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Obstetrics and gynecology services are a vital part of the health care delivery system. Unfortunately, these services are not always easily accessible by women needing their services. The purpose of this brief is to examine the current distribution of providers, and to identify areas in need of such services, particularly for rural populations in South Carolina. The results can then be utilized to strategically place providers to serve these areas.

## Key Findings

- Residents of many areas in the state live more than 30 minutes from an obstetrics provider. These areas include:
- Southwest, near the Georgia Border
- Low Country, -northwest of Charleston
- Near the North Carolina Border, outside of the Greenville/Spartanburg area
- Residents of rural areas are more likely to have a longer travel time
- These travel times can be explained by provider distributions
- Ten counties (Abbeville, Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell, Calhoun, Edgefield, Hampton, Lee, McCormick, and Saluda) have zero providers in their county.
- Providers cluster in areas near urban centers and/or birthing hospitals
- Using a multifactor scoring index, counties, and zip codes within those counties, were identified as high need for services
- Placements can now be targeted by high need county, then high need zip code within that county.

For this brief, obstetric providers included those with an active license for the following specialties: Obstetrics, Obstetrics and Gynecology, Gynecology, Neo-Natal, Maternal Fetal Medicine, and Neonatal-Perinatal Medicine. Also included in these data are Family Medicine residency sites that are known to provide obstetric services. Other FM providers are not included, as these data do not inform their obstetric service capabilities.
Data were drawn from licensure data, up to date as of September 2018.

## Distribution of Obstetric Providers

## Travel Time

A robust indicator for access to services is to estimate the travel to from a location to the nearest service ${ }^{1}$. As Figure 1 demonstrates, a substantial portion of the state is more than 30 minutes from an obstetrics provider (approximately $65 \%$ of the geographic area).

Many areas greater than 30 minutes from an obstetrics provider are uninhabitable or natural areas, such as national forests (See Figure 1). This occurs particularly near urban areas such as the wetlands south and west of the Charleston metro area and south and east of the Columbia metro area. However, some areas, such as portions of Florence and Marion County, have gaps despite their relative proximity to larger population centers. Many rural areas are populated yet are still more than 30 minutes away. These include a large contiguous portion of the western part of the state, the area between Augusta and Orangeburg, and the area between Augusta and Greenwood. Small gaps exist in counties such as in Chesterfield, Orangeburg, Berkeley, Colleton, Kershaw, Florence, Jasper, and Darlington. Fortunately, further analysis indicates that nearly $100 \%$ of the state is within 60 minutes of a provider.

## Distribution

These disparate travel times are reflect where providers choose to practice. As of July 2017, there were 928 active providers serving patients in South Carolina, for a ratio of 0.43 per 1,000 SC women aged 15-50 years old.

These providers are not distributed evenly across the state, with several large gaps and underserved areas. The ratio of OB/GYN to 1,000 residents, at the county level, ranges from 0.043 in Berkeley County to 1.218 in Charleston County (Table 1). The median ratio among counties with a provider was 0.24 (mean 0.31 ). Ten counties (Abbeville, Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell, Calhoun, Edgefield, Hampton, Lee, McCormick, and Saluda) have zero providers in their county.

[^0]Using just the provider to resident ratios, one can identify counties that have none, low, medium, or high ratios (See Figure 2). Focusing on areas of high need, there are several counties that would theoretically demonstrate a high need for obstetric services. These counties are distributed throughout the state, particularly along the western border. These data can be misleading, however, as demonstrated in Figure 3. This figure displays results of the same division of ratios (none, low, medium, and high). These results demonstrate a much larger portion of the state's zip codes without providers at all, and very few with a high ratio.

