:02:55.2 | 15.643 | 0.003 | 16.805 | 0.005 | 17.469 | 0.016 | $\cdots$ |
| 2026 |  | 02:26:03.63 | +62:03:26.1 | 17.513 | 0.011 | 18.928 | 0.023 | 19.371 | 0.082 |  |
| 2027 | . . | 02:25:55.83 | +62:03:29.3 | 17.673 | 0.008 | 19.083 | 0.017 | 19.873 | 0.097 | $\ldots$ |
| 2028 |  | 02:25:44.84 | +62:03:41.8 | 15.834 | 0.003 | 18.097 | 0.009 | 18.754 | 0.039 |  |
| 2029 | $\ldots$ | 02:25:46.06 | +62:03:45.0 | 16.802 | 0.005 | 17.981 | 0.007 | 18.481 | 0.030 | $\ldots$ |
| 2030 |  | 02:25:46.67 | +62:03:57.5 | 16.670 | 0.004 | 18.095 | 0.008 | 18.837 | 0.037 |  |
| 2032 | $\cdots$ | 02:25:56.82 | +62:04:27.5 | 16.624 | 0.004 | 17.783 | 0.006 | 18.383 | 0.026 | . . . |
| 2033 | - . | 02:25:47.13 | +62:05:21.1 | 17.303 | 0.005 | 18.792 | 0.013 | 19.698 | 0.091 | $\cdots$ |
| 2036 | 55 | 02:26:08.24 | +62:04:53.4 | 14.445 | 0.001 | 15.436 | 0.002 | 15.734 | 0.005 | . . . |
| 2037 | 81 | 02:26:16.94 | +62:04:18.6 | 15.608 | 0.003 | 16.655 | 0.004 | 16.990 | 0.013 | $\cdots$ |
| 2038 | $\cdots$ | 02:26:15.59 | +62:02:41.4 | 17.766 | 0.014 | 19.218 | 0.033 | 20.049 | 0.157 |  |
| 2039 | 54 | 02:26:10.11 | +62:06:12.3 | 16.027 | 0.002 | 16.983 | 0.004 | 17.185 | 0.010 | $\cdots$ |
| 2040 | 76 | 02:26:16.75 | +62:06:39.9 | 14.740 | 0.001 | 15.805 | 0.002 | 16.531 | 0.006 |  |
| 2041 | 77 | 02:26:18.83 | +62:06:27.7 | 13.191 | 0.001 | 14.070 | 0.001 | 14.379 | 0.001 | . . |
| 2042 | 75 | 02:26:21.09 | +62:06:44.3 | 14.045 | 0.001 | 14.988 | 0.001 | 15.507 | 0.002 | . . . |
| 2043 | .. | 02:26:19.58 | +62:05:40.0 | 16.598 | 0.005 | 17.969 | 0.010 | 18.564 | 0.049 | $\cdots$ |
| 2044 | . . | 02:26:24.79 | +62:05:46.8 | 16.049 | 0.002 | 17.366 | 0.005 | 18.019 | 0.019 | $\cdots$ |
| 2045 | $\cdots$ | 02:26:26.14 | +62:04:47.1 | 16.527 | 0.005 | 17.744 | 0.009 | 18.416 | 0.038 | $\cdots$ |
| 2046 | $\cdots$ | 02:26:32.12 | +62:06:27.4 | 14.074 | 0.001 | 14.989 | 0.001 | 15.534 | 0.002 | . . . |
| 2048 | 80 | 02:26:38.29 | +62:06:11.1 | 13.326 | 0.001 | 14.419 | 0.001 | 14.889 | 0.002 | $\ldots$ |
| 2049 | . . | 02:26:33.69 | +62:05:34.9 | 16.589 | 0.003 | 17.838 | 0.007 | 18.465 | 0.032 | . . . |
| 2050 | 82 | 02:26:38.01 | +62:03:27.9 | 12.877 | 0.001 | 13.713 | 0.002 | 13.956 | 0.001 | ... |
| 2051 | 110 | 02:26:39.03 | +62:02:55.9 | 15.219 | 0.001 | 16.395 | 0.003 | 17.035 | 0.009 |  |
| 2052 | 8 | 02:26:36.70 | +62:02:47.0 | 16.283 | 0.003 | 17.962 | 0.007 | 18.691 | 0.032 | . . . |
| 2053 | 83 | 02:26:34.32 | +62:01:52.8 | 14.372 | 0.001 | 15.285 | 0.001 | 15.361 | 0.003 | $\cdots$ |
| 2054 | 84 | 02:26:29.22 | +62:01:48.1 | 15.491 | 0.002 | 16.751 | 0.003 | 17.552 | 0.013 | . . . |
| 2055 | , | 02:26:26.89 | +62:02:48.4 | 17.646 | 0.017 | 19.006 | 0.034 | 20.019 | 0.170 |  |
| 2056 | . . | 02:26:40.58 | $+62: 02: 10.4$ | 17.309 | 0.009 | 19.040 | 0.024 | 19.982 | 0.125 |  |

