Ecology & Evolution | Jan 7, 2026 | 10 min read | By Bryan White

Wolves, Willows, and Water: A Retrospective on the Yellowstone Northern Range

Biology * Environment * Conservation

Introduction: The Green World Hypothesis and the Yellowstone Experiment

The reintroduction of 41 gray wolves (Canis lupus) to Yellowstone National Park between 1995 and 1997 stands as one of the most intensively scrutinized conservation interventions of the twentieth century. In the decades since, a linear narrative captured popular and scientific imagination: the return of the apex predator triggered a top-down trophic cascade in which wolf predation on Rocky Mountain elk (Cervus canadensis) released riparian aspen (Populus tremuloides) and willow (Salix spp.) from decades of suppression, stabilizing stream hydrology and enabling the return of the beaver (Castor canadensis). Rooted in Hairston, Smith, and Slobodkin's 1960 "Green World Hypothesis," Yellowstone's northern winter range served as a natural laboratory for testing whether apex carnivore recovery can reverse seventy years of trophic downgrading.

Following federal wolf extirpation in the 1920s, the northern Yellowstone elk herd swelled to over 19,000 individuals by 1994.[1] Dendrochronological records show that woody sapling recruitment virtually ceased between the 1920s and 1990s as winter-foraging elk browsed young stems below the two-meter escape threshold.[2] Without willow root networks and beaver dams, stream channels incised and riparian biodiversity simplified into a grazing lawn.[4] Yet thirty years of multidisciplinary data show that while wolves fundamentally altered the Northern Yellowstone ecosystem, the cascade is complicated by human harvest legacies, a resurgent multi-predator guild, compensatory bison (Bison bison) herbivory, and physical constraints buffered by climate change.

Multi-Causal Elk Dynamics and the Predator Guild

Following wolf restoration, the northern Yellowstone elk herd declined by nearly 80%, falling from 19,045 counted individuals in 1994 to 3,915 in 2013 before stabilizing between 4,000 and 6,000 animals.[6][8] Forensic mortality accounting indicates that this contraction was driven by additive pressure from multiple predators alongside human harvest rather than wolves alone.

Throughout 1995-2005, Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks conducted the Gardiner Late Hunt, harvesting 2,000 to 3,000 antlerless female and calf elk annually as they migrated north of the park.[7] In 1997, 2000, and 2003, human harvest of adult females exceeded wolf predation before the late hunt was curtailed and canceled in 2010.[7] Simultaneously, recovering grizzly bears (Ursus arctos) and cougars (Puma concolor) established a year-round predation gauntlet.[11] Neonatal telemetry by Barber-Meyer et al. showed that bears accounted for 58-60% of summer elk calf mortality, compared to 14-17% by wolves.[9][10] While wolves cull vulnerable elk in

winter snow, bears limit summer recruitment and cougars ambush adults in rocky terrain, locking elk into a low-density equilibrium.[12][13]

Testing the Landscape of Fear and Patchy Vegetation Release

Early cascade models emphasized "behavioral mediation" -- positing that elk proactively avoided risky riparian corridors ("Landscapes of Fear"), releasing willow and aspen before elk numbers fell.[14][15] Fine-scale GPS telemetry pairing wolves and elk has revised this hypothesis. Adult female elk exhibit strong winter range fidelity, adjusting behavior temporally rather than spatially: foraging in valley bottoms at midday when wolves rest and retreating to open slopes at dawn and dusk.[13][16][17] Moreover, endocrine assays of cortisol metabolites and pregnancy rates show no chronic predation-stress physiology, demonstrating that woody plant release depends primarily on lower elk density rather than spatial avoidance.[13][18]

Consequently, woody recovery is spatially heterogeneous. While Ripple, Beschta, and Painter documented young aspen breaching the 200 cm browse line in low-elk eastern Lamar Valley stands,[2][19][20] randomized range-wide sampling and fenced exclosures by Kauffman et al. demonstrated that browsing across core winter patches continued to suppress sapling recruitment.[3][14]

Geomorphic Constraints: The Willow-Beaver Hydrologic Trap

Where elk browsing declined along northern range streams, willow recovery frequently stalled against bottom-up physical constraints. Willows are obligate phreatophytes requiring root contact with shallow groundwater. During the mid-twentieth-century absence of beavers, high-velocity spring runoff incised stream channels vertically, dropping adjacent floodplain water tables below willow root zones.[4][22]