Table 1: Obstetric Providers per 1,000 Residents, by County

| County | Obstetric/FM <br> Providers per <br> $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$ residents | County | Obstetric <br> Providers per <br> $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$ residents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abbeville County | 0 | Greenwood | 0.539 |
| Aiken County | 0.158 | Hampton County | 0 |
| Allendale County | 0 | Horry County | 0.282 |
| Anderson County | 0.195 | Jasper County | 0.333 |
| Bamberg County | 0 | Kershaw County | 0.192 |
| Barnwell County | 0 | Lancaster County | 0.148 |
| Beaufort County | 0.550 | Laurens County | 0.139 |
| Berkeley County | 0.043 | Lee County | 0 |
| Calhoun County | 0 | Lexington County | 0.288 |
| Charleston County | 1.218 | Marion County | 0.229 |
| Cherokee County | 0.157 | Marlboro County | 0.255 |
| Chester County | 0.073 | McCormick | 0 |
| Chesterfield County | 0.050 | Newberry County | 0.194 |
| Clarendon County | 0.449 | Oconee County | 0.343 |
| Colleton County | 0.064 | Orangeburg | 0.227 |
| Darlington County | 0.173 | Pickens County | 0.170 |
| Dillon County | 0.533 | Richland County | 0.631 |
| Dorchester County | 0.203 | Saluda County | 0 |
| Edgefield County | 0 | Spartanburg | 0.357 |
| Fairfield County | 0.212 | Sumter County | 0.356 |
| Florence County | 0.497 | Union County | 0.350 |
| Georgetown County | 0.457 | Williamsburg | 0.076 |
| Greenville County | 0.803 | York County | 0.265 |
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Figure 1: Travel time (minutes) to reach an Obstetric Provider in South Carolina


Figure 2: Distribution of Obstetric Providers, by County


Figure 3: Distribution of Obstetric Providers, by Zip Code


## Identifying areas of need

In order to target areas that would benefit from an obstetrics provider, we utilized the data displayed above, as well as additional community-level information, to create a need index for obstetrics services. This index utilized several factors that would indicate a higher need for such services. These include:

- Obstetric Providers per 1,000
- Number of Health Care Facilities
- Percentage not within 30 minutes of an OBGYN
- Number of women aged 15-50
- Birth Rate
- Percent rural (according to census data)

These factors were standardized, summed, then re-scaled to range from 0-100 (with 100 indicating an area with the highest need for services). A need index was calculated for both the county and zip code level.

Using this index, the average score at the county level was 32.2 (median 30.8). Fourteen counties had a score greater than 40 , with 7 of those scoring greater than 60 (McCormick had a score of 100 , indicating the highest need - See Table 2). All of these counties were also predominately rural.
Table 2: Index Scores, by county

| County | Need Index | County | Need Index | County | Need Index |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| McCormick | 100.0 | Laurens | 37.7 | Anderson | 17.2 |
| Fairfield | 65.8 | Clarendon | 36.8 | Pickens | 16.9 |
| Calhoun | 65.7 | Jasper | 34.2 | Greenwood | 16.0 |
| Edgefield | 64.2 | Dillon | 33.8 | Berkeley | 11.8 |
| Saluda | 61.9 | Union | 33.2 | Florence | 11.4 |
| Lee | 60.6 | Cherokee | 32.0 | Sumter | 10.4 |
| Hampton | 60.5 | Kershaw | 31.7 | Beaufort | 10.4 |
| Williamsburg | 56.0 | Marlboro | 30.0 | Lexington | 10.4 |
| Allendale | 51.0 | Darlington | 28.9 | Spartanburg | 10.0 |
| Abbeville | 49.4 | Orangeburg | 28.6 | York | 8.4 |
| Newberry | 45.5 | Lancaster | 27.4 | Dorchester | 7.4 |
| Barnwell | 44.7 | Georgetown | 24.6 | Greenville | 2.3 |
| Chesterfield | 43.9 | Bamberg | 21.7 | Richland | 0.9 |
| Colleton | 43.5 | Marion | 20.2 | Charleston | 0.0 |
| Chester | 39.5 | Aiken | Horry | 18.9 |  |
| Oconee | 39.1 |  |  |  |  |

