
Subject: What should C&C3 have been?

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 22 Feb 2010 23:14:45 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So, as we all know, C&C3 pretty much wasn't what any of us expected or really wanted. However, I'd like to know what most people would have liked to have seen in C&C3.

That being said, what would you expect C&C3 to have been if Westwood had made it (or, alternatively, what you wanted it to be)?

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?

Posted by [\[NE\]Fobby\[GEN\]](#) on Mon, 22 Feb 2010 23:35:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I didn't think C&C3 was an epic failure or anything, but I probably would've done things differently.

I think one of the main things about C&C3 was that it felt like more of a sequel to Tiberian Dawn than Tiberian Sun. Mammoth tanks, "Medium Tanks", Grenadiers, flametroopers, nukes, etc. were all brought back. I would've liked to see that dark, gritty, futuristic post-apocalyptic Tiberian Sun environment come back.

-More Tiberium: in C&C3, Tiberium fauna, plants, mutated animals, and different forms of the substance just disappeared. Blue Tiberium wasn't explosive as well, even though it was before.

-Subterranean units: The underground theme was very suiting for Nod - surprise attacks, hidden units, etc. - the sub-APC and Devil's Tongue were useful, but can still be repelled with the MSA and pavement.

-A Mammoth Mark II type vehicle: I would've loved to see a giant walker come back for GDI. This was sort of fulfilled in Kane's Wrath with the MARV, but I thought its design was boring.

-Vines: These also disappeared, even though I thought a growing anti-vehicle substance was a pretty good idea. It also immersed the player into the idea that this world's mutations were a ticking time bomb.

-A more mysterious Kane: When Kane was shown in C&C95 and Tiberian Sun, he'd usually be in a secret, hidden location. In C&C3, you have people walking around, handing him things, talking to him face to face, etc. Although it's not really a big deal, Kane feels more normal and not mysterious and secretive.

-No Scrin: Personally, I think the whole "aliens invading the earth" thing has been way overdone. Westwood originally wanted CABAL as the third faction; this could've been a lot more interesting.

-Third Person Commander: I really enjoyed seeing McNeil and Slavic. I like to see how bad ass I am. Talking to the camera is a bit cheesy.

-World Domination Mode: Speaks for itself

-No cranes: I thought the cranes and the ability to build a million things at the same time made the game feel like a race to unit spam and expansion, rather than a tactical strategy game like previous C&Cs. I preferred the RA2 build style of things.

-Natural Disasters: Tiberian Sun had ion storms and meteors, Emperor: Battle for Dune had tornadoes and giant worms. I would've loved to see some natural disasters that randomly hit parts of the map.

-The Forgotten: These guys were completely "forgotten" in C&C3, even though they played a pretty integral role in the TS story. It was a large group, and their loyalty was fought over between Nod and GDI. They were brought back in Kane's Wrath, but only 1 savage-like unit with a rifle (and not the honourable Forgotten we remember, with railguns and shit.)

There's just too much to say.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?

Posted by [zeratul](#) on Mon, 22 Feb 2010 23:46:35 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

^ What he said

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 22 Feb 2010 23:48:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Agreed with pretty much everything ya said there, but lemme pick out a small little bit here.

[NEFobby[GEN] wrote on Mon, 22 February 2010 17:35]

-No Scrin: Personally, I think the whole "aliens invading the earth" thing has been way overdone. Westwood originally wanted CABAL as the third faction; this could've been a lot more interesting. While CABAL was definitely intended to be a third faction, the Scrin clearly were meant to have more involvement. HOWEVER, they should have been introduced in an entirely different fashion. Rather than a third, playable faction, they should have been WAY more ominous and foreboding. Something of a plot device that CABAL or Kane would use as a method of bringing about the destruction of the Earth (or, well, terraforming it, whatever).

Personally, I LOVED how the Scrin were in TD (a small, tiny spacecraft), Renegade (an outright crashed UFO being investigated by Nod), and in TS (a remade ship, as well as being more or less hinted at than directly mentioned and appearing). They should have continued along a similar path, possibly with the end being something along the lines of Nod and/or GDI discovering that there are more scout ships patrolling around Earth's atmosphere or something (which would hint at a very imminent invasion).

