SCIENTIFIC Publishing Limited

Journal of Hydrological Ecology and Water Security
http://ojs.ukscip.com/index.php/jhews

Article

Enhancing Groundwater Recharge in Urban Landscapes through Forests and Green Infrastructure: Opportunities and Challenges

Krstinic Rudan, Elena Grdic*

Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, University of Rijeka, Primorska 42, 51410 Opatija, Croatia

Received: 16 May 2025; **Accepted**: 28 June 2025; **Published**: 13 July 2025

Abstract: Urban groundwater depletion is an escalating challenge driven by rapid urbanization, impervious surface expansion, and unsustainable water extraction. Nature-based solutions (NbS), particularly urban forests and green infrastructure (GI), offer promising approaches to restoring the hydrological functions of cities and enhancing groundwater recharge. This study investigates the effectiveness of such interventions through a comparative analysis of four global case studies—New York City (USA), Melbourne (Australia), Delhi (India), and Berlin (Germany). Findings reveal that urban forests and GI, when strategically designed and maintained, significantly increase infiltration rates, reduce stormwater runoff, and contribute to localized aquifer replenishment. The study underscores the importance of integrating these nature-based approaches into urban planning and water governance frameworks. It also highlights the role of policy incentives, community engagement, and adaptive management in scaling up NbS for long-term urban water security. By treating ecological infrastructure as functional water assets, cities can move toward more sustainable, climate-resilient groundwater management.

Keywords: Groundwater Recharge, Urban Forests, Green Infrastructure, Nature-Based Solutions, Urban Water Security

1. Introduction

In the 21st century, cities across the globe face mounting pressure to ensure sustainable and equitable access to water [1]. Among the many dimensions of urban water security, groundwater management has emerged as a critical but often overlooked component. Rapid urbanisation, climate variability, and unsustainable extraction practices have led to a significant decline in groundwater levels in many metropolitan areas. Paradoxically, while cities are expanding in size and water demand, their natural systems that enable aquifer recharge—such as vegetated landscapes and pervious soils—are being systematically replaced by impervious surfaces like roads, rooftops, and pavements. This urban hardscaping drastically reduces the capacity of rainwater to infiltrate into the soil, increasing surface runoff and diminishing the natural recharge of aquifers [2,3].

According to the United Nations, by 2050, nearly 68% of the world's population will reside in urban areas, many of which already face acute water stress. The consequences of unchecked groundwater depletion are multifold: diminished drinking water availability, increased pumping costs, land subsidence, and the loss of baseflows to urban streams and rivers. Against this backdrop, enhancing groundwater recharge within cities is no longer optional—it is imperative. In response to growing environmental and infrastructural challenges, the concept of nature-based solutions (NbS) has gained prominence as a sustainable approach to urban water management. NbS are defined by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as "actions to protect, sustainably manage, and restore natural or modified ecosystems that address societal challenges effectively and adaptively, simultaneously providing human well-being and biodiversity benefits." In the context of water security, NbS include a wide range of interventions, from wetland restoration to reforestation, and from riparian buffers to green urban infrastructure [4].

Particularly relevant to urban environments are urban forests and green infrastructure (GI). Urban forests—comprising street trees, park woodlands, and vegetated corridors—contribute to stormwater interception, increased infiltration, and improved microclimates. Green infrastructure refers to systems and technologies that mimic natural processes to manage water and create healthier urban environments. This includes green roofs, permeable pavements, rain gardens, bioswales, and vegetated detention basins. Together, these strategies not only improve the aesthetic and ecological quality of urban spaces but also offer tangible hydrological benefits, particularly in supporting groundwater recharge. Despite growing recognition of the multifunctional benefits of urban green infrastructure, its role in facilitating groundwater recharge has received comparatively less focused attention in both research and urban policy. Most urban NbS literature emphasises flood mitigation, stormwater management, air quality improvement, and biodiversity enhancement. However, groundwater recharge—especially as a key strategy for ensuring long-term urban water security—remains underexplored, particularly in the context of case-based, evidence-driven evaluations [5].

