

## Pontogenine genera

The subfamily Pontogeneinae is represented by several genera in the NEP, but neither *Accedomoera* nor *Paramoera* penetrate south of Pt. Conception. Members of *Nasageneia* and *Pontogeneia* do occur in the SCB, and are in the SCAMIT Ed. 4 list. The two genera can be separated in the generic key, but all members of these two genera will be keyed together to species level below. The disjunct subspecies *Paramoera serrata escofetae*, which is known only from the outer coast of Baja California, is also included.

Key to NEP pontogenine species known from south of Pt. Conception – D. Cadien  
17Apr06

1. Epimeron 3 posterior margin serrate.....*Nasageneia* 2  
Epimeron 3 posterior margin sinuous or convex, smooth.....3
2. Anterioventral head corner acute.....*N. nasa* Barnard 1969\*  
Anterioventral head corner subacute.....*N. quinsana* Barnard 1964\*
3. Coxae 1-3 bearing small posteroventral tooth; epimera 1-2 lacking oblique ridge extending from anterior margin along ventral margin.....  
.....*Paramoera serrata escofetae* Staude 1995  
Coxae 1-3 lacking posteroventral teeth; epimera 1-2 with oblique ridge extending from anterior margin along ventral margin.....*Pontogeneia* 4
4. Telson lobes rounded, with no definite corner at the cleft.....5  
Telson lobes obliquely truncate, with distinct corner at the cleft.....  
.....*Pontogeneia rostrata* Gurjanova 1938
5. Coxae 1-3 bearing a single large posterior spine; G2 carpus with narrow ventral lobe in both sexes.....*Pontogeneia (Tethygeneia) opata* Barnard 1959  
Coxae 1-3 lacking posterior spines; G2 carpus lacking narrow ventral lobe.....6
6. Epimeron 3 strongly sinuous with posteroventral corner quadrate, lacking a tooth  
.....*Pontogeneia (Pontogeneia) inermis* (Krøyer 1838)  
Epimeron 3 convex with posteroventral corner bearing a small tooth.....  
.....*Pontogeneia (Pontogeneia) intermedia* Gurjanova 1938

\* in my opinion these two forms cannot be reliably separated, and *N. nasa* should be synonymized with *N. quinsana*. The differences mentioned by Barnard 1979 between them do not seem substantiated by the descriptions and illustrations of the species available. His assertion that one is an embayment form and the other an offshore form when both occur intertidally is absurd.