If we were to focus on just those counties with the highest scores, we can then narrow down the placement process to zip codes within each county. This will help to ensure the greatest potential for impact of such a placement. Table 3 displays the zip codes within each of these 14 counties. For example, McCormick County has the highest overall need score, of 100. The zip codes that are within this county, however, range in need scores from 95.5 to 22.4. In addition, we can identify those zip codes that not only have a high score, but are mostly within the high need counties. Using this additional information, one would target zip codes 29899 (score of $95.5,100 \%$ in the county) over 29819 (score of 77.4 , but only $0.7 \%$ in the county.

The fourth column in Table 3 produces a weighted score for each zip code in the high need counties - this is simply the individual zip code score multiplied by the percentage in the county. Using this score, priorities for that specific county would emerge.

Table 3: Need Scores by County and Zip, weighted and Unweighted

| County/Zip | Index | Percent in the County | Weighted Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McCormick | 100.0 |  |  |
| 29899 | 95.5 | 100.0\% | 95.5 |
| 29819 | 77.4 | 0.7\% | 0.6 |
| 29848 | 76.4 | 9.9\% | 7.6 |
| 29838 | 71.4 | 64.0\% | 45.7 |
| 29840 | 69.4 | 100.0\% | 69.4 |
| 29845 | 67.2 | 98.7\% | 66.4 |
| 29835 | 65.7 | 94.6\% | 62.1 |
| 29821 | 46.1 | 54.5\% | 25.1 |
| 29844 | 40.2 | 100.0\% | 40.2 |
| 29620 | 22.4 | 0.4\% | 0.1 |
| Fairfield | 65.8 |  |  |
| 29130 | 81.5 | 78.6\% | 64.0 |
| 29132 | 81.5 | 100.0\% | 81.5 |
| 29055 | 76.7 | 17.4\% | 13.3 |
| 29014 | 75.6 | 32.8\% | 24.8 |
| 29031 | 70.6 | 10.9\% | 7.7 |
| 29065 | 67.8 | 100.0\% | 67.8 |
| 29015 | 59.8 | 100.0\% | 59.8 |
| 29180 | 46.2 | 98.0\% | 45.2 |
| 29045 | 33.9 | 0.4\% | 0.1 |
| 29016 | 33.0 | 2.0\% | 0.7 |
| Calhoun | 65.7 |  |  |
| 29047 | 82.4 | 49.5\% | 40.8 |
| 29160 | 75.2 | 25.1\% | 18.9 |
| 29030 | 72.5 | 73.4\% | 53.2 |
| 29135 | 70.2 | 97.0\% | 68.1 |
| 29112 | 62.3 | 4.7\% | 2.9 |
| 29053 | 41.5 | 6.5\% | 2.7 |