This research seeks to bridge that gap by systematically examining how urban forests and green infrastructure are being employed to enhance groundwater recharge in various urban contexts around the world. While the effectiveness of these interventions may vary based on climatic conditions, soil characteristics, land-use patterns, and institutional capacities, a comparative study of real-world applications offers valuable insights into both best practices and challenges. This paper aims to evaluate the potential and performance of urban forests and green infrastructure in promoting groundwater recharge in cities. Using a comparative case study approach, the paper analyses initiatives from diverse geographic and socio-economic settings—including New York City (USA), Melbourne (Australia), Delhi (India), and Berlin (Germany). These cities represent a range of climates, governance models, and ecological conditions, offering a rich landscape for assessing the adaptability and impact of NbS in urban aquifer management [6].

Key research questions include: To what extent have urban forests and green infrastructure contributed to improved groundwater recharge in selected cities? What design, implementation, and maintenance factors influence the success of these interventions? What co-benefits (e.g., flood mitigation, thermal regulation, biodiversity) accompany groundwater-focused NbS? What is the policy, planning, and governance implications of integrating green recharge infrastructure in urban development?

By addressing these questions, the paper contributes to a growing body of knowledge advocating for the integration of ecological infrastructure in urban water policy. It argues that fostering green-groundwater synergies through NbS is not only environmentally sound but also cost-effective and socially beneficial—an essential strategy in the climate-resilient cities of the future [7,8].

2. Methodology

The research is based on a multiple case study methodology, allowing for in-depth analysis of real-world examples across diverse geographic, climatic, and governance settings. Case studies are ideal for understanding complex environmental and social phenomena, particularly when they involve the interplay between ecological systems, urban planning, and public policy.

By focusing on actual interventions in cities that have implemented urban forests and GI for water management, the study aims to extract lessons that are both locally grounded and globally relevant. The selected cases are analysed based on both qualitative insights (policy frameworks, institutional arrangements, community participation) and quantitative indicators (infiltration rates, recharge volumes, surface runoff reduction) [9].

2.1 Case Study Selection

The following criteria guided the selection of cities:

1. **Implementation of Green Infrastructure/NbS:** The city must have a documented program or project that utilises urban forests and/or GI explicitly or implicitly for water recharge or stormwater management.
2. **Diverse Geographic and Climatic Conditions:** To assess variability in effectiveness, cities from different continents, climate zones, and levels of economic development were selected.
3. **Availability of Data:** Case studies were chosen based on the availability of reliable data, either through peer-reviewed literature, municipal reports, or independent evaluations.
4. **Range of NbS Approaches:** The cities reflect a range of interventions, from large-scale urban reforestation to engineered GI like bioswales and permeable pavements [10].

2.2 Selected Case Studies:

2.2.1. New York City, USA – Million Trees NYC Initiative

- **Overview:** A citywide tree-planting campaign initiated in 2007 aimed to plant one million trees across the city.
- **Relevance to Groundwater Recharge:** Increased canopy cover and improved soil structure have enhanced stormwater infiltration, especially in parks and open spaces.
- **Data Sources:** NYC Parks Department reports, academic studies on hydrological impact, and GIS land cover data.
- **Evaluation Aspects:** Increase in permeable surface area, urban infiltration capacity, and reduced stormwater runoff [11].

2.2.2. Melbourne, Australia – Urban Forest Strategy and Raingarden Networks

- **Overview:** Melbourne's strategy integrates urban forestry with stormwater-sensitive urban design (WSUD), including widespread use of raingardens and tree pits.
- **Relevance to Groundwater Recharge:** Raingardens allow stormwater to percolate slowly through vegetated media into shallow aquifers.
- **Data Sources:** City of Melbourne water planning documents, CSIRO evaluations, and field studies.
- **Evaluation Aspects:** Infiltration rates in raingardens, reduction in surface runoff, and soil moisture improvements [12].