TABLE 1, continued

| ID | OI | RA(J2000.0) | Dec(J2000.0) | V | $V$ err | $B$ | $B$ err | $U$ | $U$ err | Sp Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3007 |  | 02:26:44.60 | +62:00:48.0 | 16.942 | 0.005 | 18.424 | 0.011 | 19.095 | 0.042 |  |
| 3009 |  | 02:26:47.81 | +62:01:06.9 | 17.568 | 0.006 | 19.322 | 0.019 | 20.619 | 0.167 |  |
| 3010 |  | 02:26:50.89 | +62:00:45.5 | 17.136 | 0.005 | 18.778 | 0.013 | 19.651 | 0.066 |  |
| 3030 |  | 02:26:52.69 | +62:04:11.9 | 17.669 | 0.012 | 19.132 | 0.026 | 20.092 | 0.141 |  |
| 3041 | 109 | 02:26:45.29 | +62:03:07.6 | 13.114 | 0.002 | 14.846 | 0.001 | 15.145 | 0.003 | O9.7 Ia |
| 3043 |  | 02:26:50.85 | +62:02:53.4 | 17.559 | 0.011 | 19.253 | 0.029 | 19.657 | 0.100 |  |
| 3044 |  | 02:26:51.92 | +62:02:28.0 | 17.680 | 0.011 | 19.035 | 0.023 | 19.698 | 0.100 |  |
| 4010 |  | 02:26:45.69 | +61:59:50.8 | 16.632 | 0.004 | 18.170 | 0.010 | 18.710 | 0.040 |  |
| 4011 |  | 02:26:46.41 | +61:59:47.3 | 16.631 | 0.004 | 18.455 | 0.013 | 19.330 | 0.068 |  |
| 4012 | 111 | 02:26:46.66 | +62:00:26.1 | 13.932 | 0.002 | 14.908 | 0.001 | 14.993 | 0.003 | B2 V |
| 4060 |  | 02:26:41.75 | +61:58:50.6 | 17.677 | 0.008 | 19.765 | 0.030 | 20.418 | 0.139 |  |
| 5009 |  | 02:26:37.65 | +61:59:19.2 | 18.613 | 0.030 | 20.592 | 0.094 | 21.002 | 0.362 | $\ldots$ |
| 5014 |  | 02:26:34.86 | +61:57:56.0 | 18.397 | 0.019 | 20.946 | 0.110 | 22.188 | 0.966 |  |
| 5037 |  | 02:26:23.36 | +61:58:11.7 | 18.708 | 0.025 | 20.598 | 0.083 | 21.881 | 0.762 |  |
| 5041 |  | 02:26:20.48 | +61:57:17.8 | 18.520 | 0.021 | 20.145 | 0.056 | 20.943 | 0.302 |  |
| 5069 | . . | 02:25:59.03 | +61:59:47.7 | 17.903 | 0.011 | 19.428 | 0.024 | 19.893 | 0.095 | $\ldots$ |
| 6020 |  | 02:26:22.87 | +62:06:25.9 | 17.840 | 0.012 | 19.204 | 0.025 | 19.687 | 0.099 |  |
| 6024 |  | 02:26:16.28 | +62:06:22.3 | 17.606 | 0.012 | 18.826 | 0.022 | 19.640 | 0.133 |  |
| 9039 |  | 02:26:26.38 | +62:06:17.3 | 18.350 | 0.018 | 19.594 | 0.039 | 19.897 | 0.151 |  |
| $10003{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 40 | 02:25:36.38 | +62:02:04.1 | 13.100 | 0.002 | 14.222 | 0.001 | 14.510 | 0.002 | G3 V |
| 10004 |  | 02:25:34.59 | +62:01:40.1 | 16.471 | 0.011 | 17.751 | 0.018 | 18.035 | 0.045 |  |
| 10005 | $\ldots$ | 02:25:36.70 | +62:01:18.9 | 16.153 | 0.007 | 17.421 | 0.012 | 18.154 | 0.042 |  |
| 10006 | $\cdots$ | 02:25:37.75 | +62:01:19.1 | 16.853 | 0.016 | 18.143 | 0.024 | 18.447 | 0.060 |  |
| 10020 | 33 | 02:25:40.67 | +62:04:19.8 | 15.102 | 0.002 | 16.029 | 0.003 | 16.171 | 0.006 |  |
| 10021 | 35 | 02:25:34.79 | +62:03:28.9 | 16.399 | 0.006 | 17.485 | 0.009 | 17.708 | 0.025 |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Photometry suspect, yielding unphysical parameters; star omitted from analysis.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Foreground star.
${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ Spectral type from Mathys (1989).