In a landmark 10-year factorial experiment along Elk Creek, Marshall, Hobbs, and Cooper crossed ungulate exclosure fencing with simulated beaver dams that recharged groundwater.[22][33] Willows protected from browsing alone above incised banks reached an average height of only 106 cm and stagnated; only when browsing protection was paired with elevated water tables did willows reach 147 cm and restore dense canopy cover.[22][23] Loss of beaver dams shifted streams into an incised alternative stable state that top-down predation alone cannot reverse.[24][34] Although park-wide beaver colonies rose to roughly 121 by 2024, northern range recolonization remains restricted to reaches with favorable gradients or remnant willow thickets.[5]

Compensatory Bison Herbivory and Climatic Forcing

As elk biomass plummeted, northern range plains bison expanded from roughly 500 individuals in 1997 to over 5,000 by 2024 (with nearly 5,300 parkwide in 2025 under the National Park Service's July 2024 Bison Management Plan targeting a 3,500-6,000 post-calving range).[6][25] Three to four times heavier than elk and defending calves in cohesive herds, bison face low wolf predation risk and occupy Lamar Valley riparian flats year-round.[26][27] Winter-foraging bison browse woody shoots and physically snap regenerating aspen saplings that had escaped the 200 cm elk browse line, suppressing tree recruitment in core valley bottoms.[26][28][35]

| Ecological Metric | | Elk (Pre-1995 Peak) | | Elk (2013-2024 Equilibrium) | | Bison (2024 Northern Range) | | Cascade Implication |

| Population Size | | ~19,045 individuals | | ~3,900-6,000 individuals | | >5,000 individuals | | Shift from elk-dominated to bison-dominated ungulate biomass.[6][8] |

| Primary Mortality Drivers | | Winterkill & Gardiner Late Hunt | | Multi-predator guild (bears on calves; wolves/cougars in winter) | | Minimal wolf predation; boundary management removals | | Bison forage in riparian bottoms without spatial avoidance.[9][11][27] |

| Woody Plant Impact | | Intensive winter leader browsing (<200 cm) | | Patchy release in eastern & upland stands | | Heavy summer grazing, trampling, and mechanical stem breakage (>200 cm) | | Bison mechanically reset aspen and willow saplings escaping elk.[20][26][35] |

| Hydrologic Context | | Active beaver extirpation & channel incision | | 106 cm willow height in fenced incised reaches vs. 147 cm with dam recharge | | Bank trampling along low-gradient valleys | | Top-down release constrained by incised water tables and regional drought.[22][30] |

Simultaneously, dendroclimatological reconstructions show that the early twentieth-century elk expansion coincided with an anomalously wet pluvial period, whereas the post-1995 wolf recovery unfolded during severe multi-year drought, warming temperatures, and declining spring snowpacks.[29][30][31] Lower groundwater recharge and earlier snowmelt compound stream incision stress on riparian phreatophytes while altering winter snow conditions that govern wolf hunting efficiency.[32][33]

Conclusion: A Cascade of Complexity

Three decades after wolf reintroduction, Yellowstone's northern range affirms that apex predators are vital keystone regulators, yet refutes the notion of a simple, single-lever trophic cascade. Wolves, operating alongside a recovered guild of grizzly bears and cougars as well as historic human harvests, decisively ended seventy years of elk hyper-abundance.[1][11] Where groundwater tables remain accessible and bison densities are moderate, aspen and willow stands have achieved measurable structural recruitment.[20][21] However, across incised floodplains and heavily grazed valley bottoms, bottom-up hydrological thresholds, warming regional climates, and compensatory bison herbivory override top-down release.[22][26][30] Rather than snapping back to a pre-1920s baseline, Yellowstone has assembled a dynamic novel ecosystem where biological predation and physical geomorphology continuously co-author the landscape.

Updates... (Nov 21, 2026): Updated Yellowstone bison population context with 2025 National Park Service figures, split grouped inline citations into individual reference superscripts, replaced the timed-out USGS Reference #29 URL with its primary Quaternary Research CrossRef DOI (10.1016/j.yqres.2007.02.002), standardized the references container identifier, and added verified publication and institutional update dates across all references.