2.2.3. Delhi, India – Ridge Forest and Percolation Parks

- **Overview:** The Delhi Ridge acts as a natural green barrier and recharge zone. Recent GI projects have added recharge wells and percolation parks.
- **Relevance to Groundwater Recharge:** The combination of native forests and engineered recharge systems helps counter severe aquifer depletion in the semi-arid region.
- **Data Sources:** Central Ground Water Board reports, Delhi Jal Board projects, and environmental impact assessments.
- **Evaluation Aspects:** Change in water table levels near percolation parks, infiltration capacity of forest soils [13].

2.2.4. Berlin, Germany – Green Roofs and Permeable Pavement Programs

- **Overview:** Berlin has integrated GI into urban planning through incentives for green roofs and porous surface materials.
- **Relevance to Groundwater Recharge:** These features reduce runoff and increase vertical water movement into shallow aquifers.
- **Data Sources:** Berlin Senate Department for the Environment publications, EU Urban Water Atlas, and academic hydrology models.

- **Evaluation Aspects:** Rainwater retention on green roofs, increased infiltration from permeable pavements, groundwater recharge estimates [14].

2.2.5 Data Collection and Analysis

- **Data Types:**
  - *Qualitative:* Urban planning documents, policy analysis, community engagement reports.
  - *Quantitative:* Infiltration rates (mm/hr), increase in permeable surface area (m^2), change in groundwater level (meters), surface runoff reduction (%).
- **Analytical Methods:**
  - Comparative matrix to analyze key parameters across all four cities.
  - Thematic coding of policy and planning documents to understand enabling conditions and barriers.
  - Spatial data analysis using GIS tools (where available) to track land-use changes and infiltration zones.

Limitations

- Differences in measurement techniques across cities can limit direct comparison.
- Some interventions may have indirect recharge effects that are difficult to isolate.
- Long-term monitoring data is not uniformly available for all sites [15].

3. Results

This section presents the findings from the four case studies—New York City, Melbourne, Delhi, and Berlin—based on how urban forests and green infrastructure (GI) have influenced groundwater recharge. The results are organised to highlight both quantitative and qualitative outcomes, followed by a comparative synthesis. While each city's approach is shaped by its unique environmental and policy context, several cross-cutting insights emerge that underscore the value of nature-based solutions (NbS) for urban aquifer sustainability [16].

3.1 Case Study 1: New York City, USA – MillionTreesNYC Initiative

The MillionTreesNYC campaign, launched in 2007, successfully planted over 1 million trees across the city by 2015. Many of these trees were planted in parks, along streets, and in underserved neighbourhoods.

- **Hydrological Impact:**

  Post-planting monitoring showed improved infiltration rates in urban soils, especially in parks and greenways. In areas with restored soils and deep tree pits, infiltration rates increased by 25–40% compared to pre-intervention baselines.
- **Stormwater Management Benefits:**

  Urban trees intercepted an estimated 890 million gallons of stormwater annually, reducing surface runoff and allowing more water to percolate through soil layers.
- **Recharge Contribution**

While direct groundwater recharge data is limited due to subsurface variability, localised soil moisture and water balance models indicate that up to 12% of intercepted stormwater infiltrated deep enough to contribute to shallow aquifers in greened zones [17-19].

3.2 Case Study 2: Melbourne, Australia – Urban Forest Strategy and Raingardens

Melbourne's commitment to water-sensitive urban design includes more than 10,000 raingardens, integrated tree planting, and green corridors.

- **Infiltration Performance**

  Raingardens in urban Melbourne showed infiltration rates ranging from 15–45 mm/hr, depending on soil type and vegetation density. Tree roots and engineered media improved subsurface percolation.
- **Quantitative Recharge Estimate**

  A modelling study estimated that Melbourne's integrated GI interventions could contribute up to **1.2 billion litres per year** of additional recharge in key urban sub-basins.
- **Co-benefits**

- Apart from infiltration, the urban forest strategy reduced local temperatures by 1–2°C and improved soil structure, further enhancing recharge potential over time [20].

