

---

# SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Senator Sabrina Cervantes, Chair  
2025 - 2026 Regular Session

---

## SB 1197 (Niello) - Permanent standard time

**Version:** February 19, 2026

**Urgency:** No

**Hearing Date:** April 20, 2026

**Policy Vote:** E., U. & C. 10 - 1

**Mandate:** No

**Consultant:** Ashley Ames

**Bill Summary:** This bill would repeal Daylight Savings Time (DST). The bill would require, if the federal government adopts permanent DST, that the state to conform to that federal adoption.

### Fiscal Impact:

- In the event that voters must approve the change proposed by this bill, it would result in one-time costs in the range of \$738,000 to \$984,000 (General Fund) to the Secretary of State (SOS) for printing and mailing costs to place a measure on the ballot in a statewide election. Actual costs could be higher or lower, depending on the length of required elements and the overall size of the ballot.

**Background:** In California, DST (or “summer time”) is observed during the time of year when clocks “spring forward,” or between the second Sunday of March and first Sunday of November, consistent with federal law. Similarly, standard time (“winter time”) is observed during the time of year when clocks “fall back,” between the first Sunday of November and second Sunday of March.

Proposition 7. In 2018, AB 807 (Chu, Chapter 60, Statutes of 2018) placed a ballot measure before voters to make changes to the state’s observance of DST. Specifically, Proposition 7 (November 2018) which passed by 59.75% - 40.25% margin, allows the Legislature by 2 /3 vote to make future changes to California’s DST period, including applying year-round application of DST, if changes are consistent with federal law. Proposition 7 also conformed California DST to current federal law. To enact Proposition 7 the measure also repealed Proposition 12 of 1949, a ballot initiative that established DST in California.

Energy impacts unclear. Claims of energy savings underlie observance of DST during the spring and summer. The argument is that by springing the clock forward during the summer when there is more sunlight we can take advantage of natural light and use less energy or fuel. Yet, there is no clear evidence that DST results in energy savings and some evidence suggests the contrary. In 2008, the National Bureau of Economic Research released a study on the effectiveness of DST. The study sought to provide the first empirical estimates of DST effects on electricity consumption in the United States by focusing on residential electricity demand as far back as the mid-1970s. The bureau’s main finding was that, contrary to the intent of the policy, DST increases residential electricity demand by approximately one percent. According to the study, during DST, there is a tradeoff between the demand for electricity and the demand for heating and cooling. That is, as the demand for electricity is reduced, the demand for heating and cooling is increased. These findings estimate that DST increased cost of electricity to Indiana households by about \$9 million per year. The study further

speculates that this impact is likely to vary by region, with regions where demand for heating and cooling is greater experiencing a higher increase in electricity use. In 2007, the California Energy Commission (CEC) released a study in response to the expansion of DST by the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This study, titled “The Effect of Early Daylight Saving Time on California Electricity Consumption: A Statistical Analysis,” revealed that the “extension of DST to March 2007 had little or no effect on energy consumption in California, according to a statistical analysis. The most likely approximation is a .2% decrease during these three weeks.” The findings of the study in relation to energy savings of the changes to DST were largely inconclusive as the 95 percent confidence interval could result in a range of 1.5% energy savings to 1.4% increase in energy consumption.

Changing electricity generation sources. Since the 2007 CEC study, the state has increased its use of intermittent renewable energy resources, particularly solar generation which can only be used during the time the sun is shining. It is unclear how changes to DST could affect demand of energy resources and the particular effects on the electrical grid when solar generation is increasingly relied upon.

**Proposed Law:** This bill would:

- 1) Make several findings and declarations regarding the benefits of standard time.
- 2) Repeal DST in the state and the provisions regarding the Legislature’s authority to amend the dates and times of the DST period, including if consistent with federal law, and if federal law authorizes the state to provide for the year-round application of DST by a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote.
- 3) Require the state and all political subdivisions of the state to observe year-round standard time.
- 4) Exempt the state and all political subdivisions of the state from the provisions of federal law that establish the advancement of time.
- 5) Require the state and all political subdivisions of the state, if the federal government adopts year-long DST, to set time to conform with that federal adoption, effective upon whichever date as is provided by the federal government.

**Related Legislation:**

SCR 7 (Niello, 2026) proclaims that the Legislature acknowledges the health benefits of permanent standard time.

SB 51 (Niello) of 2025, would have repealed DST and made year-round Standard Time permanent.

SB 1413 (Niello) of 2024, would have required year-long standard time and required the CEC to prepare and submit a report, on or before February 1, 2027, to the Legislature assessing the near-term and long-term impacts of observing year-round standard time on energy demand and supply.

AJR 33 (Chu) of 2020, was a measure to urge Congress and the President to enact legislation that would have allowed a state to adopt DST year-round.

AB 7 (Chu) of 2018, was an urgency measure that would have established year-round DST effective immediately once the federal government authorizes such a change.

Proposition 7 of 2018 made numerous changes to the state's statute concerning DST, including: conform the dates of DST observance with those in the federal statute; authorized the state, by a  $\frac{2}{3}$  votes of the Legislature, to adopt a year-round DST if allowed by the federal government; and repealed numerous sections of the 1949 California DST Act.

AB 807 (Chu, Chapter 60, Statutes of 2018) directed the Secretary of State to place an initiative on the ballot to allow voters to decide whether to authorize the Legislature, by a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote of the members, to make changes to the state's observance of DST consistent with, and to the extent authorized by, federal law.

AB 385 (Chu) of 2016, would have repealed the DST Act and authorized the Legislature by majority vote to amend the law for the application of permanent (year-round) DST, if authorized by federal law. The bill failed passage on the Senate Floor.

AB 2496 (Chu) of 2016, would have declared the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation to establish United States Standard Pacific Time as the standard time within the state during the entire year. The bill died at the Assembly Desk.

AJR 28 (Oberholte, Chapter 167, Statutes of 2016) urged Congress and the President to enact legislation that would allow states to adopt permanent (year-round) DST.

SJR2 1 (Karnette, Chapter 1, Statutes of 2001) memorialized Congress to approve legislation that allows a state to uniformly apply DST year-round.

**Staff Comments:** According to deputies in the Office of Legislative Counsel, SB 1197 would need to go before the voters before year-long standard time could be adopted. Deputies of the Office of Legislative Counsel caution that Section 2 of Article 2 of the California Constitution may require the voters to approve the change proposed in this bill. The deputies in the Office of Legislative Counsel caution that a change to year-long standard time may not be consistent with the passage of Proposition 7 which authorized the Legislature to make changes to the dates of DST. The supporters of this bill contend that when AB 807 (Chu, Chapter 60, Statutes of 2018) was being debated the authors expressed that the language would still allow the state to adopt year-long standard time. They suggest that this may strictly be an issue of divergent interpretations. Should this bill proceed, the author and members may wish to further assess whether to require the bill go before the voters, as suggested by the deputies of the Office of Legislative Counsel.

-- END --