I really did hate how the Scrin just outright invaded in C&C3, but I still like the idea of them.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [\[NE\]Fobby\[GEN\]](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 00:01:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree. Let me rephrase that - I believe the Scrin should be a part of the storyline, the same way the Forgotten are, but not as a playable faction with the central focus of the game.

In other words, GDI, Nod, and CABAL would be the main factions, the Forgotten and the Scrin would be sort of "sub-factions".

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [Lone0001](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 00:32:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I didn't mind C&C3, anything past it is horrible though.

RA3 is just ridiculous, C&C4 is just an epic failure. Every game after C&C3 has been horrible, not to mention the game before it.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [nope.avi](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 01:35:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

screw c and c make another Generals

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 01:39:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

C&C3 was a good game. There were some unit ideas and faction mechanics that I would have made different and some game mechanics that I would have either changed or omitted, but it was a decent game.

Things like cranes I would have taken out completely because they totally ruined the game, imo, because they made echo-booming much easier.

I also would have made Nod less of a steamroller faction then they ended up becoming.

For GDI, I would have payed more tribute to what happened in TS, technology and design wise.

As for the single player, they did an ok job, but if it were me, they could have lengthened it. Obviously it told its story, but I would have made more early missions. Kane's re-appearance should have been more dramatic because of how he was personally killed by McNeil in TS. And overall, I would have made at least a few references to Tiberian Sun. Just mentioning things that

happened in that game would be a basis to drive ideas, so I'm kind of perplexed at why they sort of tended to stay away from that.

From what I've seen from the C&C4 FMV trailers, C&C3's story should have been more like that. If C&C4's gameplay didn't suck so bad, it could potentially be an excellent C&C game. However, it's bad gameplay isn't really what has me distressed, it's the fact that it's the conclusion of the Kane story.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?

Posted by [terminator 101](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 02:00:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 22 February 2010 18:48

Personally, I LOVED how the Scrin were in TD (a small, tiny spacecraft), Renegade (an outright crashed UFO being investigated by Nod), and in TS (a remade ship, as well as being more or less hinted at than directly mentioned and appearing). They should have continued along a similar path, possibly with the end being something along the lines of Nod and/or GDI discovering that there are more scout ships patrolling around Earth's atmosphere or something (which would hint at a very imminent invasion).

I really did hate how the Scrin just outright invaded in C&C3, but I still like the idea of them. They were in TD? What mission was that in? I played that game many times but never noticed any such space ship, or a reference to it. (Then again, I have never seen any cutscenes for the GDI because the cracked dos version that I had did not have those)

Unless you mean this:

Though that barely looks like anything like an ufo.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?

Posted by [DRNG](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 02:04:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Where the fuck were the fucking walls.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?

Posted by [Lone0001](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 02:55:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 22 February 2010 20:39 C&C3 was a good game. There were some unit ideas and faction mechanics that I would have made different and some game mechanics that I would have either changed or omitted, but it was a decent game.

Things like cranes I would have taken out completely because they totally ruined the game, imo, because they made echo-booming much easier.

I also would have made Nod less of a steamroller faction then they ended up becoming.

For GDI, I would have payed more tribute to what happened in TS, technology and design wise.

As for the single player, they did an ok job, but if it were me, they could have lengthened it. Obviously it told its story, but I would have made more early missions. Kane's re-appearance should have been more dramatic because of how he was personally killed by McNeil in TS. And overall, I would have made at least a few references to Tiberian Sun. Just mentioning things that happened in that game would be a basis to drive ideas, so I'm kind of perplexed at why they sort of tended to stay away from that.

From what I've seen from the C&C4 FMV trailers, C&C3's story should have been more like that. If C&C4's gameplay didn't suck so bad, it could potentially be an excellent C&C game. However, it's bad gameplay isn't really what has me distressed, it's the fact that its the conclusion of the Kane story.

I thought the story of C&C4 looked like just as much as an epic failure as the gameplay, overall the game is really bad.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 03:49:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yea, but you also said that RA3 was a failure.

I'm a single player person. I don't play many online games. But RA3 compelled me to play online. Its the only C&C game to have ever done that for me. It is the best playing and best constructed C&C game to date.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [Gen_Blacky](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 04:07:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

you should see C&C4 beta completely different rts game play. Complete failure.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [Zion](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 10:12:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The thing EA fucked up most on with C&C3 is the storyline with Tiberian Sun/Firestorm.