3.3 Case Study 3: Delhi, India – Ridge Forest and Percolation Parks

Delhi's semi-arid climate and heavily depleted aquifers make groundwater recharge critical. The city has implemented percolation parks and recharge wells, especially near the Delhi Ridge—a forested area of ecological and hydrological significance.

- **Recharge Wells**

  Percolation parks with native vegetation and shallow recharge wells showed seasonal recharge rates of 1–3 meters in nearby borewells during monsoon periods.
- **Vegetated Zone**

  Forested areas on the Ridge retained rainwater and supported slow infiltration. Soil infiltration tests revealed rates of 12–25 mm/hr, much higher than nearby urbanised areas.
- **Water Table Response**

  Observations from select parks (e.g., Nehru Park) showed modest but consistent rises in the water table (up to 0.5 meters over three years), especially in areas combining vegetation with artificial recharge structures [21].

3.4 Case Study 4: Berlin, Germany – Green Roofs and Permeable Pavements

Berlin has implemented extensive green roofs and permeable surfaces as part of its sustainable water management strategy.

- **Surface-Level Impact**

  Green roofs retained up to 80% of annual rainfall in summer months, slowly releasing it to vegetated surfaces and permeable ground below.
- **Groundwater Recharge Modeling**

  Simulation studies suggest that in pilot districts with high permeable surface coverage (30–40%), the annual groundwater recharge increased by 15–25% compared to districts dominated by impervious surfaces.
- **Policy-Supported Results**

  Berlin's stormwater fee reduction program encouraged property owners to install GI, resulting in nearly 3,000 hectares of green roofs and permeable surfaces contributing indirectly to recharge through delayed runoff and reduced drainage system loads.

3.5 Comparative Synthesis

To summarise, the case studies reveal that both urban forests and green infrastructure significantly enhance the potential for groundwater recharge, though outcomes vary based on local environmental conditions and intervention types.

City	Primary Intervention	Infiltration Rate (mm/hr)	Estimated Recharge Impact	Key Co-benefits
New York	Tree pits &	20–35	Localized recharge in	Runoff reduction, air

	reforestation		green zones	quality
Melbourne	Raingardens & urban trees	15–45	Up to 1.2 billion L/year	Cooling effect, soil restoration
Delhi	Percolation parks, forests	12–25	Seasonal water table rise (0.5 m)	Native biodiversity, community use
Berlin	Green roofs, porous roads	Not applicable (surface-level)	Recharge +15–25% in pilot districts	Decentralized drainage, energy saving

3.6 General Findings

- **Combined systems (forests + engineered GI)** perform better than either intervention alone.
- **Native vegetation** in recharge zones significantly improves infiltration rates due to deeper root systems and better adaptation to local soils.
- **Maintenance and design quality** are critical; poorly maintained raingardens or clogged pervious pavements can negate hydrological benefits.
- **Policy incentives and public engagement** play a major role in sustaining long-term benefits [22,23].

4. Discussion

The results from the case studies indicate that **urban forests and green infrastructure (GI)** play a significant role in enhancing **groundwater recharge**, albeit to varying degrees depending on the city's climate, geology, planning context, and institutional frameworks. This discussion unpacks the implications of these findings, explores cross-case lessons, and addresses the enabling and limiting factors that influence the success of nature-based recharge strategies in cities.

4.1 Effectiveness of Urban Forests and GI for Recharge

Urban forests contribute to groundwater recharge primarily by intercepting rainfall, reducing surface runoff, improving soil structure, and facilitating infiltration through root systems and leaf litter accumulation. For instance, New York's MillionTreesNYC project not only reduced stormwater volumes but also enhanced the infiltration capacity of urban soils, especially in areas with restored topsoil.

On the other hand, engineered GI elements like rain gardens, bioswales, and permeable pavements are designed specifically to direct and absorb stormwater. Melbourne's rain gardens, for example, demonstrated measurable improvements in infiltration and modelled recharge volumes of over 1 billion litres annually. Importantly, the combination of natural systems (like tree cover) with engineered GI structures creates synergistic effects, where trees increase evapotranspiration and soil permeability, while GI ensures controlled percolation and storage.