| 29118 | 29.7 | 1.6\% | 0.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Edgefield | 64.2 |  |  |
| 29848 | 76.4 | 0.4\% | 0.3 |
| 29838 | 71.4 | 36.0\% | 25.7 |
| 29832 | 70.0 | 93.2\% | 65.2 |
| 29129 | 69.6 | 4.9\% | 3.4 |
| 29847 | 69.4 | 76.1\% | 52.8 |
| 29845 | 67.2 | 1.3\% | 0.9 |
| 29835 | 65.7 | 5.4\% | 3.6 |
| 29821 | 46.1 | 45.5\% | 20.9 |
| 29138 | 45.6 | 0.1\% | 0.1 |
| 29824 | 32.7 | 100.0\% | 32.7 |
| 29860 | 25.3 | 57.9\% | 14.6 |
| 29841 | 2.1 | 0.0\% | 0.0 |
| Saluda | 61.9 |  |  |
| 29666 | 75.4 | 3.0\% | 2.3 |
| 29127 | 70.5 | 0.1\% | 0.1 |
| 29832 | 70.0 | 6.5\% | 4.6 |
| 29129 | 69.6 | 33.7\% | 23.4 |
| 29105 | 68.9 | 20.7\% | 14.3 |
| 29070 | 62.5 | 16.9\% | 10.6 |
| 29166 | 51.1 | 100.0\% | 51.1 |
| 29006 | 46.8 | 24.5\% | 11.5 |
| 29138 | 45.6 | 98.1\% | 44.7 |
| 29824 | 32.7 | 0.0\% | 0.0 |
| Lee | 60.6 |  |  |
| 29104 | 85.5 | 52.7\% | 45.1 |
| 29128 | 85.0 | 14.1\% | 12.0 |
| 29069 | 83.8 | 9.2\% | 7.7 |
| 29009 | 68.6 | 2.0\% | 1.4 |
| 29032 | 67.5 | 6.5\% | 4.4 |
| 29080 | 55.3 | 50.2\% | 27.8 |
| 29010 | 50.0 | 99.3\% | 49.6 |
| 29550 | 39.8 | 0.9\% | 0.3 |
| 29153 | 39.6 | 3.2\% | 1.3 |
| 29040 | 32.0 | 8.8\% | 2.8 |
| 29020 | 30.8 | 2.9\% | 0.9 |
| 29046 | 10.8 | 100.0\% | 10.8 |
| Hampton | 60.5 |  |  |
| 29934 | 72.9 | 10.9\% | 8.0 |
| 29921 | 70.1 | 100.0\% | 70.1 |
| 29939 | 68.7 | 100.0\% | 68.7 |
| 29945 | 64.6 | 30.7\% | 19.8 |
| 29923 | 64.3 | 100.0\% | 64.3 |
| 29911 | 63.1 | 100.0\% | 63.1 |
| 29916 | 62.5 | 58.9\% | 36.8 |
| 29827 | 62.4 | 3.4\% | 2.1 |
| 29932 | 61.0 | 100.0\% | 61.0 |
| 29933 | 61.0 | 100.0\% | 61.0 |
| 29918 | 55.5 | 100.0\% | 55.5 |
| 29922 | 52.4 | 79.0\% | 41.4 |
| 29944 | 35.7 | 100.0\% | 35.7 |
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| 29924 | 24.2 | 100.0\% | 24.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Williamsburg | 56.0 |  |  |
| 29518 | 80.3 | 97.9\% | 78.6 |
| 29056 | 79.8 | 100.0\% | 79.8 |
| 29580 | 78.7 | 100.0\% | 78.7 |
| 29590 | 77.9 | 100.0\% | 77.9 |
| 29554 | 60.9 | 57.7\% | 35.2 |
| 29555 | 53.2 | 3.0\% | 1.6 |
| 29510 | 45.5 | 38.6\% | 17.6 |
| 29556 | 40.7 | 100.0\% | 40.7 |
| 29440 | 37.3 | 0.1\% | 0.0 |
| 29564 | 34.6 | 100.0\% | 34.6 |
| 29560 | 27.5 | 10.4\% | 2.9 |
| Allendale | 51.0 |  |  |
| 29836 | 71.4 | 90.4\% | 64.6 |
| 29846 | 67.2 | 100.0\% | 67.2 |
| 29827 | 62.4 | 96.6\% | 60.3 |
| 29849 | 53.7 | 81.8\% | 43.9 |
| 29810 | 19.7 | 100.0\% | 19.7 |
| Abbeville | 49.4 |  |  |
| 29819 | 77.4 | 5.1\% | 4.0 |