In the TS/FS games, we had mechanical walkers, hover units, great big disruptor tanks, underground units, and walls.

Now, ahead of time in the C&C3 era, we've gone back in time to wheeled and tracked units, with rail technology. I don't see the sense in that.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?

Posted by [nopol10](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 10:18:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have to interrupt here. There's been way too many complaints about C&C4 which are unfounded.

Let's get a few facts straight.

-I didn't like the idea of C&C4's gameplay at all when they mentioned it. Too much of an FPS element to it and quite little of C&C. The first time I played the beta online I had totally no idea what I was supposed to do. They couldn't expect veteran C&C players to understand this concept quickly and it could fail if it didn't get anyone's interest.

-I managed to get a few friends to enter the beta and started playing together over Skype. The experience is completely different and we actually enjoyed it. Sure, its almost completely different from past C&C RTSs but keeping an open mind about the game really helps in making an objective judgment of the game. Treat it like a new game with a new gameplay experience and you'll be pleasantly surprised.

-Class based gameplay is just another term for multiple factions and there is little harm in trying out something new for the series especially when the new formula works. It will definitely cause the franchise to lose some followers but may bring new players in. That's a huge MAY because this is advertised as the last game in this story arc and it hasn't been released into public yet. Still, the devs should be applauded for willing to take such a risk.

-Changing the gameplay mechanics is something I find crucial to the franchise. C&C has followed the same formula for more than a decade now things will inevitable get stale. Imagine C&C4 using the same formula as previous games. We know the tech gap between 3 and 4 isn't too much so even with different unit names graphics, the multiplayer and even singleplayer aspect of the game would be unchanged. They can add the Forgotten, fix up the Scrin and do all sorts of new faction related stuff but that would be doing so out of quota satisfaction and fan appeasement more than anything else. Putting the Forgotten in as a new faction now would just be shoehorning and it will feel jutted just like the Scrin were in C&C3. I don't know about you, but I don't want to be playing through C&C3 all over again but this time packaged as C&C4.

-There's a few reasons why I say C&C4 will end up like C&C3 if it remained pure C&C. There's just so many things you can do with a base or a bunch of soldiers/tanks/commandos for a mission. Key point is: Blow things up. Those sort of things have been done to death in the previous C&C games and it seems that the devs are unlikely to come up with more original ideas for those missions.

-Multiplayer wise C&C3 was a success. The only thing it failed at was in promoting RTS as a sport (which was on the back cover of the game). Their Battlecast viewer (if anyone even remembered that) faded into obscurity after a short while and watching matches Live just didn't attract people's attention enough. Gameplay was good even with the multitude of balance patches that changed the game a lot each time. The Tiberium series simply didn't need another identical multiplayer element in C&C4. They can add new modes of gameplay but fan maps and mods could solve that problem in no time and they could focus on balancing the main draw which is C&C mode. Why did RA3 work then? The Red Alert universe had never been realised in 3D officially so they had the freedom to make the game with almost the same formula. Its the same reason StarCraft 2 will work. It'll be almost the same deal as SC1 in terms of multiplayer but it is now in glorious three dimensions with a spanking new (continued) story to boot.

On to singleplayer and the story

-C&C3's story was a tad cliché and rather boring. It however set up the premise for the ending of Kane's story arc and it seems to me that they are doing/did a very good job story wise judging from the FMV trailers. No one seems to be complaining about the FMVs in C&C4 (unless I am living in a dream world) because they are rather good. New first person style of shooting with a very mobile camera setup is refreshing and very immersive.

-The fact that they promised we would be using different strategies to tackle the SP missions depending on the class we chose sounds like a good idea though it may fail badly. The symmetry that they've shown us in official SP walkthru vids doesn't seem to be a good sign either. Hopefully we've just seen the tip of the iceberg for that one.

-Hold on, no more Kane anymore? We love the character and we love Joe Kucan's portrayal of him. However, his story has got to end somewhere. As one of the producers or story lead had said, they just can't carry on pulling Kane out of a hat every few years and go "Kane lives!". Its been done every sequel and it won't work as a selling factor. What they can do however, is give him a fitting ending and tie up the plot strands left all over the place within the last decade. I'm convinced the story will be a stunner direction and story wise.

HOWEVER

If you're still not convinced to at least keep an open mind about the game, you could always wait for people to post the FMVs on YouTube and just watch them all there as though it was a film. Or read Wikipedia. I'll be buying the game for my collection and also because I have a feeling it will be good.