The Delhi and Berlin cases also show that urban recharge is feasible even in densely built or water-scarce environments, provided that there is strategic integration of NbS with urban design. Berlin's decentralised approach using green roofs and permeable surfaces mitigated runoff and enhanced recharge through a distributed network, proving that NbS can also work effectively in temperate and highly urbanised settings [24].

4.2 Comparative Insights and Contextual Variability

The effectiveness of recharge-oriented NbS varies greatly depending on **local conditions**:

- **Climate and rainfall patterns**: Melbourne and Delhi exhibit high infiltration variability due to seasonal rainfalls. Delhi's recharge parks are most effective during the monsoon, whereas Berlin's green infrastructure has a year-round impact due to more consistent rainfall.
- **Soil type and geology**: Recharge is most effective in areas with **permeable soils** (e.g., sandy or loamy textures). Delhi's Ridge area shows strong recharge potential due to its forested, rocky substrate, whereas compacted urban soils in New York needed restoration for effective infiltration.

- **Urban morphology**: Cities with more **open space**, like Melbourne, can implement larger and more effective GI networks. Dense cities like Delhi must rely on **small-scale, high-impact recharge interventions**, such as percolation wells and micro-parks.
- **Governance and institutional support**: Berlin's success is tied to its strong **policy incentives** (e.g., stormwater fee discounts), whereas in Delhi, recharge efforts have often been fragmented due to **inter-agency coordination gaps** [25].

4.3 Policy and Planning Implications

The findings underscore the need to embed groundwater-sensitive planning into urban development frameworks. Cities should not treat green infrastructure as merely aesthetic or recreational, but rather as functional hydrological assets. Policies that incentivise pervious surfaces, mandate tree planting in development codes, or offer financial benefits for green roofs can mainstream NbS into urban planning.

Moreover, long-term effectiveness depends on maintenance and community involvement. GI features like bioswales or percolation wells can quickly become ineffective if they are not properly maintained. This calls for not only technical standards but also community stewardship models and public awareness campaigns.

Another critical insight is the need for integrated water and land-use governance. Recharge strategies should be co-developed by hydrologists, urban planners, landscape architects, and ecologists. Institutional silos between water utilities, environmental departments, and city planning agencies often undermine the holistic planning needed for effective NbS deployment [26].

4.4 Challenges and Limitations

Despite promising results, several challenges must be acknowledged:

- **Lack of long-term data**: Many cities do not consistently monitor changes in water tables or infiltration rates post-intervention, making it difficult to evaluate the sustained impact of NbS.
- **Measurement complexity**: Groundwater recharge is a slow and diffuse process, influenced by many variables (e.g., evapotranspiration, soil heterogeneity). Isolating the effect of urban GI or tree planting on aquifers is methodologically complex.
- **Equity and access issues**: Recharge-focused GI may be unevenly distributed, benefiting affluent neighbourhoods more than underserved areas, as observed in parts of New York. Future planning must address **environmental justice** in the allocation of NbS.
- **Urban development pressures**: The pressure to maximize buildable land often competes with the space required for GI and urban forests. Balancing short-term development with long-term water security requires visionary leadership and public engagement [27].

4.5 Opportunities for Innovation

Looking forward, cities can enhance the performance and scalability of recharge-based NbS by:

- **Integrating smart monitoring tools**, such as soil moisture sensors, flow meters, and GIS-based models, to quantify and optimize recharge contributions in real time.
- **Blending grey and green infrastructure**, such as combining stormwater drains with vegetated swales or integrating recharge wells with urban parks.
- **Co-producing solutions with local communities**, especially in informal settlements or underserved areas, to ensure relevance, ownership, and sustainability.

In summary, the discussion highlights that urban forests and green infrastructure are not only ecologically beneficial but also hydrologically vital. Their contribution to groundwater recharge is real and measurable, though highly context-dependent. To maximise their potential, cities must move from project-based experiments to strategic, citywide integration of nature-based solutions, supported by data, policy, and citizen engagement [28-30].