Myr old, as estimated by those authors, regardless of the age of IC 1805. Thus, it is a fairly robust result that the superbubble activity associated with W4 is at least $6-20$ Myr old.

From Figure 6, we derived an age for IC 1795, in the center of the W3 superbubble, of $3-5 \mathrm{Myr}$. This age is consistent with the location of IC 1795 in the central, cleared area of the molecular shell (Figure 2), while younger, ongoing star formation, is taking place in the ultracompact H II regions on the edge of that shell, in W3-North, W3Main, and W3-OH. These youngest star-forming regions show individual sources embedded in their molecular gas cores, which are of order $10^{4}$ to $10^{5}$ years old (e.g. Megeath et al. 1996; Tieftrunk et al. 1998). Therefore, the entire W3/W4 complex does indeed show an age sequence consistent with hierarchical triggering of star formation: The first generation corresponds to the 1300 pc loop, and possibly the Perseus superbubble, along with the progenitor stellar population; these triggered the formation of IC 1795 on the western edge; which in turn triggered the formation of W3-North, W3-Main, and W3-OH at the edges of its shell (Figures 1-2). IC 1805, at the apex of the W4 shells by projection, is a young, $1-3 \mathrm{Myr}$ old association that
appears not to be responsible for triggering the creation of IC 1795. It is possible that the formation of IC 1805 was itself triggered by the earliest generation, and possibly it, too, is located on the edge of the shell, although projected toward the center in our line of sight.

In contrast to two-generation superbubble systems, this three-generation configuration is extremely difficult to attribute to coincidental sequential star formation. Thus, the W3/W4 complex provides some of the strongest evidence to date that superbubble activity and mechanical feedback from massive stars is indeed a mechanism for triggering star formation. Additional examples of confirmed multi-generation star formation can further confirm this.