References & Primary Sources

* [1] MacNulty, D. R., Stahler, D. R., Wyman, T., Ruprecht, J., Smith, L. M., Kohl, M. T., & Smith, D. W. (2016). The Challenge of Understanding Northern Yellowstone Elk Dynamics after Wolf Reintroduction. Yellowstone Science, 24(1), 25-33, https://qanr.usu.edu/wild/labs/macnulty-lab/files/macnulty-et-al-2016a.pdf

* [2] Painter, L. E., Beschta, R. L., Larsen, E. J., & Ripple, W. J. (2014). After long-term decline, are aspen recovering in northern Yellowstone? Forest Ecology and Management, 329, 108-117, https://trophiccascades.forestry.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/Painter_2014FEM.pdf

* [3] Kauffman, M. J., Brodie, J. F., & Jules, E. S. (2010). Are wolves saving Yellowstone's aspen? A landscape-level test of a behaviorally mediated trophic cascade. Ecology, 91(9), 2742-2755, https://downloads.regulations.gov/APHIS-2021-0055-0130/attachment_1.pdf

* [4] Smith, D. W., & Tyers, D. B. (September 1, 2012). The History and Current Status and Distribution of Beavers in Yellowstone National Park. Northwest Science, 86(4), 276-289, https://doi.org/10.3955/046.086.0404

* [5] U.S. National Park Service (updated April 18, 2025). Beaver -- Yellowstone National Park. https://www.nps.gov/yell/learn/nature/beaver.htm

* [6] National Park Service (2025). Restoration of Yellowstone Bison: Executive Summary, https://www.nps.gov/yell/learn/nature/upload/YellowstoneBison_ExecutiveSummary.pdf

* [7] Kohn, J. (2010). Gardiner elk hunt falls victim to wolves. Montana Environmental Quality Council Exhibit 23, https://archive.legmt.gov/content/Committees/Interim/2009_2010/Environmental_Quality_Council/Minutes/eqc03052010_ex23.pdf

* [8] Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (November 13, 2024). Montana 2024 Elk Counts, https://fwp.mt.gov/binaries/content/assets/fwp/conservation/wildlife-reports/elk/2024/elk2024_20241113.pdf

* [9] Barber-Meyer, S. M., Mech, L. D., & White, P. J. (May 2008). Elk Calf Survival and Mortality Following Wolf Restoration to Yellowstone National Park. Wildlife Monographs, 169, 1-30, https://doi.org/10.2193/2008-004

* [10] Barber-Meyer, S. M., Mech, L. D., & White, P. J. (May 2008). Elk Calf Survival and Mortality Following Wolf Restoration to Yellowstone National Park. UNL Digital Commons, https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usgsnpwrc/396/

* [11] National Park Service (2025). 2024 Wolf, Cougar and Elk Project Report, https://www.nps.gov/yell/learn/nature/upload/2024-YELL-Wolf-Cougar-and-Elk-Report.pdf

* [12] White, P. J., Garrott, R. A., & Plumb, G. E. (2013). Northern Yellowstone Elk: Resilience & Adaptation to Changes in Management Policies and the Ecosystem. National Park Service, https://www.nps.gov/yell/learn/nature/upload/ELK-BOOK-FOR-WEB_accessible.pdf

* [13] Utah State University Today (March 26, 2019). Yellowstone Elk Don't Budge for Wolves say Scientists. https://www.usu.edu/today/story/yellowstone-elk-dont-budge-for-wolves-say-scientists

* [14] Brice, E. M., Larsen, E. J., & MacNulty, D. R. (November 8, 2021; print January 2022). Sampling bias exaggerates a textbook example of a trophic cascade. Ecology Letters, 25(1), 177-188, https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13915

* [15] Beschta, R. L., & Ripple, W. J. (2016). Riparian vegetation recovery in Yellowstone: The first two decades after wolf reintroduction. Biological Conservation, 198, 93-103, https://trophiccascades.forestry.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/Beschta_Ripple2016.pdf

* [16] Kohl, M. T., Stahler, D. R., Metz, M. C., Forester, J. D., Kauffman, M. J., Varley, N., White, P. J., Smith, D. W., & MacNulty, D. R. (2018). Diel predator activity drives a dynamic landscape of fear. USGS Publications Warehouse, https://www.usgs.gov/publications/diel-predator-activity-drives-a-dynamic-landscape-fear

* [17] Kohl, M. T., et al. (June 22, 2018). Diel predator activity drives a dynamic landscape of fear. Ecological Monographs, 88(4), 638-652, https://doi.org/10.1002/ecm.1313

* [18] Cusack, J. J., Kohl, M. T., Metz, M. C., Coulson, T., Stahler, D. R., Smith, D. W., & MacNulty, D. R. (March 21, 2019). Weak spatiotemporal response of prey to predation risk in a freely interacting system. Journal of Animal Ecology, 89(1), 120-131, https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12968