5. Conclusion

As urban populations continue to grow and climate variability intensifies, securing reliable and sustainable sources of freshwater has become a critical challenge for cities worldwide. Groundwater, often the most resilient and accessible resource, is being rapidly depleted in many urban regions due to over-extraction and the widespread replacement of natural recharge zones with impervious surfaces. This study has demonstrated that urban forests and green infrastructure (GI)—as key components of nature-based solutions (NbS)—offer a powerful, adaptive, and sustainable approach to enhancing groundwater recharge in cities.The case studies examined—New York City, Melbourne, Delhi, and Berlin—reveal that strategically implemented NbS can significantly improve stormwater infiltration, reduce runoff, and support localised aquifer replenishment. While the magnitude of recharge varies based on soil characteristics, climate, urban design, and governance structures, a consistent pattern emerges: when designed and maintained effectively, urban forests and GI systems enhance the hydrological function of urban landscapes. Furthermore, these interventions provide critical co-benefits, such as urban cooling, biodiversity enhancement, and improved public health and well-being.

Importantly, the study highlights that the success of NbS depends not only on technical design but also on institutional capacity, public engagement, policy support, and long-term monitoring. Cities that foster cross-sector collaboration, incentivise green design through regulatory frameworks, and invest in public awareness are more likely to realise the full potential of recharge-oriented GI. In moving forward, urban planners and policymakers must treat urban forests and GI not as optional amenities, but as core infrastructure that delivers essential ecological services, chief among them, groundwater security. Integrating NbS into mainstream urban development and water management will be crucial to building climate-resilient, water-secure cities for the future. Further research should focus on quantifying long-term recharge impacts, exploring hybrid green-grey solutions, and developing decision-support tools that can guide cities in prioritising and optimising nature-based interventions.

Ultimately, by embracing the logic of working with nature rather than against it, cities can restore their hydrological balance and lay the groundwork for sustainable urban living in a rapidly changing world.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Howard KW. Sustainable cities and the groundwater governance challenge. Environmental Earth Sciences. 2015 Mar;73(6):2543-54.

[2] Jha A, Lamond J, Bloch R, Bhattacharya N, Lopez A, Papachristodoulou N, Bird A, Proverbs D, Davies J, Barker R. Five feet high and rising: cities and flooding in the 21st century. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper. 2011 May 1(5648).

[3] Borah G. Urban Water Stress: Climate Change Implications for Water Supply in Cities. Water Conservation Science and Engineering. 2025 Apr;10(1):20.

[4] He C, Liu Z, Wu J, Pan X, Fang Z, Li J, Bryan BA. Future global urban water scarcity and potential solutions. Nature communications. 2021 Aug 3;12(1):4667.

[5] Sanesi G, Colangelo G, Lafortezza R, Calvo E, Davies C. Urban green infrastructure and urban forests: A case study of the Metropolitan Area of Milan. Landscape Research. 2017 Feb 17;42(2):164-75.

[6] Escobedo FJ, Giannico V, Jim CY, Sanesi G, Lafortezza R. Urban forests, ecosystem services, green infrastructure and nature-based solutions: Nexus or evolving metaphors?. Urban forestry & urban greening. 2019 Jan 1;37:3-12.

[7] Kuehler E, Hathaway J, Tirpak A. Quantifying the benefits of urban forest systems as a component of the green infrastructure stormwater treatment network. Ecohydrology. 2017 Apr;10(3):e1813.

[8] Riaz A, Nijhuis S, Bobbink I. The Role of Spatial Planning in Landscape-Based Groundwater Recharge: A Systematic Literature Review. Water. 2025 Mar 17;17(6):862.

[9] Steiner G, Posch A. Higher education for sustainability by means of transdisciplinary case studies: an innovative approach for solving complex, real-world problems. Journal of Cleaner production. 2006 Jan

1;14(9-11):877-90.

[10] Kuehler E, Hathaway J, Tirpak A. Quantifying the benefits of urban forest systems as a component of the green infrastructure stormwater treatment network. Ecohydrology. 2017 Apr;10(3):e1813.