Whoops, what should C&C3 have been?

More focussed on the story. Better script as well. There, I haven't gone too OT have I?

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?

Posted by [DRNG](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 12:53:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nopol10 wrote on Tue, 23 February 2010 04:18

There, I haven't gone too OT have I?

Almost.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 15:59:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I disagree, nopol10.

I went into the C&C4 beta knowing it was different. But I had imagined all the changes to potentially be really fun. I often defended the changes by saying that they may not have been justified enough, but they still would be fun.

But what did I find when I entered the beta? A horribly executed, boring and repetitive game. Every good thing that I once thought about C&C4 had been stolen, spit on, and stomped into the dirt.

All of the good ideas that C&C4 has, such as player progression, classes, ect, were all done horribly wrong.

Half the things that were removed don't make sense to remove and half the things that were added don't make sense period.

For example, the way they did player progression is like this:

- You kill stuff and get experience.
- Use experience to get new units and powers.
- Your army gets bigger.

This method is incredibly flawed because it makes the game get boring after a while. People will see it more as a limitation rather than something to work for.

This is how they should have done it:

- You kill stuff to get experience.
- You use experience to unlock new units and powers.
- You choose from your unlocked units a select few that you bring to battle.
- Your army is completely customized.

They should have given you only a few open spots to add units into. For example, if you have 15 units per class, you should only be allowed 7 or 8 in one game.

Unit pools should be similar to how Call of Duty has the customizable player sets. In Call of Duty, you can chose your weapons, attachments, perks, ect. In C&C4, you should have been able to do the same thing with units and powers.

You shouldn't have all unlocked units available to you in a single game.

That's only one thing they did wrong in the game. The game's design has a lot of good ideas, but they were rushed and are nowhere near as good as they could be. As a result, the game is horribly not fun.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?

Posted by [nopol10](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 23:32:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I definitely agree with you on th experience system. It works for COD because of the long drawn out nature of the game and the multitudes of levels available. It can't be done for C&C4 properly because of the small amount of units and vthe lack of any true incentives to show off apart from the almost indistinguishable ranks. This makes it become a hindrance that goes away all too quickly (almost once a match). However, if they did the system where you chose your army before a match, it could lead to potential disaster as the scissors paper stone nature of the game would cause you to continuously get bthrashed or vice versa thanks to the imbalance. The CP system does solve the problem of overpowered high level players a little. It boils down to a lot of teamwork in this game which is something I like. It may reek of BF/COD but has the functional element of teamwork that those games cannot claim to have.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?

Posted by [\[NE\]Fobby\[GEN\]](#) on Tue, 23 Feb 2010 23:57:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I fully agree with R3 on this one. When I was originally invited for the alpha testing, I thought I knew what I was getting into: crawlers instead of bases, etc. I didn't like that version, and as the game evolved into the private beta and then the public beta, I found myself disliking the game more and more.

C&C4 is following the path of other mainstream RTS games, which have been simplified greatly to attract FPS, RPG, and casual gamer fanbases. The game is void of tactical and strategic play. You basically choose which class you want (Offense, Defense, Support) and each class can only build one type of unit (infantry, vehicle, aircraft). Since this is the case, it forces you to work together with your teammates. There are several problems with this:

- a) Several teammates can choose the same class
- b) There's almost always a teammate that leaves at the beginning of the game and therefore successfully screwing you over
- c) There's almost always a teammate that leaves in the middle of the game
- d) Teammates almost never work together the way EA assumed

So the multiplayer basically feels like "every man for himself".

If you play a 1 on 1, what ends up happening is that one player destroys the Crawler of the other player a few minutes into the game. Since the population caps are increased in a 1v1, the winning player can go ahead and unit spam, build up a huge army, and practically "spawnkill" enemy Crawlers until he wins.

On top of that, the gameplay is not fast and fluid, but instead slow paced and boring. It feels like everything has double the health it should have, and battles that would've taken 30 seconds in an older C&C game end up taking a few minutes of you looking at the screen waiting for something to die.

My biggest complaint is the mere simplicity of everything. Build units, and take over outposts. Its like Battlefield's conquest mode, except in the form of an RTS, which is dull and repetitive. I feel like I'm playing "whack a mole" without the excitement of wamming that hammer against the plastic mole.