* [19] Painter, L. E., Beschta, R. L., Larsen, E. J., & Ripple, W. J. (January 2015). Recovering aspen follow changing elk dynamics in Yellowstone: evidence of a trophic cascade? Ecology, 96(1), 252-263, https://doi.org/10.1890/14-0712.1

* [20] Painter, L. E., Beschta, R. L., Larsen, E. J., & Ripple, W. J. (January 2015). Recovering aspen follow changing elk dynamics in Yellowstone: evidence of a trophic cascade? Oregon State University, https://trophiccascades.forestry.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/Painter_2015Eco.pdf

* [21] Ripple, W. J., & Beschta, R. L. (2025). The strength of the Yellowstone trophic cascade after wolf reintroduction. Global Ecology and Conservation, https://consbio.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/1-s2.0-S2351989425000290-main.pdf

* [22] Bilyeu, D. M., Cooper, D. J., & Hobbs, N. T. (January 2008). Water tables constrain height recovery of willow on Yellowstone's northern range. Ecological Applications, 18(1), 80-92, https://doi.org/10.1890/07-0212.1

* [23] Bilyeu, D. M., Cooper, D. J., & Hobbs, N. T. (January 2008). Water tables constrain height recovery of willow on Yellowstone's northern range. Mountain Scholar, https://mountainscholar.org/bitstreams/cbef06f0-899e-4e39-9480-c8d23a4eed2d/download

* [24] Marshall, K. N., Hobbs, N. T., & Cooper, D. J. (April 7, 2013). Stream hydrology limits recovery of riparian ecosystems after wolf reintroduction. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 280(1756), 20122977, https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2012.2977

* [25] U.S. National Park Service (updated May 4, 2026). Bison Ecology -- Yellowstone National Park. https://www.nps.gov/yell/learn/nature/bison.htm

* [26] Painter, L. E., Beschta, R. L., Larsen, E. J., & Ripple, W. J. (August 29, 2023). Bison alter the northern Yellowstone ecosystem by breaking aspen saplings.

Ecology and Evolution, 13(8), e10369, https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.10369

* [27] Oregon State University Newsroom (March 31, 2020). Bison in northern Yellowstone proving to be too much of a good thing. https://news.oregonstate.edu/news/bison-northern-yellowstone-proving-be-too-much-good-thing

* [28] Cowboy State Daily (August 9, 2025). Wolves Might Have Saved Yellowstone's Aspen From Elk, But Now Bison Are Eating It. https://cowboystatedaily.com/2025/08/09/wolves-might-have-saved-yellowstones-aspen-from-elk-but-now-bison-are-eating-it/

* [29] Gray, S. T., Graumlich, L. J., & Betancourt, J. L. (July 2007). Annual precipitation in the Yellowstone National Park region since AD 1173. Quaternary Research, 68(1), 18-27, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yqres.2007.02.002

* [30] Hostetler, S., et al. (2021). Greater Yellowstone Climate Assessment. University of Wyoming, https://www.uwyo.edu/research/_files/centers_and_institutes/wyact/docs/gyca-2021-report.pdf

* [31] Hostetler, S., et al. (2021). Greater Yellowstone Climate Assessment: Chapter 3 -- Historical Climate and Water Trends in the GYA, https://www.gyclimate.org/ch3

* [32] U.S. National Park Service (updated February 16, 2024). Temporal Variation in Wolf Predation Dynamics. https://www.nps.gov/articles/temporal-variation-in-wolf-predation-dynamics.htm

* [33] Marshall, K. N., Cooper, D. J., & Hobbs, N. T. (2014). Interactions among herbivory, climate, topography and plant age shape riparian willow dynamics in northern Yellowstone National Park. Journal of Ecology, 102(3), 667-677, https://sites.warnercnr.colostate.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2017/02/2014MarshallCooperHobbsJEcology.pdf

* [34] Johnston, D. B., Cooper, D. J., & Hobbs, N. T. (2011). Relationships between groundwater use, water table, and recovery of willow on Yellowstone's northern range. Ecosphere, 2(2), art20, https://sites.warnercnr.colostate.edu/davidcooper/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2017/02/JohnstonCooperHobbs2011.pdf

* [35] Beschta, R. L., Painter, L. E., & Ripple, W. J. (2020). Bison limit ecosystem recovery in northern Yellowstone. Food Webs, 23, e00142, https://trophiccascades.forestry.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/Beschta2020_FoodWebs_0.pdf