[11] Pincetl S. Implementing municipal tree planting: Los Angeles million-tree initiative. Environmental management. 2010 Feb;45:227-38.

[12] Creek CU. The New Urban Catchment.

[13] CHAUHAN O. Planning for Restoration and Rejuvenation of Water Bodies across Southern Ridge of South & Southeast Delhi.

[14] Vogel MJ. The Role of Green Roofs in Mitigating Urban Heat Islands in Berlin, Germany. Journal of Research in Social Science and Humanities. 2024 Nov 28;3(11):48-54.

[15] Dadrasajirlou Y. Quantitative flood mitigation in urban basins with optimal low-impact development and best management practices designs under climate change conditions. Semnan Universtiy. 2021 Sep.

[16] Zeydalinejad N, Javadi AA, Webber JL. Global perspectives on groundwater infiltration to sewer networks: A threat to urban sustainability. Water Research. 2024 Sep 15;262:122098.

[17] Garrison JD. Seeing the park for the trees: New York's "Million Trees" campaign vs. the deep roots of environmental inequality. Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science. 2019 Jun;46(5):914-30.

[18] Campbell LK. Constructing New York City's urban forest: The politics and governance of the MillionTreesNYC campaign. In Urban forests, trees, and greenspace 2014 Jul 25 (pp. 242-260). Routledge.

[19] Debats JJ. *Seeing the city for the trees: public space, climate adaptation, and environmental justice in LA and New York's" Million Trees" campaigns* (Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).

[20] Sharma A, Gardner T, Begbie D, editors. Approaches to water sensitive urban design: potential, design, ecological health, urban greening, economics, policies, and community perceptions. Woodhead Publishing; 2018 Oct 3.

[21] Roy SS, Rahman A, Ahmed S, Shahfahad, Ahmad IA. Alarming groundwater depletion in the Delhi Metropolitan Region: a long-term assessment. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment. 2020 Oct;192:1-4.

[22] Köhler M, Schmidt M, Wilhelm Grimme F, Laar M, Lúcia de Assunção Paiva V, Tavares S. Green roofs in temperate climates and the hot-humid tropics–far beyond the aesthetics. Environmental management and health. 2002 Oct 1;13(4):382-91.

[23] Sanesi G, Colangelo G, Lafortezza R, Calvo E, Davies C. Urban green infrastructure and urban forests: A case study of the Metropolitan Area of Milan. Landscape Research. 2017 Feb 17;42(2):164-75.

[24] Ajirotutu RO, Adeyemi AB, Ifechukwu GO, Iwuanyanwu O, Ohakawa TC, Garba BM. Designing policy frameworks for the future: Conceptualizing the integration of green infrastructure into urban development. Journal of Urban Development Studies. 2024.

[25] Ali QS, Pandey S, Chaudhuri RR, Behera S, Jeyakumar L. Development of rainfall-infiltration measurement system and recharge strategies for urban flooding areas: a case study of Delhi, India. Modeling Earth Systems and Environment. 2021 Nov 1:1-3.

[26] Dave YD. *Adapting the Built for the Buried: Biomimicry for Groundwater Recharge in Urban Infrastructure* (Master's thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo).

[27] Paredes Méndez D, Pérez-Sánchez M, Sánchez-Romero FJ, Coronado-Hernández OE. Assessment of the Effectiveness of Green Infrastructure Interventions to Enhance the Ecosystem Services in Developing Countries. Urban Science. 2025 Mar 17;9(3):85.

[28] Shaikh M, Birajdar F. Advancements in remote sensing and GIS for sustainable groundwater monitoring: applications, challenges, and future directions. International Journal of Research in Engineering, Science and Management. 2024;7(3):16-24.

[29] Rwanga SS, Ndambuki JM. Approach to quantify groundwater recharge using GIS based water balance model: a review. Int J Adv Agric Environ Eng (IJAAEE). 2017;4(1).

[30] Babaei M, Ketabchi H. Determining groundwater recharge rate with a distributed model and remote sensing techniques. Water Resources Management. 2022 Nov;36(14): 5401-23.