So not only is C&C4 a big discourse from traditional C&C games, I find it downright boring altogether, C&C or not.

IMO.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 24 Feb 2010 00:04:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nopol10 wrote on Tue, 23 February 2010 18:32However, if they did the system where you chose your army before a match, it could lead to potential disaster as the scissors paper stone nature of the game would cause you to continuously get bthrashed or vice versa thanks to the imbalance. How so? You would have to use the right units for what strategy you wanted to use.

- You'd take the map terrain into consideration.
- Your planned attack strategy
- Your enemy's nature and most likely actions.

You pick a small army of units to use but so does your opponent.

No two games would be the same and it that would make give the multiplayer tones of replay value.

The balance for C&C4 is not rock, paper, scissors. It's more like Rock beats paper & scissors, paper beats scissors & rock, and scissors beats rock & paper. There is no line of effectiveness between different types of units (except for maybe ground vs air.) Sure some units might be stronger vs other units, but that doesn't mean that they are weak against everything else.

The beauty of having player chosen units is that the balance is in the hand of the player. The devs just need to make sure that each unit is reasonably balanced vs everything else. But ultimately if the player decides to go all ground forces, its their own fault for leaving themselves open to air

attacks.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [HaTe](#) on Wed, 24 Feb 2010 00:35:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Renegade 2 in place of C&C3. Or at least some sort of FPS/TPS game....RPG's can be fun, but there's just so many of them in the series....i like to be able to control one certain unit, rather than the entire team, personally.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 24 Feb 2010 13:24:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Terminator 101 wrote on Mon, 22 February 2010 20:00They were in TD? What mission was that in? I played that game many times but never noticed any such space ship, or a reference to it.(Then again, I have never seen any cutscenes for the GDI because the cracked dos version that I had did not have those)

Unless you mean this:

Though that barely looks like anything like an ufo.
and there's no reason it should, since it's a crashed orca.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 24 Feb 2010 13:57:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I appreciate the discussion guys, but could you please bring the topic of C&C4 elsewhere? This thread's about C&C3 and what it should've been, not C&C4 and how it sucks/doesn't suck/whatever.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 24 February 2010 07:24
and there's no reason it should, since it's a crashed orca.
Really? I never saw it in other missions except the last one, and it was kinda hard to reach IIRC.
Not to mention, it's a good deal larger than orcas (almost all the crashed vehicle images in the C&C games are about the same size as their actual unit counterparts).

I dunno, I always saw it as some kind of UFO, and that it was intended to be that way, especially since it's silver instead of gold.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [Tiesto](#) on Wed, 24 Feb 2010 14:02:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It looks about the right size tbh.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 24 Feb 2010 18:52:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Does anyone have a bigger image? I do remember seeing the crash many times, but I don't remember what it looks like. And that image is way too small to tell.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 24 Feb 2010 19:12:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

btw, "it doesn't look anything like a ufo"? well, ufo = unidentified flying object. it's an object, it is arguably unidentified if you don't buy my orca explanation, and if not, there's not a great deal of evidence that it can fly.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 24 Feb 2010 20:03:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Therefore it isn't a UFO.

It's a UO.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [\[NE\]Fobby\[GEN\]](#) on Thu, 25 Feb 2010 04:44:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 24 February 2010 08:57I appreciate the discussion guys, but could you please bring the topic of C&C4 elsewhere? This thread's about C&C3 and what it should've been, not C&C4 and how it sucks/doesn't suck/whatever.

I guess this means the thread isn't about UFOs (or UOs) either

Anyway the thread is about two and a half years late, but I feel like I've covered quite a bit in my post. I'd like to add though, that I don't really feel strongly about C&C3. Complaining about plot holes and inconsistencies between TS and TW is one thing, but the gameplay itself wasn't that bad in my opinion. It's still one of the better RTS games of the past decade, and probably EALA's best game in general (definitely better than Generals, RA3, and C&C4) but that being said there still is room for complaints.

Subject: Re: What should C&C3 have been?
Posted by [cmatt42](#) on Thu, 25 Feb 2010 05:31:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 24 February 2010 07:57
Really? I never saw it in other missions except the last one, and it was kinda hard to reach IIRC. Not to mention, it's a good deal larger than orcas.
If memory serves, it's been confirmed by someone who now works at Petroglyph at their forums.