We thank Phil Massey for discussions on the photometry, and Brian Skiff for cross-referencing the stars in the literature. MSO and GLW acknowledge support from the National Science Foundation, grant AST-0204853. KK participated through the Research Experience for Undergraduates program at Northern Arizona University, also supported by the National Science Foundation. Much of this work was done by MSO at the Space Telescope Science Institute and Lowell Observatory.
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## APPENDIX

Here we present the complete, new stellar dataset for the greater W 3 region. Table 2 presents our $U B V$ photometry for stars observed in the region covered by Figure 3. (The complete version of Table 2 is available in the on-line edition). The first two columns give ID numbers assigned by this work and Ogura \& Ishida (1976), respectively, columns 3 and 4 give the celestial coordinates for epoch J2000.0, and columns 5-10 list the $V, B$, and $U$ magnitudes with corresponding formal (non-systematic) uncertainties. Finally, column 11 gives the number of observations that were averaged to obtain the final values, and column 12 gives the spectral classification resulting from our spectroscopic data.

## Special notes:

Star 2001 (OI $89=\mathrm{BD}+61$ 411): Formal uncertainties $<0.001$ in all three bands. This star was classified as O6.5 V((f)) by Mathys (1989).

Star 9018 (OI 71): V measurement saturated; listed value is adopted from Ogura \& Ishida (1976).
Star 2046: Resolved into two stars, OI 78 and OI 79, by Ogura \& Ishida (1976).

Table 2
Photometry and Spectral Types for the W3 Region

| ID | OI | RA(J2000.0) | $\operatorname{Dec}(J 2000.0)$ | $V$ | $V$ err | $B$ | $B$ err | $U$ | $U$ err | n-obs | Sp Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1007 | 112 | $2: 26: 41.31$ | $61: 59: 24.2$ | 14.318 | 0.001 | 15.256 | 0.001 | 15.299 | 0.002 | 3 | B1-2 V |
| 1008 | $\ldots$ | $2: 26: 34.63$ | $61: 59: 10.6$ | 15.312 | 0.001 | 16.947 | 0.003 | 17.753 | 0.011 | 3 | $\ldots$ |
| 1009 | $\ldots$ | $2: 26: 38.45$ | $61: 59: 26.2$ | 18.138 | 0.013 | 19.585 | 0.028 | 20.080 | 0.120 | 2 | $\ldots$ |
| 1010 | $\ldots$ | $2: 26: 40.83$ | $61: 58: 11.7$ | 17.233 | 0.005 | 18.736 | 0.011 | 18.000 | 0.023 | 3 | $\ldots$ |
| 1011 | $\ldots$ | $2: 26: 34.54$ | $61: 58: 16.6$ | 18.124 | 0.013 | 20.069 | 0.042 | 20.883 | 0.235 | 2 | $\ldots$ |
| 1012 | $\ldots$ | $2: 26: 34.69$ | $61: 57: 32.9$ | 17.853 | 0.010 | 19.403 | 0.023 | 20.086 | 0.121 | 2 | $\ldots$ |
| 1013 | $\ldots$ | $2: 26: 35.17$ | $61: 57: 11.0$ | 16.616 | 0.003 | 17.989 | 0.006 | 18.891 | 0.030 | 3 | $\ldots$ |
| 1014 | $\ldots$ | $2: 26: 39.27$ | $61: 57: 06.2$ | 17.501 | 0.006 | 19.211 | 0.015 | 20.046 | 0.104 | 3 | $\ldots$ |
| 1015 | 93 | $2: 26: 33.94$ | $61: 56: 57.2$ | 14.739 | 0.001 | 15.757 | 0.001 | 16.043 | 0.003 | 3 | $\ldots$ |
| 1016 | $\cdots$ | $2: 26: 33.30$ | $61: 56: 58.6$ | 15.584 | 0.001 | 16.914 | 0.003 | 16.923 | 0.008 | 3 | $\cdots$ |

Note.-Table 2 is presented in its entirety in the electronic edition of the Astronomical Journal. A portion is shown here for guidance regarding its form and content.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Participant in the 2003 Research Experience for Undergraduates Program, Northern Arizona University.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ IRAF is distributed by NOAO, which is operated by AURA, Inc., under cooperative agreement with the NSF.