| 29638 | 75.0 | 82.2\% | 61.7 |
| 29653 | 74.4 | 2.6\% | 1.9 |
| 29639 | 65.0 | 100.0\% | 65.0 |
| 29692 | 63.9 | 14.9\% | 9.5 |
| 29655 | 59.6 | 33.8\% | 20.2 |
| 29628 | 52.1 | 100.0\% | 52.1 |
| 29659 | 48.1 | 100.0\% | 48.1 |
| 29627 | 46.3 | 0.2\% | 0.1 |
| 29654 | 41.4 | 19.0\% | 7.9 |
| 29620 | 22.4 | 99.6\% | 22.3 |
| 29646 | 20.4 | 0.4\% | 0.1 |
| 29649 | 13.6 | 0.7\% | 0.1 |
| Newberry | 45.5 |  |  |
| 29122 | 82.3 | 100.0\% | 82.3 |
| 29037 | 80.4 | 96.7\% | 77.7 |
| 29075 | 79.3 | 66.0\% | 52.3 |
| 29145 | 79.2 | 100.0\% | 79.2 |
| 29332 | 73.7 | 7.0\% | 5.1 |
| 29178 | 73.7 | 88.4\% | 65.1 |
| 29127 | 70.5 | 99.9\% | 70.4 |
| 29126 | 64.3 | 100.0\% | 64.3 |
| 29108 | 31.9 | 100.0\% | 31.9 |
| 29036 | 20.8 | 1.3\% | 0.3 |
| 29355 | 6.8 | 53.5\% | 3.6 |
| Barnwell | 44.7 |  |  |
| 29808 | 78.9 | 100.0\% | 78.9 |
| 29836 | 71.4 | 9.6\% | 6.9 |
| 29853 | 69.2 | 79.8\% | 55.3 |
| 29843 | 64.7 | 34.2\% | 22.1 |
| 29826 | 62.4 | 100.0\% | 62.4 |
| 29849 | 53.7 | 18.2\% | 9.8 |
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| 29817 | 36.6 | $96.1 \%$ | 35.2 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29812 | 33.3 | $100.0 \%$ | 33.3 |
| 29813 | 33.3 | $100.0 \%$ | 33.3 |
| Chesterfield | 43.9 |  | 80.9 |
| 29709 | 80.9 | $100.0 \%$ | 64.9 |
| 29101 | 80.4 | $80.7 \%$ | 76.1 |
| 29741 | 76.1 | $100.0 \%$ | 17.9 |
| 29593 | 74.5 | $24.0 \%$ | 0.0 |
| 29067 | 70.6 | $0.1 \%$ | 66.7 |
| 29727 | 66.7 | $100.0 \%$ | 54.6 |
| 29718 | 61.3 | $89.1 \%$ | 48.4 |
| 29584 | 48.4 | $100.0 \%$ | 2.5 |
| 29550 | 39.8 | $6.4 \%$ | 34.9 |
| 29728 | 34.9 | $100.0 \%$ | 34.2 |
| 29520 | 34.2 | $100.0 \%$ | 79.4 |
|  | 43.5 |  | 77.2 |
| Colleton | 79.4 | $100.0 \%$ | 73.4 |
| 29474 | 77.2 | $100.0 \%$ | 72.9 |
| 29475 | 75.4 | $97.3 \%$ | 72.1 |
| 29082 | 72.9 | $100.0 \%$ | 7.9 |
| 29435 | 72.1 | $100.0 \%$ | 71.1 |
| 29929 | 71.7 | $11.0 \%$ | 58.2 |
| 29472 | 71.1 | $100.0 \%$ | 23.5 |
| 29446 | 66.3 | $87.8 \%$ | 63.7 |
| 29481 | 64.6 | $36.4 \%$ | 22.7 |
| 29945 | 63.7 | $100.0 \%$ | 0.2 |
| 29493 | 56.9 | $39.8 \%$ | 51.9 |
| 29438 | 54.2 | $0.3 \%$ | 0.5 |
| 29432 | 51.9 | $100.0 \%$ | 41.7 |
| 29452 | 44.0 | $1.2 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| 29081 | 41.7 |  |  |
| 29488 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Bosanac, E. M., Parkinson, R. C., \& Hall, D. S. (1976). Geographic access to hospital care: a 30-minute travel time standard. Medical Care, 14(7), 616-624.

